

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,
THEOLOGICAL and
ECCLESIASTICAL
LITERATURE

Suada- Syzygus

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

Suada

the Roman personification of *persuasion*; the Greek *Peitho*.

Suadela

the diminutive of SUADA *SEE SUADA* (q.v.).

Su'äh

(Heb. **שׁוּאֵחַ**, *Su'ach*, *sweeping* [Gesén.], *oriches* [Fürst]; Sept. **Σουέ**), first named of the eleven “sons” of Zophah an Asherite (~~1376~~ 1 Chronicles 7:36). B.C. apparently cir. 1020.

Suares (or Suarez), Joseph Marie

a French prelate and antiquarian, was born July 5, 1599, at Avignon, and educated at his native place. Having embraced the ecclesiastical state, he became the coadjutor of his uncle Francisco Suarez (q.v.) as provost of the cathedral; and afterwards went to Rome, where cardinal Barberini gave him charge of his library. Having received several additional honors, he was at length promoted by Urban VIII, in 1633, to the bishopric of Vaison, in which capacity: he attacked Calvinism; but he finally resigned in favor of his brother Charles, and retired to Rome, where he died, Dec. 7, 1677. His antiquarian writings are enumerated in Hoefér, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

His brother CHARLES JOSEPH, born at Avignon in 1618, became priest in 1641, succeeded to the bishopric of Vaison, in 1666, and died there Nov. 7, 1670.

A nephew of both the preceding, Louis ALPHONSE, born June 6, 1642, at Avignon, studied theology at the Seminary of St. Sulpice, succeeded his uncle as bishop of Vaison in 1671, held a synod there in 1673, and died March 13, 1685, near Sorgues, in Vaucluse,

A nephew of the last preceding, Louis MARIE, was bishop of Acqs (now Dax) in 1736, and died April 17, 1785.

Suarez, Francisco

a Spanish Jesuit, born at Granada, Jan. 5, 1548, was a professor of reputation at Alcalá, at Salamanca, and at Rome. He was afterwards invited to Coimbra, Portugal, where he became the principal professor of

divinity. He died at Lisbon, Sept. 25. 1617. He was an author of the most voluminous kind, and the Jesuits consider him the greatest and best scholastic divine that their order has produced. See his writings in Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s.v. He is the principal author of the system of congruism, which is at bottom only that of Molina. Father Noel, a French Jesuit, made an abridgment of the works of this commentator (Geneva, 173, 2, fol.). There is a *Life* of him by Antony Deschamps (Perpignan, 1671, 4to).

Suayambhu

in Hindu mythology, was the son of Bramah and ancestor of the human race. His daughter Devagdhi was married to Kartama, one of the great progenitors, and bore nine daughters, who became the wives of the nine remaining progenitors. By Satarupa the daughter of Bramah, Suayambhu became the father of five other children, whose offspring contributed towards the extension of the human family. — Vollmer, *Wörterb. d. Mythol.* s.v.

Su'ba

(Σουβάς v.r. Σαβιή), a name given only in the Apocrypha (1 Esdr. 5, 34) among the sons of Solomon's servants who returned with Zerubbabel from the Captivity; but not found in the parallel Hebrew lists (^{<1525>}Ezra 2:35-37; ^{<1525>}Nehemiah 7:37-39).

Su'bai

(Σουβαί), a Graecized form (1 Esdr. 5, 30) of the SHALMAI *SEE* SHALMAI (q.v.) of the Hebrew lists (^{<1526>}Ezra 2:46; ^{<1526>}Nehemiah 7:48).

Subarrhation

a term denoting the delivery by the bridegroom to the bride of the ring and other gifts at the time, and during the act, of marriage.

Subcanon

an inferior or minor canon (q.v.). Subchancellor, or Scribe. The notary of Italian cathedrals is the chancellor's vicar, called also registrar or matricular, and at St. Paul's, in 1280, designated as *scriptor librorum*. He

acted as assistant secretary, librarian, lecturer in theology and law, aid teacher of reading.

Subchanter, or Succentor

the deputy of the precentor, the principal among the vicars in choir. The precentor sat on the right-hand side of the choir, and the succentor on the left. His office was usually the gift of the chapter; occasionally, however, he was nominated by the precentor. There were two kinds of subchanters:

1. The succentor of canons, or succentormajor (first mentioned in the 11th century), at York, Bayeux, Paris, Amiens, Glasgow, Chalons, Girgenti, Wells, and Salisbury, acted as precentor's deputy with regard to the canons; he ranks, after the subdean, and the office was given by the diocesan. At Amiens he installs canons in the lower stalls; at Rouen he holds a prebend and regulates processions; he is often called *prichantre* in distinction from the *grand chantré*.

2. A vicar, deputy, and assistant precentor. At Seville and Placentia and in England he tabled the ministers for service; at Chichester and Hereford he chastised the boys, and ordinarily his duties were confined to ordering processions, delating offenders, and general supervision of the lower choir; he could not correct a canon. His office appears at Chichester and St. David's in the 13th century; he corresponds to the precentor of the new foundations. At Lichfield and St. David's the subchanter is head of the Vicar's College.

Subdeacon

The ancient Christian Church had but two classes of officers, the *presidents*, *προιστάμενοι*, *ποιμένες*, *ἡγούμενοι*, also *ἐπίσκοποι*, *πρεσβύτεροι* and the *servants*, *διάκονοι*; the former being charged with functions within the field of worship, while the latter were employed in administering the charities of the Church. In time, the episcopacy was developed out of the presbyterate, and the subdiaconate from the diaconate. The latter was always regarded by the Church as of human invention, and as having been introduced "utilitatis causa" (see Morinus, *Comm. de S. Eccles. Ordin. Exercitat.* 11:1). Its introduction was, more over, gradual, and not uniform throughout the Church. Some churches were without subdeacons as late as the middle of the 9th century; and, before the hierarchy assumed a rigid and unchangeable form, the

subdiaconate was not regarded an indispensable preliminary, to the diaconate. The existence of subdeacons in the Church of Rome as early as A.D. 250 is shown in a letter of pope Cornelius to bishop Fabius of Antioch (Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* 6:43; comp. Jaff, *Regest. Pontiff* No. 8); in Spain as early as A.D. 305, in ch. 30 of the Synod of Elvira; in Africa about the middle of the 3rd century, in different letters of Cyprian (2, 3, 29, 30, etc.); and in the East by the middle of the 4th century, as appears from determinations of the Synod of Laodicea in 361 (Dist. 23:21-23), and a letter of Athanasius (*Ad Solita.* A.D. 330).

The subdeacons were reckoned among the class of *Ordines Minores*, and their functions were of inferior dignity. They were permitted to touch the sacred vessels if empty, in this having a pre-eminence over other *Minores*; but, in general, their duties were simply the receiving of oblations (hence *Oblationarii*), the care of the tombs of martyred saints, the guarding of church doors during the administration of the sacrament, etc. In course of time the reading of the lesson from the epistles was added and became their leading function.

The importance of the subdiaconate was enhanced when Gregory the Great included it under the operation of the law of celibacy (Dist. 31:1), and yet more when its members were made eligible to the episcopal office by the Council of Benevento in the pontificate of Urban II, 1091. The question now arose whether the subdiaconate must not be counted among *the Ordines Majores*, which was finally determined by Innocent III in favor of such promotion. Subdeacons thereby acquired the rights of the superior orders as respects personal independence, etc. They assume a title at ordination, take vows of celibacy, etc., and are forbidden to return to secular life. Their ordination is, however, peculiar, in that the candidates are not presented to the consecrating bishop by the archdeacon, the laying on of hands and questioning of the people are not used, and the consecration is performed instead by “*traditio instrumentorum et vestium.*” The beginning of the twenty-second year was fixed by the Council of Trent (Sess. 23:12, *De Reform.*) as the proper age for entering on this office, and a year is required to intervene before ordination to the diaconate may follow bishops, however, may depart from this rule when needful (Sess. 23:11 Richter, *Kirchenrecht*, § 113). At the present time, the subdiaconate exists simply as a stage on the way to higher stations, and its functions are generally performed by laymen and presbyters. The term is sometimes used in Protestant churches, but without denoting any distinction of order.

See Morinus, *De Sacris Ordinationibus*, pt. 3, exercit. 12, Thomassinus, *Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Discipl.* 20:30 sq., Seitz, *Recht des Pfarramtes*, II, 1, 415 sq.; Richter, *Kirchenrecht*, § 91, 103, 113 Coleman, *Ancient Christ. Exemplified*, 23, 11; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v., Walcott: — *Sacred Archaeol.* s.v.

Subdean

There were three kinds of subdeans:

1. The vice-dean.
2. The dean's vicar, his subofficer, assistant when present, and deputy when absent vicegerent in choir, as at Lichfield both had a similar office, that of supplying the duties of the dean in his absence.
3. The capitular subdean; the perpetual subdean, who is said to hold a place which is a quasi-dignity in the gift of a bishop. He has a stall, and corresponds to the foreign archpriest having parochial charge of the close. The office was founded in Salisbury in 1021. For a full account of his duties 'in the several cathedrals, see Walcott, *Sacred Archaeol.* s.v.

Subdiaconissa

a term applied, in the early Church, to the wife of a subdeacon.

Subigus

a Roman divinity, the god of the wedding-night, whose office it was to render the newly married maidens favorably disposed towards their husbands.

Subintroductae

(*συνείσακτοι*) was a term applied to females kept by persons of clerical rank. Celibacy and chastity were regarded as identical from an early period in the Church, and in consequence ascetics invented the plan of remaining unmarried and taking into spiritual union with themselves young virgins (*ἀδελφαί*, *so-ores*, sisters). The relation is already hinted at in Hermas, but becomes more frequent in the 3rd century, when Cyprian condemns it. Its spiritual character was speedily lost, and it soon became necessary to legislate against the abuses to which it gave rise. The question was discussed at the trial of Paul of Samosata, at Antioch, in 269 (see

Eusebius). In 305 the Council of Eleberis forbade the clergy to have “sisters” living with them; and that of Ancyra in 314, and of Nice in 325, prohibited association with all females whose relation to the clergyman did not obviate all suspicion (mother, sister, etc.). Subsequent legislation on the parts of both Church and State was in the same direction; e.g. of the third Council of Carthage in 397 (Can. 17, 27) and *Cod. de Episc. et Clericis* 1, 3, 19 of Honoris and Theodosius, 420; Novella 123, 29; 137, 1, *in fine*, of Justinian.

The practice of keeping *subintroductae* or *extreaese*, developed into complete concubinage, and became so general that constantly repeated prohibitions became necessary, under penalty of degradation. Upon the whole subject, see Bruns, *Canones Apostol.*, etc. In the 11th century the term *focarice* began to be applied to this disreputable class (“meretrices foco assidentes”), and the priests were termed *focaristae*, i.e. *conicubinariii, fornicatores*. See Du Fresne, *Glossar* 5; Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* 4th ed. vol. 1-3, *passim*; *Gerh. Maui* (d.1384) *Sermo de Focaristis et Notoriis Fornicaf.* (Dresd. 1859); Trident. Cone. Sess. 25, 14, *De Reformé*. —*Herzog, Real Encyklop.* s.v. **SEE AGAPETAE**.

Subjectivism

the doctrine of Kant that all human knowledge is merely relative, or, rather, that we cannot prove it to be absolute. According to him we cannot *objectify the subjective*; that is, we cannot prove that what appears true to us must appear true to all intelligent beings; or that, with different faculties, what now appears true to us might not appear untrue. But to call our knowledge relative is merely calling it human, or proportioned to the faculties of a man; just as the knowledge of angels may be called angelic.. Our knowledge may be admitted to be relative to our faculties of apprehending it; but that does not make it less certain. See Fleming, *Vocab. of Philosoph. Science*, s.v.

Sublapsarians, or Infralapsarians

is the name given by the orthodox Reformed theologians to those who consider the divine decree of election as dependent upon that which permitted the introduction of evil. The *supralapsarians*, on the contrary, consider the decree of election, or of predestination to eternal salvation or damnation, as the original decree upon which all others, including that permitting the introduction of evil, depend. The question consequently

refers to the order in which these two decrees were promulgated, or, which amounts to the same, to a nearer appreciation of the object of predestination, i.e. whether God in issuing his decree of election considered man (and the angels) as fallen, or simply as subjects whose eternal fate was to be decided apart from the consideration of sin, although, of course, knowing what would be their conduct. Both opinions have been permitted to exist side by side in the Church even in times of the greatest intolerance, as, in reality, the question does in no way affect the *dogma* of predestination. Both systems hold to the fundamental principles that election is *absolute*, *not* motivated by any cause outside of God's will, *unchangeably* settled; since the beginning of the world, and *infallible* in its action. Yet the Synod of Dort, in 1618-19, endorsed the sublapsarian theory, Gomarus alone upholding supralapsarianism, without, however, ceasing to be considered orthodox. The synod had recognized that both systems preserved the same fundamental doctrine, and only preferred sublapsarianism as presenting that doctrine in a form less objectionable to other churches. This question had no connection whatever with Arminianism, for not even the slightest appearance of a concession to those views would have been tolerated. In 1675, at the drawing-up of the *Formula Consensus*, the Swiss refused expressly to endorse sublapsarianism for fear of appearing thereby to cast blame on the supralapsarians. The most eminent theologians, such as Beza, Piscator, Voetius, Gomarus, etc., upheld the stricter system. It is only in modern times that sublapsarianism has come to be considered as a real diminishing (of the difficulties of the orthodox Reformed doctrines; but the ancients, who appreciated it more correctly, did not look upon it as such, and consequently did not oppose it. The general principles of the system *were* as follows: The world, and man at first, answered exactly to the divine plan: man was created in primitive purity, fell by his own voluntary act, and thus became subject to retribution, and this infallibly; and although all are bad alike, yet some are redeemed by grace and made blessed, but the others remain unredeemed, and as all, even those who are saved, deserve to be damned. All this happens exactly as it was originally decided in the organization of the world, and because it was thus decided. The decrees were all equally promulgated by God from all eternity without one having precedence over the other. Yet we are obliged to distinguish the different decrees according to their relation to each other, as the final decree includes unnecessarily the means by which its object is to be attained; and these decrees concerning, the means even precede the decree on the final

result, yet only in causality, not in time, since there is *no* time with God. The supralapsarian system, on the other hand, holds that the final object of creation, independent from any other, is the revelation, the self manifestation of God, and that in his two great attributes of mercy and justice—mercy on those he saves, justice on those he leaves to the punishment they deserve. All other decrees serve but as means for this great object of the creation; in this view God created men, then permitted the introduction of sin, thus making them ‘objects of his salvation or of his condemnation, which were decided beforehand. In consequence of these views, that school asserts that in issuing the decree of election God looked on man merely as man, not as man fallen; hence, also, Gomarus names as objects of the decree of predestination the “creature rationabiles, servabiles, damnabiles, creabiles, labiles, et reparabiles,” i.e. creatures considered yet as without any determined properties. The sublapsarians arranged the plan of creation in such a manner that God, from motives of his own, decreed to create man, and to allow him to sin knowing that he would infallibly do so; and from these decrees they make the other decree depend whereby some are saved, though no better than the others, and the others damned, though no worse; and this manifestation of mercy to some and of justice to others constitutes the justification of the whole. This is their whole difference. The two methods uphold the same doctrine of absolute predestination, only the supralapsarians present it in a stricter, more imperious manner, without, however, lessening the guilt of man or making God the originator of evil; the sublapsarian method is more cautious in its expression, although it upholds predestination as firmly, and the guilt of man in the Fall; for what God allowed in his plan is not permitted because God foresees what will happen, but only because he wills it. The supralapsarians, indeed, say that the Fall itself was predestined, but mean only that it was infallibly to come; while, on the other side, the sublapsarians do not in any way mean that the Fall might not have happened, that it could only be considered in the plan of creation as having occurred, or even that the entrance of sin into the world might have occurred in a different manner than in that which God freely appointed in his scheme of creation. See Hagenbach, *Dogmengesch.* 3rd ed. p. 589; Schweizer, *Ref Dogmatik*, 2, 123 sq.; the same, *Gesch. d. ref Central Dogmeng.* 2, 43, 55. 181.

Subleyras, Pierre

a French painter and engraver, was born at Uzes in 1699, and was the son of Matthieu Subleyras, a painter of considerable merit. Pierre, at the age of fourteen, went to Toulouse in order to receive lessons from Antoine Rivalx. In 1724 he went to Paris, took the course in the Academy, and in 1726 gained the first prize. He went to Rome in 1728 as royal pensioner, and died there, May 28, 1749. He painted several sacred and ecclesiastical scenes which have been greatly admired. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s.v.

Submission, Act of

an act passed in the reign of Henry III, in 1534, which makes royal license necessary to the validity of certain acts of convocation.

Submission To God

implies an entire giving up of our understanding, will, and affections to him or, as Dr. Owen observes, it consists in—

1. An acquiescence in his right and sovereignty;
2. An acknowledgment of his righteousness and wisdom;
3. A sense of his love and care;
4. A diligent application of ourselves to his mind and will;
5. Keeping our souls, by faith and patience, from weariness and despondency;
6. A full resignation to his will. *SEE RESIGNATION.*

Subprebendary

a prebendary in inferior orders. Subprecentor, an assistant to and substitute for the precentor of a church or cathedral, whose duty it is to attend to and guide the singing in the absence of the precentor.

Subprior

an official in a priory, who is the prior's deputy, and is ordinarily second in rank to the prior.

Subramanya Mahasena

in Hindü mythology, meaning *the great leader of armies*, is a surname of *Karetikeya*, the son of *Siva* and the sisters *Gonya* and *Uma*.

Subruncingator

a Roman divinity who presided over the weeding and grubbing of gardens.

Subsacrist

an assistant to, or deputy of, the ordinary sacrist or sacristan of a church. They were keepers of the vestry and sacristy, church-cleaners, bell-ringers, etc. At Lincoln they were called stall keepers; at York, clerks of the vestibule; and at Canterbury, vesturers.

Subsacristan

SEE SUBSACRIST.

Subscription, Clerical

Subscription to articles of religion is required of the clergy of every established Church, and of some churches not established.

“The most stringent and elaborate subscription probably ever enforced,” says Dr. Stanley, “was that in the duchy of Brunswick, when duke Julius required from all clergy, from all professors, from all: magistrates, a subscription to all and everything contained in the Confession of Augsburg, in the Apology for the Confession, in the Smalcaldic Articles, in all the works of Luther, and in all the works of Chemnitz” (*Letter on State of Subscription*, p. 37). The Church of England only requires this kind of assent to the Thirty-nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer. But it has been a matter of dispute whether it answers any valuable purpose as to religion, however necessary as a test to loyalty. All language is more or less ambiguous, so that it is difficult always to understand the exact sense, or the *animus imponentis*, especially when creeds have been long established. It is said that the clergy of the churches of England and Scotland seldom consider themselves as fettered by the Thirty-nine Articles or the Confession of Faith, when composing instructions for their parishes or the public at large. It is to be feared, indeed that many subscribe merely for the sake of emolument; and though it be professedly *ex animo*, it

is well known that it is not so in reality; for when any one appears to entertain conscientious scruples on the subject, he is told it is a thing of no consequence, but only a matter of form.

Stanley presents the following arguments in favor of repeal: 1. The first is, that there are signs of a growing reluctance, due in some part to the stringency of present subscriptions, on the part of thoughtful young men, to enter the ministry of the Church. 2. There is some recent evidence, especially at the universities, that the abolition of subscription has not tended to the injury of the Church or to any increased disbelief of her doctrines; 3. But, more especially, there is a growing disposition to interpret adhesion to formularies more narrowly than in former times. See Paley, *Maor. Phil.* 1, 218; Dyer, *On Subscription*; Doddridge, *Lect. lect.* 70; Conybeare, *Sermon on Subscription*; *Free and Candid Disquisitions relating to the Church of England*; *The Confessional*; Duncan and Miller, *On Creeds*; Stanley, *A Letter to the Lord Bishop of London on the State of Subscription in the Church of England and in the University of Oxford*.

Subsellium

Picture for Subsellium

a term given in the early Church to the footstool provided for persons of distinction. Upon Christian monuments God is represented as using the subsellium while receiving the offerings of Cain and Abel; our Lord, when teaching his disciples; and the Holy Virgin, in the adoration of the magi. The episcopal chairs were also provided with them, and, to show their submission to bishops, persons were accustomed to seat themselves thereupon. They were also called *scabellum*, *subpositorium*, *suppedaneum*.

Subsellium was likewise a name for the seats of the presbyters, in the ancient Church, on each side of the bishop's throne, in the upper part of the chancel, called the *apsis*. Also the two lower steps in a *sedilia*, i.e.. those for the deacon and subdeacon.

Subsexton

SEE SUBSACRISTAN.

Substance

(Lat. *sub*, under, *sto* or *stans*, to stand) is literally that which subsists by itself. In Greek, substance is denoted by οὐσία; hence, *that which truly is*, or *essence*, seems to be the proper meaning of substance. It is opposed to *accident*; of which Aristotle has said that you can scarcely predicate of it that it is anything. Our first idea of *substance* is probably derived from the consciousness of self—the conviction that, while our sensations, thoughts, and purposes are changing, *we* continue the same. We see bodies, also, remaining the same as to quantity or extension, while their color and figure, their state of motion or of rest may be changed. — Substances are either *primary*, that is, singular, individual substances; or *secondary*, that is, genera and species of *substance*. Substances have also been divided into *complete and incomplete, finite and infinite*. But these are rather divisions of *being*. Substance may, however, be properly divided into matter and spirit, or that which is extended and that which thinks. Substance is given by Aristotle as one of the four principles common to all spheres of reality; the other three being form or essence, moving or efficient cause, and end. He says, further, that the individual alone has *substantial* existence, and defines οὐσία, in the sense of the individual substance, as that which cannot be predicated of anything else, but of which anything else may be predicated. Johannes Philoponus of Alexandria, by extending the Aristotelian doctrine, that substantial existence is to be predicated in the fullest sense only of individuals, to the dogma of the Trinity, thereby incurred the accusation of tritheism. John Scotus regarded the Deity as the substance of all things, and could not, therefore, regard individual, concrete things as substances, of which the general may be predicated and in which the accidental is contained. He views all things, rather, as contained in the divine substance. Berengarius of Tours (*De Sacra Cenan*) disputes the theory of a change of *substance*, claimed by the advocates of transubstantiation, without a corresponding change in the accidents, i.e. a change in the bread and wine apparent to the senses. Roscelinus teaches that whatever is a substance is, as such, not a *part*; and the *part* is, as such, not a substance, but the result of that subjective separation of the substance into parts which we make in [thought and in] discourse. Gilbertus thus speaks: The intellect collects the universal, which exists, but not as a substance (*est, sed non substat*), from the particular things which not merely are (*sunt*), but also (as subjects of accidents) have substantial existence, by considering only their substantial similarity or conformity.

Descartes defines *substance* as follows: “By *substance* we can only understand that which so exists that it needs nothing else in order to its existence,” and adds that, “indeed, only one substance can be conceived as plainly needing nothing else in order to its existence, namely, God; for we plainly perceive that all others cannot exist without God’s assistance.” Spinoza understands *substance* to be “that which is in itself, and is to be conceived by itself. There is only one substance, and that is God. This substance has two fundamental qualities or attributes cognizable by us, namely, thought and extension; there is no extended substance as distinct from thinking substance.” “There are not two substances equal to each other, since such substances would limit each other. One substance cannot produce or be produced by another substance. Every substance, which is in God’s infinite understanding, is also really in nature. In nature there are not different substances; nature is one in essence, and identical with God.” Locke says, “The mind, being furnished with a great number of simple ideas, conveyed to it by sensation and reflection, remarks that a certain number of them always go together; and since we cannot imagine that which is represented by them as subsisting by itself, we accustom ourselves to suppose a substratum in which it subsists, and from which it arises; this substratum we call a *substance*. The idea of *substance* contains nothing but the supposition of an unknown something serving as a support for qualities.” Leibnitz gives the name monad to simple, unextended *substance*; that is, a substance which has the power of action; active force (like the force of the strained bow) is the essence of substance. He held that the divisibility of matter proved that it was an aggregate of substances; there can be no smallest indivisible bodies or atoms, because these must still be extended, and would therefore be aggregates of substances; that the real substances of which bodies consist are indivisible, cannot be generated, and are indestructible, and in a certain sense similar to souls, which he likewise considers as individual substances. The individual, unextended substances were termed by Leibnitz monads. Hume remarks, “We have no clear ideas of anything but perceptions; a *substance* is something quite different from perceptions; hence we have no knowledge of a substance. The question whether perceptions inhere in a material or immaterial substance cannot be answered, because it has no intelligible sense.” John Stuart Mill distinguishes substances as bodily and mental, and says, “Of the first, all we know is, the sensations which they give us, and the order of the occurrence of these sensations; i.e. the hidden cause of our sensations. Of

the second, that it is the unknown recipient of them.” See Fleming, *Vocab. of Philosoph. Sciences*, s.v.; Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy* (see Index).

Substance, a term used in technical divinity to describe nearly the same idea as *essence* or *nature*. Thus the Son is said to be the same substance with the Father, that is, truly and essentially God, as the Father is. **SEE CHRISTOLOGY.**

Substantialists

The Lutheran heresiologist Schlüsselburg gives this name as a synonym of the Manichees, in his *Catalogue of Heresies*, the second volume of which is entitled *De Secta Manichaeorum seu Substantia Mistarum*.

Substitution

SEE VICARIOUS SUFFERING.

Substrati

(i.e. *prostrators*) were penitents of the third order, so called from the custom of prostrating themselves before the bishop or priest as soon as the sermon was ended, to receive his benediction with the imposition of hands, and be made partakers of those prayers which the congregation particularly offered to God for them; after which they were obliged immediately to depart, before the communion service. They stood until this part of the service in the nave-of the church, behind the *ambo*. This sort of penitents are mentioned in the Council of Nice, though no particular place is assigned them; but we may collect from Tertullian and Sozomen that their station was in this part of the church; for Tertullian (*De Pudicit. c. 13*), speaking of the Roman discipline, says pope Zephyrin brought penitents into the church in sackcloth and ashes, and prostrated them in the midst before the widows and presbyters, to implore their commiseration and excite their tears. They were also called Kneelers, or *Genufiecientes*. See Bingham, *Christ, Antiq.* bk. 8:ch. 5, § 3; bk. 18:ch. 1, § 5.

Subtreasurer

the deputy-receiver of certain rents in a cathedral of the new foundation; a deputy treasurer; the sacrist; a minor canon who had charge of the church goods, acted as parish priest in the precinct, provided necessaries for divine service, and was librarian. The office is still partially preserved as an

assistant in divine service and parochial cure of souls. At Hereford he ranked after the succentor, and sang the Founder's Mass. He is mentioned in 1290 at York, and at Chichester in the 14th century, being the treasurer's vicar, where he made the chrism of oil and balsam.

Subucla

(**ποδήρης**), a cassock, like a rochet, worn under the alb.

Suburbicarian

an epithet applied to those provinces of Italy which composed the ancient diocese of Rome. Concerning this, two questions arise:

1. What was the extent of this district?
2. Whether it was the limit of the metro political or patriarchal power? Dr. Cave and others think that the notion of suburbicary churches ought not to be extended beyond the limits of the *prefectus urbis*, viz., a hundred miles about Rome, or, at most, not beyond the limits of those ten provinces which were immediately subject to the civil disposition and jurisdiction of the *vicarius unrbis*— viz. Campania, Tuscia and Umbria, Picenum Suburbicarium, Valeria, Samnium, Apulia and Calabria, Lucania and Brutii, Sicilia, Sardinia and Corsica— which Dr. Cave supposes to have been the exact and proper limits of the pope's patriarchal power, as he thinks the others were the bounds of his metropolitan jurisdiction. —See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq. bk. 9, ch. 1, § 347.*

Suburbs

is the rendering, in the A.V., regularly of **vrgr̄pa** *vīgr-eash*, properly a pasture (^{<1316>}1 Chronicles 5:16; ^{<3485>}Ezekiel 48:15); hence the open country around a city used for grazing (^{<0850>}Numbers 35:2; ^{<0211>}Joshua 21:11; ^{<1360>}1 Chronicles 6:40; . 13:2, etc.), or for any other purpose (^{<3278>}Ezekiel 27:28; 45:2; 48:17). Once (^{<1231>}2 Kings 23:11), it stands for **rwr̄Pi** *parvar*, which is but a MS. variation of PARBAR *SEE PARBAR* (q.v.).

Suburbs,

in an ecclesiastical sense, meant, in the early Church, all the towns and villages within the region or district to which the city magistrate extended

his jurisdiction, whose bounds, for the most part, were the bounds of the bishop's diocese. See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 9:ch. 2, § 3.

Succat

is said to have been the proper name of ST. PATRICK *SEE ST. PATRICK* (q.v.).

Succensum

an old term for a *censer*. *SEE THURIBLE*.

Succentor

a term used to denote—

1. A precentor's assistant in a cathedral church;
2. A singer in a collegiate church or chapel;
3. A subprecentor;
4. A cantor.

Succession, Apostolical

a favorite term with prelatists and High-Churchmen to designate what is claimed to be an unbroken line of clerical ordination from the apostles to the present time. In the Roman Church this claim is put forth in the most absolute and dogmatic manner through the Tridentine canons, which excommunicate and anathematize all other branches of the Christian Church as, heretics and schismatics. In the Greek, Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, and Oriental churches generally, the same exclusive principle is maintained, although not avowed in so positive and formal a manner. A similar pretence is set up by many Protestants, such as the established churches of European countries, particularly of Great Britain and Ireland, and so likewise by the Vaudois, the Moravians, and others, who assert that they can trace their clerical pedigree in a direct line to the apostles, and in like manner the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, and other offshoots of the English Church, pride themselves upon their ecclesiastical lineage, as being in the "regular succession." On the other hand, the denominations, "unchurched" by this claim justly take exception to the clerical genealogy thus arrogated, on the following grounds:

1. *The phrase “apostolic succession” is essentially absurd and self-contradictory.* Strictly construed, it can only mean that the apostles have had a continuous line of successors to the present time. But the apostolic office was *sui generis*, and by its very constitution confined to the first incumbents. This is clear from two inherent qualifications of the order itself, not to mention others.

a. It was necessary that an apostle should have been personally conversant with our incarnate Lord; he must have been an eye-witness of his miracles, have directly received his instructions, and immediately accepted the appointment at his hands (~~(4084)~~ Mark 3:14; ~~(402)~~ Acts 1:21, 22). On this ground Paul bases his claim to the apostolate (~~(400)~~ 1 Corinthians 9:1), by virtue of the revelation of the Gospel to him without human intervention (~~(412)~~ 1 Corinthians 11:23; ~~(400)~~ Galatians 1:1, 12). Hence the office *was* in its very nature intransmissible and incapable of succession, as soon, at least, as all the “original eye-witnesses and ministers of the Words” had deceased. *SEE APOSTLE.*

b. The “sign” of an apostle was the power of conferring miraculous endowments upon others by the imposition of hands. This is often referred to in the Acts and Epistles as a distinguishing mark between them and ordinary Christians. All believers during the primitive period of the Church enjoyed these preternatural gifts, which were first imparted on the day of Pentecost (~~(400)~~ Acts 2:4); but the apostles alone were empowered to communicate the same to subsequent accessions (~~(409)~~ Acts 8:19). Hence when the original apostles died, these miraculous manifestations soon ceased, and have never been renewed. The Roman Catholic Church claims, indeed, a like power of miracle-working for eminent saints of later times, but it has never had the hardihood to aver that its “apostolical succession” is invariably accompanied with this peculiar gift. How preposterous, then, for sober Christians to set up a pretension that legitimately involves such impossibilities! *SEE GIFTS, SPIRITUAL.*

2. *Even the claim of an uninterrupted clerical succession is incapable of proof.* All the modern churches of Europe and this country, which set up this claim, trace their lineage ultimately through the Roman pontiffs. But the records of the early popes are irrecoverably lost. It is not certain that Peter (q.v.) ever was in Rome, much less that he ever acted as bishop there. All efforts to make out the asserted succession thus fail at this initial point. Many other links in’ the chain are historically wanting. The lineage is

a myth, or at best a mere eking-out of probabilities by vague and late traditions. This is now candidly admitted by the best and most careful Protestant scholars. The title is indefensible. *SEE POPE*. "I am fully satisfied," says bishop Hoadly, "that till a consummate stupidity can be happily established, and universally spread over the land, there is nothing that tends so much to destroy all due respect to the clergy as the demand of more than can be due to them; and nothing has so effectually thrown contempt upon a regular succession of the ministry as the calling no succession regular but what was uninterrupted; and the making the eternal salvation of Christians to depend upon that uninterrupted succession, of which the most learned must have the least assurance, and the unlearned can have no notion but through ignorance and credulity." (See below.)

3. *The claim is offensive and tends to bigotry and exclusiveness.* In the Roman Catholic, Greek, and Anglican churches, this tendency and result are notorious, and in the High-Church party of the Protestant Episcopal Church they are almost equally obvious. In fact, a good churchman," as he is styled, is compelled by this fact to hold himself aloof from other communions, and such a rule is avowed, more or less distinctly, in the canons and regulations of all the bodies last named. This single circumstance is today one of the greatest scandals of Christendom. No principle can be just which leads to such unchristian lack of brotherly kindness. *SEE CHARITY*.

4. *The assertion is unnecessary, unwise, and based upon a wrong view of ecclesiastical polity.* The true evidences of an evangelical Church are the conversion, sanctification, and salvation of souls; the propagation of a spiritual Gospel, and the amelioration of the state of society. But the "churchly" claim referred to turns the attention of its adherents too earnestly upon their own organization and technical order, and thus leads them away from a broad and catholic spirit, and from a wholesome personal experience, as well as from the highest forms of individual and collective usefulness. The question with them habitually inclines to be, not what will best promote the welfare of Christendom at large, and most effectually promote personal holiness; but what must be done to subserve party purposes, and keep up the pretensions of a select circle. The Church is too often put in the place both of Christ and man. This, alas, is no ideal picture; it is but the record of sad, solemn fact. Ecclesiasticism and its fellow formalism have ever been the greatest banes to genuine piety, and the direst foes to the real kingdom of God. Bigotry was excusable in

Judaism; but sectarianism, of which the fable of “apostolical succession” has been the most fruitful source, is a crime under Christianity. It is both a libel on its name (~~John~~ John 17:23) and treason to its first law (~~1 John~~ 1 John 2:7; 3, 11). Wherever this assumption has been prevalent and active, religious bodies have held points of order and *esprit du corps* among their members in higher esteem than historical truth in profession or vital godliness in practice. Persecution has been more fiercely waged against secession than even against heresy. Zealots for orthodoxy have gathered many a fagot for the martyr, but sticklers for legitimacy have been foremost in kindling the pyre. Even nonconformity has at times caught the passion for its own established system, and Puritans have actually maltreated others—if not burned them at the stake for refusing the ordinances of the so-called Church. The prelatist smiles at such pseudo-ecclesiasticism, and the Romanist looks with equal contempt upon the Anglican mimicry of “the mother Church,” while the Great Head of all weeps at this petty rivalry as to who shall be esteemed first and greatest in the brotherhood of saints. In this competition all that is more valuable in religion has been lost sight of. Laxity of morals has been winked at while an infringement of canonical rules has been severely punished. It is the old story over again; making void the law of God by the tradition of men, tithing herbs and neglecting judgment, mercy, and faith. We need ever to revert from the symbols of Christianity to its essentials, or we shall find ourselves holding its form, but denying its power. *SEE PRELACY.*

Literature. —This may well be exhibited in brief by the following extract from Eadie’s *Eccles. Cyclop.*, which shows how writers in the Episcopal Church are disagreed on the main elements of the question:

I. *On the Office of the Apostles, and whether they had any Successors.* — Until Christ’s death the apostles were presbyters, and Christ alone was bishop.

1. This is affirmed by Stillingfleet, *Isrenicatm*, 2, 218; Spanheim, *Op. Theol.* 1, 436; in Ayton, *Constit. of the Ch.* p. 15; Hallmond, *Work-*, 4:781, who makes them deacons; Brett, *Divine Right Episcop.* lect. 8 p. 17. **2.** This is contradicted, and the apostles made bishops during the same time, by Taylor [Jeremy], *Episcop. Asserted*; *id. Works*, 7:7, etc., who contradicts himself in *ibid.* 13:19. sq.; Scott, in *Christian Life*; 3, 338; Mouro, *Inquiry into the New Opinions*, p. 96; Rhind, *Apol.* p. 50, etc.; Willet, *Synopsis Papismi*, p. 236; archbishop of Spalato, in Ayton, *Constit.*

of the Ch., app. p, 7. Archbishop Land is very positive in affirming that Christ chose the twelve, and made them bishops over the presbyters (*Lit. and Episcop.* p. 195), and bishop Beveridge is as confident that Christ chose these same twelve, as presbyters, and not bishops (*Works*, 2, 112). Again, Land asserts very positively that Christ ordained them, since the word used by Mark is ἐποίησε made them (*Lit. and Episcop.* p. 196). Beveridge, on the contrary, declares that Christ did not ordain any of them during his life, and adduces in proof these of this very term ἐποίησε δώδεκα (*Works*, 2, 112). 3. Others, again affirm that the apostles were not commissioned till after Christ's resurrection. Sage, quoted.

2. Ayton, *Constit. of the Ch.* app. p. 5, 6; Saravia's *Priesthood*, Spanheim, *Op. Theol.* 1, 436; Stillingfleet, *Irenicum*, 1, 117, 118, and 2, 218; Whitby, *Amot.* ~~επι~~ Luke 10:1; Hammond, in *ibid.*; Bellarmine, *De Pontiff* lib. 4, c. 25; Heber [Bp.], in *Life of Jeremy Taylor*, *Works*, 185.

II. *The apostles were extraordinary officers, and could have no successors.*

1. This is affirmed by Pearson, *On the Creed*, p. 16, "who are continued to us only in their writings" Whitby, in *Comment ref. to Titus*; Hoadly [Bp.], *Works*, fol. 2, 827; Barrow, in *Works*, foil.1, 598; Willet, in *Synopsis Papisii*, p. 164, 165; Fell [Bp.] *On Ephes.* 5, 9; Hooker, *Ecl. Vol.* vol. 3, bk. 7:§ 4:p. 187, Keble's edition; Chillingworth; Hinds, *History of Rise and Progress of Christ.* 2, 70-87; *On Inspiration*, sp.,117; Lightfoot, *Works*, 13:26, 27, 30, 70. 98, etc., and in other works; Palmer, *On the Ch.* 1, 169, 170; Bowers, *Hist. of the Popes*, 1, 5, 6; Potter, *On Ch. Government*, p. 121, 117, Amer. ed.; Steele, *Phil. of the Evid. of Christ*, p. 102, 105, 106, 107; Dodwell, *Parsi*, ad...ext. p. 68 (comp. 11, 54, 55, 62, and Ayton); Davenaut: [Bp.], *On Col.* vol.1, ch. 1; Brett, *Div. light of Episcop.* lect. 12, p 26, apud Ayton; Stillingfleet, *Irenicum*, 2, 299-301; Spanheim, *Fil Dissert.* 3,Nos. 25, 37, 34; Archbishop Tillotson (see quoted in *Presbyterianism Def.* p. 117,118).

2. This is most resolutely impugned by Laud (see his *Three Speeches on the Liturgy Episcop.* etc. in Oxf. edit. 1840; passim); Nichols L. William], in his *Defense of the Ch. of England*; "Bishops are successors to the apostles, both in name and thing," says Leslie, in *Letter on Episcopacy*, in *The Scholar. Armed*, 1, 64 et al.; Beveridge, in *Works*, 2, 88, 93, 120,147, 149, 167 278; Law, in his *Second Letter to the Bishop of Bangor See*, in

Oxf. Tr. 3, 156; Stillingfleet [Bp.], in *Works*, 1, 371, 3 art. “Bishop;” Rees, *Cyclop.*; Hicks [Bp.], Rhind, Scott, Mouro (see Aytoon, *Coinstit. of the Ch. Pope*, lect. 2); Houinmalu [Bp.], *Survey of Naphthali*, 2, 191, etc., in Ayton; Hall [Bp.], *Episcop. by Divine Right*, pt. 2. Opinions differ as widely in the Church of England at the present day (see Sunyth, *Prelatic Doctrine of Apostolical Succession Examined* [Boston, 1841]).

Succinctorium, or Succinctory

Picture for Succinctorium

an ornament peculiar to the pope, resembling a *maniple* (q.v.), and embroidered with the holy lamb (*Agnus Dei*). It is worn on the left side, being fastened by a cincture, and is, according to some, a substitute for an alms-purse, or according to others it was only a resemblance of the ends of a ribbon, formerly worn by most bishops as a cincture over the alb and which was called *balteum pudicitiae*, or “belt of modesty.” In the East bishops wear one pendant, of a lozenge form, tasseled, and with a cross on it called *epigonation*.

Succinerè

(*undersinging*), a term used to describe a mode of singing in common use in the early age of the Church. A precentor began the verse, and the people joined him in the close. It was often used for the sake of variety in the same service, with alternate psalmody. Ecclesiastical historians relate that Athanasius effected his escape from the church in which he was beset by the Arian soldiery by setting the people to this kind of psalmody, he commanded the deacon to read the psalm, and the people (*ὑπακούειν*, *respondere* or *succinere*) to repeat this clause after him: “For his mercy endureth forever.” See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 14, ch. 1, § 12. **SEE ACROSROTICS.**

Suc’coth

(Heb. *Sukkoth*’, *תּוֹכָסוֹר* [in ^{<01327>}Genesis 32:17; ^{<01237>}Exodus 12:37; 13:20; ^{<0215>}Numbers 23:5, 6] *tKsaabooths* [as often]; Sept. *Σοκχώθ* v.r.

Σοκχωθά, but *σκηναί* in Genesis and Psalms; Vulg. *Socoth* or *Soccoth*), the name of at least two Biblical places of early mention, the exact position of neither of which, however, has been clearly identified by modern researches. **SEE SUCCOTH-BENOTH.**

1. A town of ancient date in the Holy Land, being first heard of in the account of the homeward journey of Jacob from Padanaram (^(G317)Genesis 33:17). The name is derived from the fact of Jacob's having there put up "booths" for his cattle, as well as a house for himself; and these structures, in contrast with the "tents" of the wandering life, indicate that the Patriarch made a lengthened stay there—a fact not elsewhere alluded to. Travelers frequently see such "booths" occupied by the Bedawin of the Jordan valley. They are rude huts of reeds, sometimes covered with long grass, sometimes covered with a piece of a tent. They are much used by a semi-nomad people. This fertile spot must have reminded Jacob of the banks of the Euphrates from which he had recently come. The situation is approximately indicated by the fact that Jacob was on his way from Peniel to Shechem. Peniel was apparently on the north bank of the Jabbok (^(G22)Genesis 32:22, 23); and it would seem that after his interview with Esau on the south bank, he turned back to avoid further intercourse with his dangerous brother; and instead of following him to Edom, he recrossed the Jabbok and descended to the valley of the Jordan, where he resolved to rest for a time amid its luxuriant pastures (see, however, Kalisch, *ad loc.*; Ritter, *Pal. und Syr.* 2, 447).

The next notice of Succoth is in Joshua's description of the territory of Gad. To this tribe the middle section east of the Jordan was allotted, including the valley of the Jordan up to the Sea of Galilee. *SEE GAD*. Among the towns in the valley is *Succoth* (^(G27)Joshua 13:27). Nothing more can be inferred from this than that it lay on the east bank of the river.

In the narrative of Gideon's pursuit of Zeba and Zalmunna it is said, "And Gideon came to Jordan, *passed over*, and said unto the men of Succoth," etc. (^(G85)Judges 8:5). His course was eastward — the reverse of Jacob's — and he came first to Succoth, and then to Penuel, the latter being farther up the mountain than the former (^(G88)Judges 8:8, "went up thence"). The tale there recorded of the mingled cowardice and 'perfidy of the inhabitants, and of Gideon's terrible vengeance, is one of the most harrowing in the Bible. At that period Succoth must have been a place of importance, when it ventured to refuse the request of Gideon. Its "princes and elders," too, are said to have numbered "threescore and seventeen men."

Though the rulers were slain, the city continued to prosper, and in the days of Solomon it was well known. The sacred historian informs us that the brazen vessels of the Temple were cast "in the circuit (^(RKB)) of the

Jordan in the clay ground, between Succoth and Zarthan” (^{<1076>}1 Kings 7:46; ^{<1047>}2 Chronicles 4:17). Succoth gave its name to “a valley” (qm[]), probably a lower section of “the circuit,” or great plain of the Jordan (comp. “the vale of Siddim,” which was also called an *Emek* in “the circuit of the Jordan,” ^{<1006>}Psalm 9:6). Jerome observes, in his notes on Genesis: “There is to this day a city of this name (*Succoth*) beyond Jordan in the region of Scythopolis” (*Opera*, 2, 989, ed, Migne); but in the *Onomasticon* both Jerome and Eusebius merely state that it is the place where Jacob dwelt on his return from Mesopotamia, without indicating its site or appearing to know of its existence (s.v. “Scenca”).

Burckhardt, on his way from Beisan to es-Salt, forded the Jordan two hours (about six miles) below the former, and observes in a note (*Travels in Syria*, p. 345), “Near where we crossed, to the south, are the ruins of *Sukkof*.” The ruins seem to have been on the east bank of the river, though he does not expressly say so, as later travelers do (see Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 232). This may possibly be the Succoth of Jerome; but it seems too far north to suit the requirements of the narrative in Genesis Jacob’s direct road from the Wady Zerka to Shechem would have led him by the Wady Ferrah, on the one hand, or through Yanfun, on the other. If he went north as far as Sukkot, he must have ascended by the Wady Maleh to Tevasir, and so through Tubas and the Wady Bidan. Perhaps it is going north was a ruse to escape the dangerous proximity of Esau and if he made a long stay at Succoth, as suggested in the outset of this article, the did tour from the direct road to Shechem would be of little importance to him (see the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Oct. 1876, p. 742 sq.). Robinson discovered another ruin, called *Sakuot* (which is radically as well as topographically different from the *Sukkot* of Burckhardt), situated on the west bank of the Jordan, about fifteen miles south of Beisan. Near it is a copious fountain, and the plain around it is covered with most luxuriant vegetation. The ruin is merely that of a common village, a few foundations of unhewn stones (*Bibl. Res.* 3, 309; comp. Van de Velde, *Travels*, 2, 343). Its position on the west bank prevents its being identified with the Succoth of the Bible, but it is just possible that the name may have been transferred to a spot on the “other side (see Ritter, *ut sup.* 2, 446), or it may have been a crusaders site (see Conder, *Tent Work in Palest.* 2,62).

Until the position of Succoth is more exactly ascertained, it is impossible to say what was the valley of Succoth mentioned in ^{<1006>}Psalm 9:6 and 108:7.

The same word is employed (^{<1637>}Joshua 13:27) in specifying, the position of the group of towns among which Succoth occurs, in describing the allotment of Gad; so that it evidently denotes some marked feature of the country. It is not probable, however, that the main valley of the Jordan, the *Ghor*, is intended, that being always designated in the Bible by the name of the Arabah.

2. The first camping-place of the Israelites when they left Egypt (^{<1237>}Exodus 12:37; 13:20; ^{<1316>}Numbers 33:5, 6). This place was apparently reached at the close of the first day's march. Rameses, the starting-place, we have shown was probably near the western, end of the Wady et-Tumeylat. We have supposed the distance traversed in each day's journey to have been about thirty miles; and as Succoth was not in the Arabian desert, the next station, Etham, being "in the edge of the wilderness" (^{<1313>}Exodus 13:20; ^{<1316>}Numbers 33:6), it must have been along the present pilgrim route called Dub el-Ban, about half-way between the easternmost branch of the Nile and the castle of Ajruid. It was probably, to judge from its name, a resting-place of caravans, or a military station, or a town named from one of the two. We find similar names in Sense Mandrae (*Itin. Ant.*), Scense Mandrorum (*Not. Dign.*), or *Σκηνή Μανδρῶν* (*Not. Graec. Episcopatum*), Scenee Veteranorum (*l tin. Ant. Not. Dign.*), and Saesae extra Gerasa (*sic Not. Dignl.*). See, for all these places, Parthey, *Zur Erdkunde des. alten Aegyptens*, p. 535. It is, however, evident that such a name would be easily lost, and, even if preserved hard to recognize, as it might be concealed under a corresponding name of similar signification, though very different in sound, like that of the settlement of Ionian and Carian mercenaries, called τὰ Στρατόπεδα (Herod. 2, 154). **SEE EXODE SEE RED SEA, PASSAGE OF.**

Suc'coth Be'noth

(Heb. *Sukkoth' Benoth'*, תַּוּבָּאֵת וְכִסּוּבוֹת בָּנוֹת *subooths of daughters*; Sept. *Σωκχῶθ Βενίθ* v.r. *Σοκχῶθ* [and even *Ῥοκχῶθ*] *Βενιθεί*; Vulg. *Sochoth-benoth*) occurs only in ^{<1273>}2 Kings 17:30, as the name of some deity whose worship the Babylonian settlers in Samaria are said to have set up on their arrival in that country. It has generally been supposed that "this term is pure Hebrew, and as such most interpreters explain it to mean "the booths in which the daughters of the Babylonians prostituted themselves in honor of their idol" (i.e. Mylitta, see Herod. 1, 199; Strabo, 16:745); others "small tabernacles in which were contained images of female deities" (comp.

Calmet, *Cimmentaire Littiral*, 2, 897). It is in objection to both these explanations that Succoth-benoth which in the passage in Kings occurs in the same construction with Nergal and various other gods, is thus not a deity at all, nor, strictly speaking, an object of worship. It should be noted, however, that the expression “made” (𐤎𐤕 []) does not necessarily require such an interpretation. Sir H. Rawlinson thinks that Succoth-benoth represents the Chaldean goddess *Zir-banif*, the wife of Merodach, who was especially worshipped at Babylon, in conjunction with her husband, and who is called-the “queen” of the place. *Succoth* he supposes to be either “a Hamitic term equivalent to *Zir*,” or possibly a Shemitic mistranslation of the term-Zirat, “supreme,” being confounded with *Zarat*, “tents” (see the *E'ssay of*: Sir H. Rawlinson in Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, 1, 630). Gesenius arbitrarily alters the reading to 𐤕𐤗𐤁𐤁; 𐤕𐤗𐤁𐤁𐤓, *booths of the high-places* (*Thesaur.* s.v.); and Movers (*Phonic. I*, 596) understands “*involucra or secreta mulierum*,” having reference to phallus-worship (so Nork, *Mythol.* 1, 124). The rabbins. (see Kimchi and Jarch I, *ad loc.*) fable that it was a goddess under the form of a *hen and chickens*; which Kircher (*Ed.* 1, 3354) regards as an astronomical emblem of the Babylonians. See Selden, *De Dis Syris*, 2, 7, 308 sq. Vos, *Theol. Gent.* 2, 22; Creusius, *De Succoth Benoth*, in Ugolino, *Thesaur.* 23.

Su'chathite

(Heb. only in the plur. *Sukathim'*, 𐤔𐤕𐤕𐤓, a patronymic of unknown origin; Sept. Σωκαθιεύμ ulg. *in tabernaculis commorantes*), a designation of the last-named of the three families of scribes which dwelt at Jabez (1 Chronicles 2, 55); apparently descendants of some person named Suchah, a Judahite of the family of Caleb.

Suckow, Carl Adolf

a German theologian, was born in 1802 at Münsterburg, in Silesia. He studied theology and philosophy at Breslau, was appointed in 1834 professor of theology and director of the homiletical seminary at Breslau, and died there in 1847. He wrote, *De Protevangelio Jacobi. Pars I, De Argumento ac Indole Profevansgelii* (Vratislavise, 1830): — *Gedenktage des christl. Kirchenjahres in einer Reihe von Predigten* (Breslau, 1838): — *AB.C. evangelischer Kirchenverfissung* (ibid. 1846). See *Regensburger Conversations-Lexikon*, s.v.; Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* 2, 1292 sq. (B. P.)

Sud

(Σούδ v.r. [in No. 2] Σουδά, Σουσα, etc.), the name of a stream and of a person in the Apocrypha.

1. A river in the immediate neighborhood of Babylon, on the banks of which Jewish exiles lived (Bar. 1, 4). No such river is known to geographers; but if we assume that the first part of the book of Baruch was written in Hebrew, the original text may have been Sur, the final **ρ** having been: changed into **δ**. In this case the name would represent, not the town of Soras as suggested by Bochart (*Phaleg*, 1; 8), but the river Euphrates itself, which is always named by Arab geographers, “the river of Sura,” a corruption probably of the Sippara of the inscriptions (Rawlinson, *Herod.* 1, 611, note 4).

2. A corrupt Grecism (1 Esdr. 5, 29) of the name SIA or SIAHA (q.v.) in the Hebrew lists (~~4184~~Ezra 2:44; ~~4174~~Nehemiah 7:47).

Sudaili, Stephen Bar

a Monophysite monk, who, according to *the CndelabEum Sanctorum of Abul-faraj* (q.v.), in Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* 2, 291, lived about A.D. 500, at first in Edessa and afterwards in Jerusalem. He is credited with the authorship of a work which circulated under the name of Hierotheus, the teacher and predecessor of Pseudo-Dionysius, in which a limitation of the duration of hell is taught on the authority of a pantheistic interpretation of ~~4153~~1 Corinthians 15:28. Neander regarded the ascription of this work to Sudaili as resting upon a mere assumption on the part of Abn-faraj (*Gesch. d. chsistl. Rel. u. Kirhe*, 1, 727.), but without having sufficient warrant for his view.

Particulars respecting the mystico-pantheistic theology of Sudaili are furnished by Xenajas or Philoxenus (q.v.) of Mabug in a letter addressed to the presbyters Abraham and Orestes of Edessa, which earnestly warns them against the influence of that learned and subtle monk who formerly sojourn in their city (see extracts in Assemani, *aut sup.* p. 30-33). As A there represented, Sudaili taught the essential unity of the Father, Son, and Spirit, of the divine and human [nature of Christ, and also of God and all created existences, basing his views on ~~4153~~1 Corinthians 15:28, ἵνα ἡ ὁ Θεὸς τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν. He had inscribed on the wall of his cell the words “Omnis natura Divinitati constibstantialis est,” and he continued to

elaborate the same idea 'in his writings after public opinion had compelled the erasure of the inscription in his cell. It is also charged by Philoxenus that Sudaili taught that baptism and the Eucharist are superfluous, that he denied the infliction of punishment for sin at the last judgment, and that he promised to pagans and Jews the same heavenly deities as to Christians, to Judas and Simon Magus equal blessedness with Paul and Peter. It is evident that much of these assertions is dictated by malice and is grossly misrepresented. The same remark applies to the Chiliastic views of Sudaili, who was a consequential adherent of Origenistic doctrines, and must be regarded as holding a spiritualized, idealistic view of the world. He taught three world-periods—the present, corresponding to the sixth day of the week; the millennium, the great Sabbath or rest-day of the week; and the eternity of consummation or of the restoration of all things.

Nothing is known of the personal or literary career of Bar Sudaili. The violent assault of Philoxenus upon his character as a teacher and expositor of the Scriptures appears to have succeeded so far as to cause him to be regarded by all Monophysites as a dangerous heretic. The Jacobites of Syria, e.g., admitted a special sentence of condemnation against him into their formula of ordination. See Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* vol. 1 and 2. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 5.

Sudarium, or Sudary

(*sweat-cloth*): 1. The *purificatorium* (q.v.) for wiping the chalice; 2. The *maniple* (q.v.); 3. The *veronica* (q.v.) (the blessing of the priest's eyes with the sudarium was forbidden in 1549); 4. The banner of a bishop's staff, called also *vexillucit* (q.v.).

Sudbury, Simon

SEE SIMON OF SUDBURY.

Suddath, William W.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Fairfax County, Va., July 31, 1826. He professed religion in his nineteenth year, was received by the Lexington Presbytery of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church as a candidate for the ministry, and was licensed to preach in 1847. About this time he entered Chapel Hill College in Lafayette County, Mo.; studied theology in the Cumberland University at Lebanon, Tenn.; but before graduating he was

induced, by the great interest he took in the success of Chapel Hill College, to return 'to Missouri and accept the professorship of languages in that college. He was afterwards elected president, which position he filled until 1857, when he accepted a call to the chair of languages in the Masonic College at Lexington, Mo. In 1858 he became enlisted for the St. Louis mission, and his far reaching mind and noble, benevolent heart conceived a plan to relieve it of its embarrassments. But his labors were too great for his physical energies. He gave up his position in the college to engage in the work of his choice: he accepted a call from the Church in St. Joseph, but died Aug. 1, 1860, before assuming the duties of the new position. Mr. Suddath was an eloquent preacher, a scholar, and a Christian gentleman. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 236.

Sudhoff, Carl

a doctor of divinity, and prominent theologian of the Calvinistic Church of Germany, who died in the year 1865 at Frankfort-on-the-Main, is the author of, *Weihestunden* (4th ed. Hamm. 1865): — *Der Heidelberger Katechismus zergliedert* (2nd ed. Kreuznach, 1854): — *De Convenientia que inter utrumque Gratie Instrumentum, Verbum Dei, et Sacramentum Intercedat*, etc. (ibid. 1852): — *In der Stille* (Frankfort, 1859, 2 pts.) *Fester Grund christlicher Lehre, ein Hüfsbuch zum Heidelberger Katechismus* (ibid. 1857): — *Geschichte der christl. Kirche* (2nd ed. *ibid.* 1861, 2 vols.): — *Communion buch* (2nd ed. *ibid.* 1859): — *Christliche Religionslehre* (ibid. 1861): *Theologisches Handbuch zur Auslegung des leidelberger Katechismus* (ibid. 1862). Besides a number of articles for Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.*, he also wrote the lives of C. Olevianus and Z. Ursinus, published in the 8th part of *Leben und ausgewählte Schriften der Viter und Begründer der reformirten Kirche*. See Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* 2, 1293 sq. (B. P.)

Su'dias

(**Σουδίας**), a corrupt Greek form (1 Esdr. 5, 26) of the name HODAVIAH or HODEVAH **SEE HODEVAH** (q.v.) of the Hebrew lists (^{<1578B>}Ezra 3:40; ^{<1678B>}Nehemiah 7:43). s.v.

Sudices

the Fates of the Bohemians and Mora'vians, supposed to resemble the Roman *Parcae*.

Sudra

in Hinduism, is the lowest of the four castes among the Hindus, sprung from Brahma's feet and appointed to serve the other castes. It includes all inferior laborers and servants.

Sudri

one of the four powerful dwarfs of the Norse mythology, who support the arch of the sky at the four regions from which they derive their names. The other dwarfs are Nordri, Westri, and Austri. —Vollmer, *Wörterb. d. Mythol.* s.v.

Suehre

in Persian mythology, is the name of the planet Venus before it 'was placed in the sky. It is identical with the Arabic *Anahid*. Suehre was an exceedingly charming maiden, of whom two angels became enamored, and who resisted their advances with the result that she was removed to the skies, while they were banished to the abyss. In her new abode she is served by thousands of celestial spirits, who adore her for her virtue and beauty.

Suemmer Oala

in Lamaism, is a mountain of vast elevation, which is surrounded by three others, upon whose circle rests a second circle of four mountains, all of them being of gold, with the exception of the central one, which is composed of a single green stone. These mountains are the place of abode of the free spirits, Erike Bariksan. The wicked spirits dwell in the caverns of the mountains, and their chief there holds a powerful castle.

Suenes

a Christian nobleman in Persia, who, refusing to deny Christ, had his wife taken from him, and given to one of the emperor's meanest slaves; and what added to his mortification was that he was ordered to wait upon his wife and the slave, which at length broke his heart.

Sueur, Eustache Le

one of the most celebrated of French painters, was born in 1617, and after studying with his father, a sculptor, was placed in the school of Simon

Vouet at Paris. He soon excelled his master, and adopted a style which is noted for its simplicity and severity. He has been termed by his admirers the French Raphael; but he was far behind that great master in every respect. He died in 1655. He painted the celebrated series of *St. Bruno*, twenty-two large pictures on wood, in the cloister of the Carthusians at Paris, before his thirtieth year: — *St. Paul Preaching at Ephesus: The Gentiles Burning their Prescribed Book* (1649), engraved by Picart and Massard: — *Paul Healing the Sick*: — *Martyrdoms of St. Laurence* and *St. Protas*, both engraved by Gerard Audran. He painted many other celebrated pictures, as, *Christ Scourged*: — *Christ with Martha and Mary*: — *The Presentation in the Temple*: — *The Histories of St. Martin* and *St. Benedict*.

Suez

SEE RED SEA. Suffering-day. *SEE GOOD-FRIDAY*. Suffering-psalm, the name given to Psalm 22: “Deus, Deus meus;” used in the services of the Church on Good-Friday.

Suffering-week

SEE PASSION-WEEK.

Sufferings of Christ

SEE VICARIOUS SUFFERING.

Suffetum, Council of

(*Concilium Sufijtatum*), was held in 528, at which St. Fulgentius was present. Bishop Quod-vult-Deus (who had disputed the point of precedency with him at the Council of Junga, in Africa), at his request, presided.

Suffragan

(*suffraganeus*) is the title applied to every ecclesiastic who has to assist his superior. In this way Alcuin explains the term in a letter to Charlemagne: “Suffraganeus est nomen medice significationis; ideo nescimus quale fixum ei apponere debeamus ut presbyterorum, aut abbatum, aut diaconorum, aut caeterorum graduum inferiorum, si forte episcoporum nomen, qui aliquando vestrae civitati subjecti erant, addere debemus” (*Opera*, p.

1160). The term is also used as synonymous with *vicarius* (see Du Fresne, *Glossarium*, s.v.). It is given more especially to bishops, however, and in respect to them with a twofold reference. A *suffragan bishop* is an *episcopus in partibus infidelium* employed as the vicar and assistant of a regular diocesan bishop; but the name is given to the latter also in view of the relation he sustains, if not exempt, **SEE EXEMPTION**, to his metropolitan. The relation sustained by all the suffragans of a province (*conmprovinciales*) together with their metropolitan, and the rights belonging to the latter in his relation to the suffragans and their subordinates, have been exactly determined, and are stated in Gratian, *Causa* 3, qu. 6, and *Causa* 9 qu. 3. Various decisions occur also in the decretals, which ordain that the consecration of a metropolitan shall be performed by all his suffragans. — The rights of metropolitans over their suffragans are limited. See Innocent III in c. 11, *De Officio Judicis Ordinarii*, 1, 31. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v. **SEE ARCHBISHOP; SEE METROPOLITAN.**

It thus appears that anciently suffragan bishops were all the city bishops of any province under a metropolitan, who were called his suffragans because they met at his command to give their suffrage, counsel, or advice in a provincial synod. In- this sense the word was used in-England at the time when Linwood wrote his *Provinciale* (in 1430): “They were called suffragans because they were bound to give their suffrage and assistance to the archbishop, being summoned to take part in his care, though not in the plenitude of his power.” The suffragans were not the same as **CHOREPISCOPI** **SEE CHOREPISCOPI** (q.v.), or rural bishops. Thus it was also in other churches. The seventy bishops who were immediately subject to the bishop of Rome, as their primate or metropolitan, were called his suffragans, because they were frequently called to his synods. These bishops were called by the peculiar technical term *libra*, which stood for seventy. Their elections were regulated by the metropolitan, who either ordained them himself, or authorized their ordination. They were summoned by him to attend the provincial synods, and could not disobey such summons under pain of suspension, or some such canonical censure, which was left to the discretion of the metropolitan and the council. From the 13th to the 16th century there were in the English Church a class of bishops (1) holding nominal sees, titulars or *in partibus infidelium*, in Hungary, Greece, and Asia; (2) exiles, temporary or permanent, from bishoprics in Ireland or Scotland, who were called suffragans.

Bishops who had no metropolitan power first began to have suffragans under them in the 10th century. These were styled vicar-generals, vicegerents *vice-episcopi*, etc; Suffragan bishops were appointed in Germany for the ordination of inferior officers and the consecration and benediction of churches, altars, baptismal waters, etc. Some attempt was made in England, at the beginning of the Reformation, to restore the chorepiscopi, under the name of suffragan bishops. Act 26, Henry VIII, 1563-4, appointed several towns for suffragan sees. One suffragan bishop was consecrated for Nottingham, and another as bishop of Dover in 1870. A permissive act for bishops suffragan in Ireland was passed in the early part of the present century, and others have recently been consecrated in the colonies. See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 2, ch. 15 § 13-15; ch. 16:§ 12, 17; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity*, p. 139.

Suffrage

In the early Church, one of the ways of designating persons to the ministry was by the ordinary course of *suffrage* and election of the Church. It was also customary for the clergy or presbytery (or the retiring bishop or presbyter) to nominate a person to fill the vacant office, which nomination was followed by the suffrages of the people—suffrages not merely testimonial, but judicial and elective. See Riddle, *Christ Antiq.* p. 82.

The term was also used to designate—

1. The public worship the united voice and consent of the people in the petitions offered. “See now, then, both learned and unlearned, how prayers and all *other suffrages* are in common to this spiritual Church” (*Lantern of Light*, A.D. 1400).
2. A short form of petition, as in the Litany. Thus, in the Order for the Consecration of Bishops we read that in the Litany as then used, after the words that it may please thee to “illuminate all bishops,” etc., “the proper *suffrage* shall be,” etc.
3. The versicles after the Creed in Morning and Evening Prayer.

Sûfis

a sect of mystic philosophers in Persia, which was founded in the 9th century by Abul Klair. It has contained among its members many of the most noted Mohammedan scholars and poets. Schamyl, the famous

Circassian leader, is said to have belonged to this sect, and to have given to it a semi-political character, directing it especially against the aggressions of the Russians. They are to be found in every part of the empire; have their acknowledged head at Shiraz and their chief men in all the principal cities. Mr. Martyn, missionary to that country, calls them “mystic latitudinarians.” For the tenets, see Sûfism.

Sûfism, or Soofism

(Arabic, *suf, pure, wise*), a certain mystic system of philosophical theology within Islam. Its tenets are, that nothing exists absolutely but God; that the human soul is an emanation from his essence; that every man is an incarnation of Deity; and, though divided for a time from this heavenly source, will be finally reunited with him; that the highest possible happiness will arise from that reunion; and that the chief good of mankind consists in as perfect a union with the Eternal Spirit as the encumbrances of a mortal frame will allow; that, for this purpose, they should break all connection with extrinsic objects, and pass through life without attachments, as a swimmer in the ocean strikes freely without the impediments of clothes; that if mere earthly charms have power to influence the soul, the idea of celestial beauty must overwhelm it in ecstatic light. It maintains also that, for want of apt words to express the divine perfection and the ardor of our devotion, we must borrow such expressions as approach the nearest to our ideas, and speak of beauty and love in a transcendent and mystical sense; that, like a reed torn from its native bank-like wax separated from its delicious honey — the soul of man bewails its disunion with melancholy music, and sheds burning tears; like the lighted taper, waiting passionately for the moment of its extinction, as a disengagement from earthly trammels, and the means of returning to its only beloved. Sufism teaches four principal degrees of human perfection or sanctity.

1. *Shariat*, or the lowest, is the degree of strict obedience to all the ritual laws of Mohammedanism, such as prayer, fasting, pilgrimage, almsgiving, ablutions, etc. — and the ethical precepts of honesty, love of truth, and the like.

2. *Tarikat*. This degree is attainable by those who, while strictly adhering to the outward or ceremonial injunctions of religion, rise to an inward perception of the mental power and virtue necessary for the nearer

approach to the Divinity, the necessity of and the yearning for which they feel.

3. *Hakikal* (truth) is the degree of those who, by continuous contemplation and inner devotion, have risen to the true perception of the nature of the visible and invisible—who, in fact, have recognized the Godhead, and through this knowledge of it have succeeded in establishing an ecstatic relation to it.

4. *Maarifal* is the degree in which man communicates directly with the Deity, and is admitted into a mysterious union with him. Thus it will be seen that the highest aim of the Sûfi is to attain self-annihilations by losing his humanity in Deity. This is to be accomplished by abstracting his mind from all worldly objects, and devoting himself to divine contemplation. Accordingly the Sûfis, neglect and despise all outward worship as useless and unnecessary. The *Musuavi*, their principal book, expatiates largely upon the love of God, the dignity of virtue, and the high and holy enjoyments arising from a union with God. All Sûfistic poetry and parlance are to be taken allegorically and symbolically. They represent the highest things by human emblems and human passions; and religion being with them identical with love, erotic terminology is chiefly used to illustrate the relation of man to God. Thus the beloved one's curls indicate the mysteries of the Deity; sensuous pleasures, and chiefly intoxication, indicate the highest degree of divine love, or ecstatic contemplation. Its principal religious writer is Jalaeddin Rulmi, and its theology prevails among the learned Mussulmans, who avow it without reserve. *See. Chambers's Encyclop. s.v.; Gardner, Faiths of the World, s.v.; Christian Observer, 1819, p. 379; Mill, Mohammedanism.*

Suger

abbot of St. Denis, and a leading dignitary of the Church and statesman of, France in the 12th century, was born probably in the year , and in the neighborhood of St. Omer, and *was* educated in the Monastery of St. Denis, where the crown-prince, Louis the Fat, was his companion. After completing his studies in 1103, he was employed by abbot Adam of St. Denis in the administration of distant possessions of the convent, and in their defense against the incursions of predatory knights. On the accession of Louis VI to the throne (1108), Suger became his counselor, and contributed greatly to the subjugation of the barons, who had thrown off

all responsibility, and to the establishing of the royal authority, by which the reign of Louis VI became noted in the history of France. He was also an active participant in the dispute about investiture (see the article), which at that time agitated both Church and State, taking sides with the pope, as the policy of France demanded. He was present at the Lateran Council in 1112, which annulled the concessions made by pope Paschal II to Henry V. In 1118 he met the fugitive pope Gelasius II, and, in the name of his king, placed all the resources of France at his disposal against his Italian adversaries. He subsequently negotiated a settlement of the question of investiture, in 1121, which proved satisfactory to both France and the papacy. In 1122 he became the successor of the deceased Adam in the abbacy of St. Denis, and in 1124 he visited Rome to attend the great Lateran Council, and while there so ingratiated himself with the pope, Calixtus II, that the latter proposed to create him cardinal, a project which failed by reason of the decease of the pope. He accompanied the army in a campaign against the emperor Henry V in the same year; and he was at the same time earnestly engaged in endeavoring to induce the king to release the *colonies*, or lower orders in the State, from many of their pressing burdens, and to concede the right to form autonomous communes as a means of undermining the feudal system.

About 1127 Suger renounced the habits of his previous worldly life and became an ascetic; and, after having reformed himself, he undertook to enforce the Benedictine rule in all its strictness in the abbey of St. Denis. He fulfilled his spiritual functions conscientiously, and built a magnificent church while himself living in a little cell. His principal merit consists, however, in an excellent administration of the convent, in the conservation of its rights, in the artistic decoration of churches, and in the dissemination of the influences of culture throughout the surrounding wastes. His direction of the affairs of the State still continued, and, when Louis VII ascended the throne (in 1137), became even more pronounced than before. He was associated with bishop Joscelin of Soissons in the regency, and administered the government on the plan of the late king. His boldness appears in his resisting the papal interdict (in 1141) by which Innocent II sought to force a prelate into the archbishopric of Bourges against the expressed will of the king.' His endeavor to restrain the king from embarking in his crusade failed; but he was appointed regent of the country during the *king's* absence, in conjunction with the archbishop of Rheims and-count Vermenidois. Aided by the pope, he subdued the rebellious

nobility, and so wisely administered the finances that he was able to honor the incessant drafts of Louis, and also to erect many edifices, and still save large sums of money to the public treasury. The height of his career was reached when he succeeded in neutralizing the endeavors of Robert of Dreux, the brother of Louis VI, who had returned from the Holy Land in 1148, to seize upon the supreme authority. At the same time, he succeeded in resisting the desires for radical reform fostered by Abelard and Pierre de Bruys, while zealously endeavoring to correct the abuses from which those desires had sprung. He was further successful in a conflict with the canons of St. Genevieve, in Paris, whose convent pope Eugene III had directed him to reform in accordance with the Benedictine rule. Louis VII, on his return, in 1149, publicly thanked the regent and called him the father of his country; and Bernard of Clairvaux and a number of foreign princes wrote to him in token of their admiration and respect. He enjoyed his fame, however, during a brief season only, and died Jan. —12, 1151. His literary remains include only, sixty miscellaneous letters (in Duchesne, *Scriptores*, vol. 4), a report of his administration of St. Denis, and a biography of Louis VI which ranks among the superior historical productions of the Middle Ages (both in Duchesne, *utsup.*).

See *Hist. Lit. de la France*, 12:361; Bernardi, *Essai Hist. sur l'Abbé Suger*, in *Archives Lit. de l'Europe* (Par. 1807), vol. 14 and 15; Carne, *Etudes sur les Fondateurs de Unit Nat. en France* (ibid. 1848), vol. 1; Combes, *L'Abbé Suger* (ibid. 1853); monk Wilhelm's (a contemporary) biography of Suger, in Guizot *Coll. des Memoires*, vol. 8. —Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*

Suggestum, or Suggestio

(a desk), a name frequently given to the *bema*, or sanctuary, of a church.

Suggestum Lectorum,

one of several names given to the AMBO *SEE AMBO* (q.v.), or reader's desk.

Sugin

(*˘ygl̄s*, from *gll̄s*), or *pairs*, is a Masoretic term to denote groups of words which occur in one section several times, once in this connection and once in another connection. These instances having been noticed by the

Masorites, they arranged them into $\hat{y}gws$, or pairs. Thus the *Massora Finalis* gives under the letter *He* (p. 216, col. 1) “eleven pairs, each one of which pair alternately occurs with an audible *He* (=Mappik) and with a quiescent *He* (=Raphe)” e.g. $TrKm$ ($\langle 0110 \rangle$ Proverbs 31:10) and $hrkm$ ($\langle 0251 \rangle$ Genesis 25:31); $Hr[\zeta w]$ ($\langle 0130 \rangle$ Leviticus 13:20) and $hr[\zeta w]$ (ver. 4). Or the Masorites tell us of twenty-two words beginning and ending with *Vav*, each one of which occurs twice: once, *Milra*, or with *Vav* conjunctive, and once *Milel*, or with *Vav* conversive, as $wrbxyw$ ($\langle 0415 \rangle$ Genesis 41:35) and $wrbxywi$ ($\langle 0180 \rangle$ Exodus 8:10); $wskryw$ (28, 28) and $wskrywi$ ($\langle 0292 \rangle$ Exodus 39:21). They tell us that “there are four groups of words, each of which occurs twice in the same book; once with a, word less and a letter more, and once with a word more and a letter less.” The first of such a pair is “Jehovah, thy God, thou shalt fear, and him thou shalt serve” ($\langle 0163 \rangle$ Deuteronomy 6:13); the second, “Jehovah, thy God, thou shalt fear, him thou shalt serve, and to him” ($\langle 0510 \rangle$ Deuteronomy 10:20), which will be best illustrated by the Hebrew, viz.: $db[t wtaw aryt \text{yhl} a hwhy ta$ ($\langle 0163 \rangle$ Deuteronomy 6:13). $wbw db[t wta aryt \text{yhl} a hwhw ta$ ($\langle 0510 \rangle$ Deuteronomy 10:20). They enumerate instances in which four words occur twice in the same sentence, once with the negative particle *al* and once, without it, as $ynda al$ ($\langle 0131 \rangle$ Genesis 23:11) and $ynda$ (ver. 15), or $ph al$ ($\langle 0134 \rangle$ Leviticus 13:4) and ph : (ver. 20). They mention five pairs of words Which respectively occur once with the *Vav* conjunctive and once without it, as $\hat{w}mr \hat{y}[\]$ ($\langle 0197 \rangle$ Joshua 19:7) and $\hat{y}mr \hat{y}[\ w]$ (15, 32); $\hat{l} wbz rk\zeta\zeta y$ ($\langle 0108 \rangle$ Exodus 1:3) and $\hat{l} wbzw rk\zeta\zeta yw$ ($\langle 0152 \rangle$ Genesis 35:23). Without increasing the number the reader is referred to Frensdorff (*Massora Magna*, p. 339 sq.), where, under the heading $\hat{y}gwz$, these pairs are given in alphabetical order. A complete list of the above-quoted instances is given by Frensdorff in his *Ochla-ve-Ochla*, p. 14,52, § 42; p. 14,52 sq., § 45; p. 133, § 232; p. 138, § 250; p. 138, § 251; and in *Levita, Massoreth Heammasoreth* (ed. Ginsb.), p. 178, 207, 212, 223, 229. (B. P.)

Suicer, Johann Caspar

the author of the *Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus*, was born June 26, 1620. He was educated in Zurich, Montauban, and Saumur. In 1643 he returned to Zurich, and became pastor in the Thurgau, but was recalled in 1644 to the schools of the former city. In 1646 he became inspector of the aluminate

and professor of Hebrew, ten years afterwards professor of Greek and Latin in the *Collegium Humanitatis*, and in 1660 professor of Greek and canon in the superior college (*Carolinum*). He remained in this position until 1683, and died Dec. 29, 1684.

Suicer rendered valuable service to theology by his thorough philological labors. His earliest works were text-books for students; *Sylloge Vocum Novi Test.* (Tig. 1648, and 1659 with appended compend of Greek prosody; republished in 1744 by *Hagenbach*): — *Syntaxeos Graecae*, etc. (1651): — **Ἐμπυρέυματα Εὐσεβείας**, *quo du'c Chrysostomi et duce, Basilii A. Homile Continentur*, etc. (1658 and 1681): — Joh. Frisii *Tigurini Dict. Latino Germ. et Germ. — Lat.* (1661 sq.): — *Commenii Vestibul. Scholarum Usufelicis Accommodatum*, etc. (1665); finally, the celebrated *Thesaurus Eccles.* (Amst. 1682, 2 vols. fol.; two enlarged eds. 1728 and 1821, with supplements): — *Lexicon Graeco-Lat. et Lat. — Graecuni* (1683) and, after Suicer's death, the *Symbol. Nicceno-Const. et ex Antiquitate Eccles. Illustratum* (Traj. ad Rh. 1718, 4to). Various other writings were left in manuscript, and the *Lexicen Graec. Majus* and *Expositio Symbol. et Apost. et Athanasiani* are lost. Suicer's learning in these works, particularly the *Thesaurus*, is so evident that Charles Patin, in his *Travels*, observes that Suicer understood more Greek than all the Greeks taken together.

Suicer took but little part in the doctrinal controversies of his day. He regretted their existence, and assisted his friend Heidegger in securing a modification of the *Formula Consensus*. — *Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. SEE HELVETIC CONSENSUS.*

Suicide

(Lat. *sui*, one's self, and *caedere*, to kill) is defined as the killing of one's self with malice aforethought, and while in the possession of a sound mind. It is known in the law as *felo de se*, and is considered felony. In the early Church suicides were called **βιοθάνατοι** (*biothanati*), from offering violence to themselves. Because suicide was a crime that could have no penance imposed upon it, the Church denied the suicide the honor and solemnity of a Christian burial, and allowed him to lie excommunicated and deprived of all memorial in her prayers after death. In England this crime was punished not only with forfeiture of goods and chattels, like other felonies, but the body of the suicide was buried in the night at the crossings

of two highways with a stake driven through the body. This ancient rule was repealed by Statute 4 George IV, c. 51, and now the burials take place in a churchyard, but between 9 and 12 P.M.

Suicide is now generally considered a symptom of some form of insanity, permanent or temporary, in which the emotions and passions are excited or perverted. The following statistics respecting suicides are from *Chambers's Encyclopaedia s.v.*; "In the kingdom of Sweden there is calculated to be 1 suicide to every 92,375 inhabitants; in Saxony, 1 to 8446; in Russia, 1 to 34,246; in the United States, 1 to 15,000; in Paris, 1 to 2700; in St. Petersburg and London, 1 to 21,000. In all England the proportion of suicides is 7.4 to every 100,000 people." See Winslow, *Anatomy of Suicide*; Brierre de Boismont, *Du Suicide et de la Folie Suicide*; Bertrand, *Traits du Suicide*; Radcliffe, *English Suicide Fields*; *Medical Critic*, 1862.

Sukkah

SEE TALMUD.

Suk'kiim

(Heb. *Sukkiyim*', ~~μυλκασ~~ ^{μυλκασ}booth-dweller [Gesén.] or inhabitants of *Sûk* [Fürst]; Sept. **Τρωγλοδύται**; Vulg. *Troglodyte*; A.V. "Sukkiims"), a nation mentioned (^{442B}2 Chronicles 12:3) with the Lubim and Cushim as supplying part of the army which came with Shishak out of Egypt when he invaded Judah. If the name be Hebrew, it may perhaps be better to suppose them to have been an Arab tribe like the Scenite than Ethiopians. If it is borne in mind that Zerah was apparently allied with the Arabs south of Palestine SEE ZERAH; whom we know Shishak to have subdued, SEE SHISHAK, our conjecture does not seem to be improbable. The Sukkiim may correspond to some one of the shepherd or wandering races mentioned on the Egyptian monuments, but we have not found any name in hieroglyphics resembling their name in the Bible, and this somewhat favors the opinion that it is a Shemitic appellation. —Smith. The Sept. and Vulg. render *Troglodytes*, apparently meaning the Ethiopians by that name, who lived on the western shore of the Arabian Gulf (Strabo, 17, 786), who might have been employed as fleet and light-armed auxiliaries of the Egyptians (Heliód. *Eth.* 8, 16). Pliny (6, 34) mentions a Troglodytic city in this direction called *Suche* (see Bochart, *Phaleg*, 4, 29). SEE ETHIOPIA.

Suleviae

a kind of wood-goddesses among the ancient Gauls, who are known to us only from an inscription in bas-relief found near Lausanne, which includes three female figures whose hands are filled with fruit.

Sullivan, Daniel N. V.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was licensed as a local preacher in Alabama in 1833. In 1838 he removed to Texas, and engaged in teaching. In 1840 he was received on trial into the Texas Conference, and served the Church as pastor and presiding elder until his death, at Houston, Feb. 20, 1847. He was a minister of a high order of talents, and especially eminent for his ability in defining and defending the doctrines of the Bible. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M. E. Church, South*, 1847, p. 96.

Sullivan, Lott Bumpus

a Congregational minister, was born at Wareham, Mass., June 27, 1790, and was a graduate of Brown University in the class of 1814. For some time after leaving college he had charge of the Academy in Wrentham, Mass, at the same time reading theology with the Rev. Otis Thompson of Rehoboth, Mass. Having completed his theological studies, he went to Ohio, and was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church in the town of Lyme in that state. Here he remained about six years. Subsequently he resided for ten years and more in Western New York as a missionary in the service of the American Home Missionary Society, and performed a most acceptable work in preaching to several churches in that newly settled region. He did a like service in sparsely settled sections of New Hampshire and Vermont. For several years he resided at Shutesbury, Mass., preaching as opportunity presented. He died at Fall River, Mass., March 1, 1861. See the *Cong. Quarterly*, 1861, p. 216. (J. C. S.)

Sullivan, Samuel B.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born Jan. 27, 1825, and was converted at the age of eleven. In 1846 he was licensed to preach, and at the next session of the Erie Conference was received on trial. His ministry, though marked with many conversions was short, for he died April 9, 1853. He was a man of more than ordinary powers of mind-

fervent, forcible, sublime, and generally powerful in his preaching. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1853, p. 248.

Sully, Maurice de

a French prelate, was born at Sully-sur-Loire, about the middle of the 12th century, of obscure parentage. Having acquired an education through charity, he taught letters and theology in Paris, and was at length made canon of the Cathedral of Bourges, and eventually of that of Paris, to the bishopric of which he finally attained by some means. He greatly enlarged the edifices, honors, and emoluments of that see, and died Sept. 11, 1196, leaving *Letters*, *Sermons*, and a French translation of the New Testament (Lyons, 1511, 8vo). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé s.v.*

Sully, Odon (Or Eudes) De

a French prelate, was born about 1165 at La Chapelle d'Angillon (Berri), being the son of Eudes Archambaud, lord of Sully. He was educated at Paris, and in 1184 became singer at the Cathedral of Bourges. In 1187 he visited Rome, and in 1196 succeeded his brother Maurice as bishop of Paris, a see which he is said by Pierre de Blois to have administered with great fidelity, but by others in a mercenary manner. He took the pope's part in the ecclesiastical quarrels of his country at the time, and was compelled to flee, leaving his property to be confiscated by the crown, but was eventually restored with additional honors. A council of Paris was held under him by the papal legate in 1201; he laid the foundation of Porrois; afterwards famous as Port-Royal; and he preached a crusade against the Albigenses. He died at Paris, July 13, 1208. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé, s.v.*

Sulfur

is designated in Heb. as **tyrph**; *gophrith* (A. V. "brimstone"), and in Greek **θειον** (Plutarch, *Sympos.* 4:2, 3). In the Scriptures it is very frequently associated with "fire." "The Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire out of heaven" (^{<01924>}Genesis 19:24; see also ^{<0116>}Psalms 11:6; ^{<0382>}Ezekiel 38:22). In ^{<01815>}Job 18:15 and ^{<0333>}Isaiah 30:33 "brimstone" occurs alone, but no doubt in a sense similar to that in the foregoing passages, viz, as a synonymous expression with lightning, as has been observed by Le Clerc (*Dissert. de Sodomae Subversione, Commentario Pentateuch Adepta*, § 4), Michaelis, Rosenmüller, and

others. There is a peculiar sulfurous odor which is occasionally perceived to accompany a thunder-storm. The ancients draw particular attention to it, see Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* 35, 15), “Fulmina ac fulgura quoque sulfuris odorem habent;” Seneca (*Q. Nat.* 2, 53), and Persius (*Sat.* 2, 24, 25). Hence the expression in the sacred writings “fire and brimstone” to denote a storm of thunder and lightning, The stream of brimstone in ²³¹⁸Isaiah 30:33 is, no doubt, as Lee (*Heb. Lex.* p. 123) has well expressed it, “a rushing stream of lightning.” From ¹⁸²³Deuteronomy 29:23, “The whole land thereof is brimstone... like the overthrow of Sodom,” it would appear that native sulfur itself is alluded to (see also ²³⁴⁹Isaiah 34:9). Sulfur is found at the present time in different parts of Palestine, but in the greatest abundance on the borders of the Dead Sea. “We picked up pieces,” says Dr. Robinson (*Bibl. Res.* 2, 221), “as large as a walnut near the northern shore, and the Arabs said it was found in the sea near Ain el Feshkhah in lumps as large as a man’s fist: they find it in sufficient quantities to make from it their own gunpowder.” See Irby and Mangles (*Travels*, p. 453), Burckhardt (*Travels*, p. 394), who observes that the Arabs use sulfur in diseases of their camels, and Shaw (*Travels*, 2, 159). There are hot sulfurous springs on the eastern coast of the ancient Callirrhoe (Irby and Mangles, *Travels*, p. 467; Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* 2, 222). The pieces of sulfur, varying in size from a nutmeg to a small hen’s egg, which travelers pick up on the shore of the Dead Sea, have, in all probability, been disintegrated from the adjacent limestone or volcanic rocks and washed up on the shores. Sulfur was much used by the Greeks and Romans in their religious purifications (Jud. 2, 157; Pliny, 35:15); hence the Greek word *eslov*, lit. “the divine thing,” was employed to express this substance. Sulfur is found nearly pure in different parts of the world, and generally in volcanic districts. It exists in combination with metals and in various sulfates: it is very combustible, and is used in the manufacture of gunpowder, matches, etc. Pliny (*loc. cit.*) says one kind of sulfur was employed “ad ellychnia conficienda.” **SEE BRIMSTONE.**

Sulpicians, or Priests of the Society of St. Sulpice

This society was founded in the parish of St. Sulpice, Paris, in 1645, by Jean Jacques Olier de Verneuil. The act founding the society was dated Sept. 6, 1645, and was immediately sanctioned by the authorities. The society is especially devoted to the training of candidates for the priesthood, and is formed into two bands, one devoted to parish work and

the other to teaching. Being warmly befriended by St. Vincent de Paul, the Sulpicians soon established themselves in nearly all the dioceses of France, and took the chief part in the education of the French clergy down to the Revolution of 1789. They were suppressed by Napoleon in 1812, but were restored by Louis XVIII. In 1636 Olier formed a company for colonizing the island of Montreal, who purchased it in 1640, sent out Sieur de Maisonneuve with priests and nuns in 1641, and transferred their proprietorship to the Sulpicians in 1656. In 1657 the Sulpicians De Queylus, Souard, and Galinier took possession of the island, but their claims were resisted, and a conflict of jurisdiction arose which had not been settled as late as the early part of 1876. In 1668 the Sulpicians Francois de Fenelon and Claude Trouvd founded the first Iroquois mission at the western extremity of Lake Ontario, but their labors were confined principally to the Indians near Montreal. In Montreal, in addition to the seminary attached to the Church of Notre Dame, founded in 1657, they possess the Theological Seminary, the Preparatory Seminary, or "College of Montreal," founded in 1773, and several other succursal churches with their residences. Invited by bishop Carroll in April, 1791, a band of four Sulpicians and three Seminarians, headed by Francois Charles Nagot, sailed for Baltimore, Md., where they formed for a time the clergy of the cathedral. Some of their number went to teach in the Georgetown College, and founded the St. Mary's Theological Seminary, Baltimore, with a college or preparatory school. Pope Gregory XVI raised the seminary to the rank of a university. The collegiate school was removed to Ellicott City, Howard Co., in 1849, and suppressed in 1852.

Sulpicius Severus

SEE SEVERUS, SULPICIUS.

Sulter

in Norse mythology, was the knife of the wicked Hela. The word signifies *devouring hunger*.

Sulzer, Simon

an avowed adherent and advocate of the Lutheran view of the Lord's supper in Switzerland during the period of the Reformation. He was born Sept. 22, 1508-the illegitimate child of a provost of Interlachen. After previous vicissitudes, he was recommended by Berthold Haller (q.v.) to the

Council of Berne, and was thus enabled to pursue his studies at the expense of the public treasury, which he did at Basle and Strasburg. He subsequently became a teacher of ancient languages, and was employed in establishing schools throughout the canton of Berne. When Haller died he was deputed to Strasburg to negotiate the call of a successor. He took zealous part with the Strasburg theologians in their attempts at-mediation, and even (in 1538) visited Saxony and had an interview with Luther. Having been won over to the position of Luther, Sulzer steadily persevered in defending the Lutheran view of the sacrament; at first in Berne, as professor of dialectics and rhetoric and subsequently of theology, as well as in the pulpit; and afterwards, beginning in 1548, at Basle, where he became pastor of St. Peter's, and in 1552 professor of Hebrew. In 1553 he became the successor of Myconius in the cathedral, and chief pastor of Basle, and with these dignities he united in 1554 a professorship of theology. In 1563 he acquired the theological doctorate; and he filled, in addition, the position of, superintendent of Roten under the margrave Charles of Baden.

Sulzer entertained the bold project of inducing the Church of Basle to subscribe to the *Form of Concord*, and to refuse the acceptance of the second Helvetic Confession of 1566. **SEE HELVETIC CONFESSION.** He succeeded in causing the omission of explanatory notes from future publications of the first Helvetic Confession (of 1534), and in limiting its influence. Sulzer's views on the sacrament are given in the confession which he instigated the burgomaster of Brinn to issue in 1578 (see Hagenbach, *Gesch. der ersten Basler Confession*). He was also successful in persuading the authorities to permit the use of the organ in the churches and on holidays, and the ringing of the so-called "pope's bell" (a gift from Felix V). He died June 22, 1585. The archives of the Church of Basle and Sulzer's family papers fell into the hands of his heirs, and were partially lost. His successor, J. J. Grynaeus, promoted the Reformed theology, but Sulzer's arrangements with regard to organ and bell still continue in force.

See Herzog, *Athen. Raur.* p. 26, where a catalogue of Sulzer's writings may be found; Hundeshagen, *Conflikte des Zwinglianismus, Lutherthums u. Calvinismus* (Berne, 1842), p. 105 sq.; Kirchhofer, *Berth. Haller* (Basle, 1827), Hagenbach, *Die theolog. Schule Basel's*, etc. (1860); Tholuck, in *Gesch. d. akadem. Lebens im 17ten Jahrh.* p. 321 sq. —Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Sumeru (or Meru)

the north pole, a mountain of gold and precious stones on which dwell the genii and gods.

Summus

an Etruscan and Roman divinity, the god of the nightly sky, the lightning-darter of the night, as Jupiter was of the day. His temple stood near the Circus Maximus, and a representation of him in clay was given in the pediment of the Capitoline temple. Whenever a tree was struck by lightning in the night, the *Arvail brothers* would offer a black ram to Summanus (Pliny, *II. N.* 2, 53; August. *De Civ. Dei*, 4:23 Varro, *De Ling. Lat.* 5, 74; Livy, 32:29; Ovid, *Fast.* 6:731; Cicero, *De Div.* 1, 10, etc.).

Summer

is the invariable rendering in the A.V. of the Heb. /yaf̄i kayits (Chaid. fyaf̄i kayit, ^{<2125>}Daniel 2:35; New Test. **ἔπος**, *heat*), which properly signifies *harvest of fruits* (not of grain, which is **ρυξᾶ**), strictly the *cutting-off of the fruit* (^{<2369>}Isaiah 16:9; ^{<2480>}Jeremiah 8:20; 48:32); specially *fig-harvest*, which in Palestine takes place in August, although the early figs (**μυρῶν**) ripen at the summer solstice (^{<2304>}Isaiah 28:4; ^{<3108>}Micah 7:1); hence the harvest-time of figs, i.e. summer, especially *midsummer*, the hottest season (^{<1334>}Psalms 32:4; the droughts of summer, ^{<2108>}Proverbs 6:8; 10:5; 26:1 30:35; the summerhouse, Amos 3, 15); also fruit, specially figs, as harvested (8, 1, 2; comp. ^{<2201>}Jeremiah 24:1 sq.). **SEE AGRICULTURE; SEE FIG; SEE HARVEST; SEE PALESTINE; SEE SEASON.**

Summerfield, John

a distinguished divine and minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Preston, England, Jan. 31, 1798. His father was a local preacher in the Wesleyan Methodist connection in England, and he educated his son in those religious principles, which governed his own heart and life. At a suitable age he was put under the tuition of the Moravian Academy at Fairfield, near Manchester, where he gave early indications of that precocious genius for which he was afterwards so eminently distinguished. In 1810 he taught a night school in order to aid his father, who had become embarrassed. Before he was fifteen he became clerk in a mercantile house in Liverpool, conducting the French correspondence. He

now, through moral weakness, fell into evil habits and company, and had also an intense passion for listening to eloquent speakers, whether in the pulpit, the senate house, at the bar, or on the stage. He would at times shut himself up in his room and study intently for sixteen hours out of the twenty-four with insufficient nourishment. This, together with the terrible remorse he suffered, seriously and permanently injured his constitution. Established in the coal trade by his father, he was so discontented and neglectful that he brought poverty and distress upon his father's family, and was himself thrown into the Marshalsea of Dublin. Here he employed himself in drawing up the necessary memorials of his fellow prisoners, and was so successful that he continued in this business for some time after his release. In 1817, in great distress and almost despair, he was led by a plain Methodist mechanic to services, and the same night found peace. He became the principal of a "praying association" which exercised in public, and in April, 1818, took his place among the local preachers. He was received on trial in the Methodist Conference of Ireland in 1819, emigrated to America in March, 1821, and was received on trial in the New York Conference. His first appearance in public after his arrival in New York was at the anniversary of the American Bible Society, and his speech on that occasion produced a wonderful effect, and was regarded as one of the very highest efforts of platform eloquence. The following June he was admitted into the Troy Conference. He entered on his labors in New York city, where the churches could not contain, the audiences that desired to hear him. Persons of all professions and classes of society were attracted by the fame of his eloquence, and expressed their admiration of the power with which he enchained them to the words that dropped from his lips. He continued to preach to large audiences until early in June, 1822, when his ministrations were suspended by the failure of his health... Desiring a milder climate, he was appointed delegate from the American Bible Society to the Protestant Bible Society in France. He returned to America, April 19, 1824, but was unable to perform regular service, and was appointed by the Missionary Board of the Philadelphia Conference to travel in Pennsylvania and New Jersey and to take up collections. He united with ministers of other denominations in forming the American Tract Society, and his last public act was an eloquent address at its organization. He died June 13, 1825. Mr. Summerfield was very famous as a pulpit orator; naturally eloquent, deeply devoted to the cause of God, possessed of great command of language and of a rich stock of the most useful knowledge, whenever he spoke in the name of God he poured forth from a heart

overflowing with the kindest feelings a stream of evangelical truth which melted his audiences. A “godly sincerity” was evidently the pervading principle of his heart, and a tone of simplicity characterized his style of preaching. James Montgomery, the poet, said of his discourses that, “the sermons are less calculated for instantaneous effect than for abiding usefulness.” His only publication was *A Discourse on Behalf of the New York Institution for the Instruction of the Deaf and Dumb* (1822). After his death appeared, *Sermons, and Sketches of Sermons, by Rev. John Summerfield, A. M., with an Introduction by Rev. Thomas E. Bond- M.* (N.Y. 1842, 8vo). See *Holland, . Memoir of Summeffield’s Life and Ministry* (1829, 8vo; 2nd ed. 1830, 8o; N. Y. 8 vols; reviewed by L. Bacon in the *Amer. Quar. Rev.* 79, 141; *Christ. Quar. Spec.* 2, 118); his *Life* by Rev. William M. Willett (Phila. 8vo); Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 7:639-654; Fish, *Pulpit Eloquence* (1857); 2, 539; Waterbury, *Sketches of Eloquent Preachers* (1864, 12mb), Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.*; Bangs, *Hist. of the M. E. Church*, 3, 324-329; *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1, 508; Simpson; *Cyclop of Methodism, s.v.* (J. L. S.)

Summer-house Silver

a payment made in the mediaeval ages by certain tenants of abbeys to the abbot or prior, in lieu of providing a temporary summer habitation for him when he came from a distance to inspect the property. —Lee, *Gloss. of Liturg. Terms, s.v.*

Summers, William

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was- born in Fairfax County, Va., in September, 1796. He joined the Church in Leesburgh, O., and in 1832 was admitted on trial in the Pittsburgh Conference. In 1834 he was ordained deacon, and in 1843 received a supernumerary relation; but his health improving, he was made effective at the next conference. In 1853 he was again placed on the supernumerary list, and that relation continued until terminated by death, which came to him in Martinville, O. March 29, 1855. He was kind, courteous, and honorable in his deportment, calm and firm in his purpose, steadfast in his friendship, and faithful and successful as a minister. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 185, p. 568.

Summerville, John

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in the County of Tyrone, Ireland, March 1, 1782. He enjoyed early religious training, was received on trial in the Baltimore Conference in 1812, and filled the following appointments: Trumbull, Tuscarawas, Hinkstone, Oxford, Shenango, Letart Falls, Mansfield, Chautauqua, Ridgeway, Paint Creek, Erie, Youngstown, Deerfield, Lisbon, Canton, Hartford, Butler, Mercer, Centreville, Kittanning, Elizabeth, Waynesburg, and Birmingham. In 1836 he was made a superannuate. He died Oct. 6, 1850. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 4:602.

Summis Desiderantes Affectibus

is the title of the bull issued by pope Innocent VIII wherein he informed the Germans that their country was overrun by witches, and appointing two inquisitors, Henry Kramer and Jacob Sprenger, for their destruction. See Kurtz, *Church Hist.* 1, § 115, 2.

Summists, or Summistse

a name given to those scholastic divines of the Middle Ages who propounded their dogmas in works called *Summae Theologiae*. This name was first adopted from the *Summa Universe Theologiae* of Alexander Hales, whose renown was eclipsed by that of Albertus Magnus. He was, in turn, surpassed by his disciple Thomas Aquinas, who published his famous work on divinity under the title of *Summin Totius Theologiae*, and thereby greatly lowered the estimation in which the *Book of Sentences*, written by Peter Lombard, was held. See Van Oosterzee, *Christ. Dogmat.* 1, 32.

Summus Sacerdos

(Lat for chief priest), a name given to bishops when it had become the fashion in the 3rd century, to deduce the institution of the ecclesiastical hierarchy from the priests and services of the Temple of Jerusalem. Romish writers apply the title exclusively to the pope of Rome.

Sumner, John Bird

an English prelate, was the eldest; son of the Rev. R. Sumner, A.M., many years vicar of Kenilworth and Stoneley, in the County of Warwick, and was born at his father's parsonage house at Kenilworth in 1780. He was sent at

an early age to Eton, where he was nominated to a king's scholarship, and, having spent several years on that royal foundation, he passed in the usual course to King's College, Cambridge, of which he became successively scholar and fellow. Not long after having completed his academical course, Mr. Sumner was invited to return as assistant master to Eton, where he remained for several years. During this time he was ordained deacon and priest. He was preferred, about 1820, to the rectory of Maple-Durham, a pleasant and retired village on the banks of the Thames, a few miles above Reading. In 1820 Mr. Sumner was promoted by the ministry of the earl of Liverpool to a canonry in the Cathedral of Durham, which he held for many years, together with his rectory of Maple-Durham. In 1828 the see of Chester became vacant, and canon Sumner, having just received his D.D. from Cambridge, was consecrated bishop in due form. The bishopric being then but poorly endowed, he was allowed to retain the canonry of Durham, but his views would not allow him to retain the rectory of Maple-Durham. While Dr. Sumner held the bishopric of Chester, the Oxford movement commenced and came to ahead. From the time that the war cry of Anglo-Catholicism was first sounded in 1833 down to his death, bishop Sumner has ever been among the first and the foremost to denounce the dishonesty of the Tractarian school of theology. In his charges, in addresses, in sermons, he ever and again denounced the Tractarian doctrines and ritual. In the early part of 1848 lord John Russell, who held the post of premier at the time, offered the archbishopric of Canterbury to Dr. Sumner. The offer was accepted, and, much to the satisfaction of the evangelical portion of the Established Church, he was translated from Chester to Canterbury. In 1850 occurred the memorable event called the "Papal Aggression." To that measure of the pope, by which England was portioned out into Roman Catholic dioceses with prelates set over each, archbishop Sumner offered that opposition which was to have been expected, and he denounced the measure in terms of more than usual energy. His grace, as we learn from the "Peerage," was "primate of all England and metropolitan, one of the lords of her majesty's privy council, a governor of the Charterhouse, and visitor of Merton and 'All-Souls' colleges at Oxford, as well as of King's College, London, of Dulwich College, and of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury," and he enjoyed the patronage of no less than one hundred and sixty-nine livings. He was also most discreet and blameless in the distribution of his clerical patronage, bestowing his best livings on the most exemplary and painstaking of his clergy. He died Sept. 6, 1862. His works are, *Essay on the Prophecies*, etc. (Lond. 1802, 8vo): — *Apostolical*

Preaching (1815, 8vo.; 9th ed. Lond. 1850, 8vo): — *Records of Creation*, etc. (1816, 1817, 1818, 1825, 1833. 1838, 2 vols. 8vo; 7th ed. 1850, 8vo): — *Evidences of Christianity Derived from its Nature*, etc. (Lond. 1824, 8vo; N.Y. 1825, 12mo): — *Sermons and Lectures* (1827-59).

Sumner, Joseph, D.D.

a Congregational divine, was born at Pomfret, Conn., Jan. 19, 1740. He graduated at Yale College in 1759, was ordained pastor of the Church at Shrewsbury, Mass., June 23, 1762, and died Dec. 9, 1824. During a period of sixty-two years, he was never absent from the stated communion of his Church. He published, *A Sermon at the Ordination of, Samuel Sumner* (1791): — *A Thanksgiving Sermon* (1799): *A Half-century Sermon* (1812). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 4:630, note; *Cong. Quarterly*, 1859, p. 42.

Sumption, Thomas

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Cecil County, Md., Dec. 5, 1802. He was converted in 1819, licensed as a local preacher in 1828, and in 1838 was received on trial into the Philadelphia Conference. He received a superannuated relation in 1874, and died in Halifax, Dauphin Co., Pa., May 9, 1874. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1875, p. 40.

Sumptuary Laws

At an early period Christianity controlled domestic habits in a great variety of ways both in food and dress. Excesses were condemned. Thus Clement of Alexandria says, "Other men, like the unreasoning animals, may live to eat; we have been taught to eat that we may live. For the nourishment of the body is not the work we have to do, nor is sensual pleasure the object of our pursuit, but rather the entrance into those mansions of incorruption whither the divine wisdom is guiding us. We shall therefore eat simple food, as becomes children, and merely study to preserve life, not to obtain luxury. Great varieties of cookery are to be avoided. Atiphanes, the Delialh physician, considers variety and research in cookery to be a main cause of disease; yet many have no taste for simplicity, and; in the vainglory of, a fine table, make it their chief anxiety to have choice fish-es from beyond sea." They might "use a little wine for the stomach's sake," as the apostle exhorted Timothy "for it is good to bring the help of an astringent to a

languid constitution; but' in small quantity, lest, instead of benefiting, it should be found to produce a fullness which would render other remedies needful; since the natural drink of a thirsty man is water, and this simple beverage alone was supplied from the cleft rock by the Lord for the use of the Hebrews of old... Water is the medicine of a wise temperance. Young men and maidens should, for the most part, forego wine altogether; for to drink wine during the boiling season of youth is adding fire to fire... Those who require a mid-day meal may eat bread altogether without wine, and, if thirsty, let them satisfy themselves with water only. In the evening at supper, when our studies are over and the air is cooler, wine may be used without harm perhaps, for it will but restore the lost warmth; but even then it should be taken very sparingly, until the chills of age have made it a useful medicine; and it is for the most part best to mix it with water, in which state it conduces most to health." "Precious vases, rare to be acquired and difficult to be kept, are to be put away from among us," says the same writer that we have been quoting. "Silver sofas, silver basins and saucers, plates and dishes; beds of choice woods decorated with tortoise-shell and gold, with coverlets of purple and costly stuffs, are to be relinquished in like manner. The Lord ate from a humble dish, and reclined with his disciples on the grass, and washed their feet, girded with a towel. Our food, our utensils, and whatever else belongs to our domestic economy should be conformable to the Christian institutions." "It is proper that both the woman and the man should come into the church decently dressed, with no studied steps, in silence, and with a mind trained to real benevolence; chaste in body, chaste in heart, fitted to pray to God. Furthermore, it is right that the woman should be veiled, save when she is at home; for this is respectable and avoids offence." "It is enough to have the disposition which becomes Christian women," says Tertullian. "God looks on the heart. The outward appearance is nothing. Why make a display of the change that has been wrought in us? Rather are we bound to furnish the heathen no occasion of blaspheming the Christian name, and accusing Christianity of being irreconcilable with national customs." Yet he adds, "What reasons can you have for going about in gay apparel when you are removed from all with whom this is required? You do not go the round of the temples; you ask for no public shows; you have nothing to do with pagan festivals. You have no other than serious reasons for appearing abroad. It is to visit a sick brother, to be present at the communion or a sermon; and if offices of courtesy or friendship call you among the pagans, why not appear in your own peculiar armor, that so the difference may be

seen between the servants of God and of Satan?" Sumptuary laws have been passed by the State and Church, generally, however, to be disregarded. Roman laws prohibited certain luxuries in dress and food, but they were all habitually transgressed in the later times of the Republic. Such laws were in great favor in the legislation of England from the time of Edward III down to the Reformation (see statute 10 Edward III, c. 3, act 37 Edward III). In France they were as old as Charlemagne, but the first attempt to restrict extravagance in dress was under Philip IV. Scotland had also a similar class of statutes. In all these countries, however, these laws seem to have never been practically observed. Most of the English sumptuary laws were repealed by James I, c. 25, but a few remained on the statute-book as late as 1856.

Sun

(prop. *ἡλίου*, *shemesh*; ἡλίου). In the history of the creation the sun is described as the "greater light," in contradistinction to the moon, or "lesser light," in conjunction with which it was to serve "for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and for years," while its special office was "to rule the day" (¹Genesis 1:14-16). The "signs" referred to were probably such extraordinary phenomena as eclipses, which were regarded as conveying premonitions of coming events (²Jeremiah 10:2; ³Matthew 24:29, with ⁴Luke 21:25). The joint influence assigned to the sun and moon in deciding the "seasons," both for agricultural operations and for religious festivals, and also in regulating the length' and subdivisions of the "years," correctly describes the combination of the lunar and solar year, which prevailed, at all events, subsequently to the Mosaic period—the moon being the *measurer* (κατ' ἐξοχήν) of the lapse of time by the subdivisions of months and weeks, while the sun was the ultimate *regulator* of the length of the year by means of the recurrence of the feast of Pentecost at a fixed agricultural season, viz. when the corn became ripe. The sun "ruled the day" alone, sharing the dominion of the skies with the moon, the brilliancy and utility of which for journeys and other purposes enhances its value in Eastern countries. It "ruled the day," not only in reference to its powerful influences, but also as deciding the length of the day and supplying the means of calculating its progress. Sunrise and sunset are the only defined points of time, in the absence of artificial contrivances for telling the hour of the day; and, as these points are less variable in the latitude of Palestine than in many countries, they served the purpose of marking the

commencement and conclusion of the working-day. Between these two points the Jews recognized three periods, viz. when the sun became hot, about 9 A.M. (^{<9119>}1 Samuel 11:9, ^{<4078>}Nehemiah 7:3); the double light, or noon (^{<0436>}Genesis 43:16; ^{<1045>}2 Samuel 4:5); and “the cool of the day,” shortly before sunset (^{<0888>}Genesis 3:8). The sun also served to fix the quarters of the hemisphere-east, west, north, and south-which were represented respectively by the risings sun, the setting sun (^{<2466>}Isaiah 45:6; ^{<9001>}Psalms 1:1), the dark quarter (^{<0134>}Genesis 13:14; ^{<2021>}Joel 2:20), and the brilliant quarter (^{<6323>}Deuteronomy 33:23; ^{<8577>}Job 37:17; ^{<2604>}Ezekiel 40:24); or otherwise by their position relative to a person facing the rising sun-before, behind, on the left hand, and on the right hand (^{<8238>}Job 23:8, 9). The apparent motion of the sun is frequently referred to in terms that would imply its reality (^{<6803>}Joshua 10:13; ^{<2201>}2 Kings 20:11; ^{<9906>}Psalms 19:6; ^{<2005>}Ecclesiastes 1:5; ^{<8081>}Habakkuk 3:11). The ordinary name for the sun, *shemesh*, is supposed to refer to the extreme brilliancy of its rays, producing *stupor* or *astonishment* in the mind of the beholder; the poetical names **hMj i chammah** (^{<8828>}Job 30:28; ^{<2160>}Song of Solomon 6:10; ^{<2326>}Isaiah 30:26), and **srj , chires** (^{<0748>}Judges 14:18; ^{<8907>}Job 9:7) have reference to its heat, the beneficial effects of which are duly commemorated (^{<6314>}Deuteronomy 33:14; ^{<9106>}Psalms 19:6) as well as its baneful influence when in excess (^{<5016>}Psalms 121:6; ^{<2490>}Isaiah 49:10; ^{<3048>}Jonah 4:8; Ecclus. 43, 3, 4). The vigor with which the sun traverses the heavens is compared to that of a “bridegroom coming out of his chamber,” and of a “giant rejoicing to run his course” (^{<9905>}Psalms 19:5). The speed with which the beams of the rising sun dart across the sky is expressed in the term “wings” applied to them (^{<4909>}Psalms 139:9; ^{<3042>}Malachi 4:2).

The worship of the sun as the most prominent and powerful agent in the kingdom of nature was widely diffused throughout the countries adjacent to Palestine. The Arabians appear to have paid direct worship to it without the intervention of any statue or symbol (^{<8826>}Job 31:26,27; Strabo, 16. 784), and this simple style of worship was probably familiar to the ancestors of the Jews in Chaldea and Mesopotamia. In Egypt the sun was worshipped under the title of Ri or Ra, and not, as was supposed by ancient writers, under the form of Osiris (Diod. Sic. 1, 11; see Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* 4:289). The name came conspicuously forward as the title of the kings-Pharaoh, or rather Phra, meaning “the sun” (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* 4:287). The Hebrews must have been well acquainted with the idolatrous worship of the sun during the captivity in Egypt both from the

contiguity of On, the chief seat of the worship of the sun as implied in the name itself (On= the Hebrew Bethshemesh, “house of the sun,” ^{<2461>}Jeremiah 43:13), and also from the connection between Joseph and Poti-pherah (“he who belongs to Ra”), the priest of On (^{<0446>}Genesis 41:45). After their removal to Canaan, the Hebrews came in contact with various forms of idolatry which originated in the worship of the sun—such as the Baal of the Phoenicians (Movers, *Phon.* 1, 180), the Molech or Milcom of the Ammonites, and the Hadad of the Syrians (Pliny, 37:71). These idols were, with the exception of the last, introduced into the Hebrew commonwealth at various periods (Judges 2, 11; ^{<1105>}1 Kings 11:5); but it does not follow that the object symbolized by them was known to the Jews themselves. If we have any notice at all of conscious sun-worship in the early stages of their history, it exists in the doubtful term **μυντήι** *chammanim* (^{<1370>}Leviticus 26:30; ^{<2178>}Isaiah 17:8, etc.), which was itself significant of the sun, and probably described the stone pillars or statues under which the solar Baal (Baal-Haman of the Punic inscriptions, Gesenius, *Thesaur.* 1, 489) was worshipped at Baal-Hamon (^{<2181>}Song of Solomon 8:11) and other places. Pure sun-worship appears to have been introduced by the Assyrians, and to have become formally established by Manasseh (^{<1213>}2 Kings 21:3, 5), in contravention of the prohibitions of Moses (^{<1849>}Deuteronomy 4:19; 17:3). Whether the practice was borrowed from the Sepharvites of Samaria (^{<1273>}2 Kings 17:31), whose gods Adrammelech and Anammelech are supposed to represent the male and female sun, and whose original residence (the Heliopolis of Berosus) ‘was the chief seat of the worship of the sun in Babylonia (Rawlinson, *Herod.* 1, 611), or whether the kings of Judah drew their model of worship more immediately from the East, is uncertain. The dedication of chariots and horses to the sun (^{<1231>}2 Kings 23:11) was perhaps borrowed from the Persians (Herod. 1, 189; Curt. 3, 3, 11; Xenoph. *Cyrop.* 8:3, 24), who honored the sun under the form of Mithras (Strabo, 15:732). At the same time it should be observed that the horse was connected with the worship of the sun in other countries, as among the Massagetse (Herod. 1, 216) and the Armenians (Xenoph. *Anab.* 4:5, 35), both of whom used it as a sacrifice. To judge from the few notices we have on the subject in the Bible, we should conclude that the Jews derived their mode of worshipping the sun from several quarters. The practice of burning incense on the house-tops (^{<1215>}2 Kings 23:5, 12; ^{<2493>}Jeremiah 19:13; ^{<3005>}Zephaniah 1:5) might have been borrowed from the Arabians (Strabo, 16:784), as also the simple act of adoration directed towards the rising sun (^{<2086>}Ezekiel 8:16;

comp. ^{<38127>}Job 31:27). On the other hand, the use of the chariots and horses in the processions on festival days came, as we have observed, from Persia; and so also the custom of “putting the branch to the nose” (^{<20817>}Ezekiel 8:17) according to the generally received explanation which identifies it with the Persian practice of holding in the left hand a bundle of twigs called Bersam while worshipping the sun (Strabo, 15:733; Hyde, *Rel. Pers.* p. 345). This, however, is very doubtful, the expression being otherwise understood of “putting the knife to the nose,” i.e. producing self-mutilation (Hitzig, *On Ezekiel*). An objection lies against the former view from the fact that the Persians are not said to have held the branch to the nose. The importance attached to the worship of the sun by the Jewish, kings may be inferred from the fact that the horses were stalled within the precincts of the temple (the term **rwPî** *parvâr*, meaning not “suburb,” as in the A.V., but either a portico or an outbuilding of the Temple). They were removed thence by Josiah (^{<12311>}2 Kings 23:11). **SEE SUN, WORSHIP OF**. In the metaphorical language of Scripture, the sun is emblematic of the law of God (^{<9917>}Psalms 19:7), of the cheering presence of God (^{<9812>}Psalms 84:2), of the person of the Savior (^{<8019>}John 1:9; ^{<3042>}Malachi 4:2), and of the glory and purity of heavenly beings (^{<6016>}Revelation 1:16; 10:1, 12:1).

See Meiner, *Gesch. der Relig.* 1, 387 sq.; Nork, *Ueb. d. Sonnencultus d. alt. Volker* (Heilbronn, 1840); Pococke, *Spec. Hist. Arab.* p. 5, 150; Jablonski, *Opusc.* 1, 187 sq.; Doughtsei *Analect.* 1, 189; Hyde, *Rel. Vett. Persarum*, p. 206 sq.; Eichhorn, *De Sole Invicto Mithra*, in the *Comment. Soc. Götting.* 3, 153 sq.; Creuzer, *Symbol.* 1, 738 sq.; 4:409 sq.; Bochart, *Hieroz.* 1, 141 sq.; Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* 3, 249 sq.; Bose, *De Josia Quadrigas Solis Removente* (Lips. 1741); Pocarus, *De Simulacris Solaribus Israelitarum* (Jen. 1725).; Gesenius, *Monumen. Phonic.* 2, 349.

Sun, Children of

(Armen. *Arevurdis*), an Armenian sect which originated with Sembat, a Paulician. They were also called *Throntrakians* (or *Throndracians*), from the village of Throntrake (Throndrac), where their Church was formed. Sernbat, who originated in the province of Ararat, having entered into some connection with a certain Medschusic, a Persian physician and astronomer, was led, under his influence, to attempt a new combination of Parseeism and Christianity. This sect, though it met with no mercy from the bishops, continually revived, and spread widely in Armenia. About 1002 it made the most alarming progress, when it is said to have been

joined by Jacob of Harkh. He gave a more distinctively Christian cast to its tenets; journeyed through the country, preaching repentance and inveighing against work-righteousness; and denounced the false confidence which was placed in masses, oblations, alms, and church-prayers for the forgiveness of sins. Finally, the Catholics of the Armenian Church, having secured his person, caused him to be branded with the heretical mark (a fox on the forehead), carried from place to place attended by a public crier to proclaim him a heretic, and finally killed him. See Kurtz, *Church History*, 1, 71, 2; Neander, *Church History*, 3, 587.

Sun, Worship of

(*Heliolatry*). The worship of the great orb which insures to us light, warmth, and life is as ancient as history. It existed in the earliest ages among the Phoenicians, Egyptians, Persians, and Hindus, and later among the Greeks and Romans of the West, venerating its object under the different names of Helios or Sol, or of Baal, Osiris, or Mithras. Various forms of sacrifice and prayer characterized this worship among the different nations, but they agreed in regarding the sun as a mighty and superior deity who ruled the world with an independent authority more or less complete. The Greeks alone did not render higher honors to the sun than to the other gods regarded as of superior rank. All Eastern nations considered it as practically the supreme divinity. The Romans, too, maintained the worship of the sun after Heliogabalus had introduced it and had built a temple to, Sol. *SEE SUN*.

Sunadi

was a Hindu divinity, the wife of Utanubaden and mother of the famous Druva, a saint who ruled the kingdom of his father during 26,000 years, and was then translated by Vishnu to the pole-star.

Sundanese Version

Sunda is a dialect spoken in the west of the island of Java, near the Straits of Sunda, and prevails over the third of the island. The dialect belongs to the great Polynesian stock of languages, and the difficulties in mastering the same are best described by the Rev. G. J. Grashius, who studied the language with a view of rendering the translation of the Scriptures as idiomatic as possible. Mr. Grashius writes thus to the British and Foreign Bible Society (*60th Report*, 1864, p. 30):

“You will not be surprised to hear that I have as yet obtained but little insight into the Sundanese language. And this is not exactly a consequence of the difficulty and extent of the subject which is to be mastered — no, it is occasioned by *the* form in which the matter presents itself. Propose to yourself to learn a language which represents itself to you as a sea in miniature, with all conceivable motions of swelling and floating objects. At one moment you see something, the next it disappears again; at one moment you think you have got hold of something, and formed a right conception *of it*, and the next you perceive that you are mistaken.

“The study of the Sundanese is, for the greatest part, made more difficult by the childishness which characterizes the language. There is no by-law its it, but yet such a composition of laws that a novice experiences an anxious feeling on first making acquaintance with it anxious, namely, whether he will penetrate with pleasure into that childish form of thinking and speaking. The fear which at this point I entertained begins gradually to vanish, and I hope soon to be able to speak and write the Sundanese well, if God will but bless and prosper my undertaking.

“By-and-by I shall master the vocabulary; but in this I by no means hurry myself, because otherwise I might easily take things for granted which, by a closer insight into matters and significations, I should be obliged to unlearn. To unlearn takes lime, and is very unprofitable for the freshness of mind which is a first requisite for the study of the Sundanese language.” In 1870 the British and Foreign Bible Society’s *Report* shows the publication of the Gospel of St. Luke in the Sundanese, and this seems to be the only part printed by the British and Foreign Bible Society, while the Dutch Bible, Society has printed the New Test., translated by Mr. Coolsma, who has also translated the Old Test. From the *74th* (1878) *Annual Report* of the British and Foreign Bible Society we see that the Netherlands Missionary Union have requested the London committee ‘to undertake the publication of Mr. Coolsma’s translation of the Old Test., and that- the committee have resolved to print the book of Genesis on receiving satisfactory reports as to the reception of Mr. Coolsma’s New Test. translation. (B. P.)

Sunday

I. Name and Change of Day. — *Sunday* is the name of the first day of the week, adopted by the first Christians from the Roman calendar (Lat. *Dies Solis*), *Day of the Sun*, so called because it was dedicated to the worship of the sun. The Christians reinterpreted the heathen name as implying the Sun of Righteousness with reference to his “arising” (~~304B~~ Malachi 4:2). It was also called *Dies Panis* (*Day of Bread*), because it was an early custom to break bread on that day. It is called, also, the Lord’s day, its sacred observances being especially in his honor. ‘The apostles themselves introduced the religious observance of Sunday, meeting for divine service (~~401B~~ Acts 20:7; ~~414B~~ 1 Corinthians 16:2), and the opposition in the Christian Church to Judaism early led to the substitution of Sunday for the Sabbath; and in the epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians it is presupposed that even the Jews who had come over to Christianity adopted the same custom.

SEE SYNAGOGU.

Sunday began, in 1064, at nones (8 P.M.) on Saturday and lasted until Monday. In 994 parishioners were required to attend even-song and nocturns on Saturday. In 696 the Lord’s Day was reckoned from evening to evening, but in 958 from Saturday nones till light on Monday morning. ‘Islip’s- *Constitutions* and the Councils of Aix (789), Frejus (791), and Frankfort (794) assign as the cause that vespers are the first office of the morrow. The mediaeval tradition was that our Lord was born on Sunday, baptized on Tuesday, and began his fast on Wednesday.

II. Ecclesiastical Observance of the Day. — The consecration of Sunday in a special manner to religious employments and the abstaining from all worldly business was established by a synodal law (canon 29; Council of Laodicea) with this restriction, that all Christians should abstain from worldly business if they were able. In the religious services of Sunday we note the following all fasting was prohibited on that day, even in Lent; Tertullian (*De Coron. Mil.* c. 3) declaring that it was accounted a crime to fast on the Lord’s day, and other authorities were equally severe in their denunciations. The reason for this observance was that the day was considered one — of joyfulness because of our Lord’s resurrection. Yet this rule was not so strictly binding but that when a necessary occasion required, and there was no suspicion of heretical perverseness or, contempt, men might fast upon this day (Jerome, *Ep.* 28, *ad Lucinium Boeticuni*).

It may here be remarked that another custom was to pray standing on the Lord's day, in memory of our Lord's resurrection. The great care and concern of the primitive Christians for the religious observance of Sunday is seen in their ready and constant attendance upon all the offices and solemnities of public worship, and this, too, even in times of persecution; from their studious observance of the vigils, or nocturnal assemblies preceding the Lord's day; from their attendance, in many places, upon sermons twice a day, and at evening prayers; and from the censures inflicted upon those who violated the laws concerning the religious observance of the day. The celebration of the Eucharist was a standing part of divine service every Lord's day, and every communicant was expected to partake thereof See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 20 ch. 2, § 912; bk. 16 ch. 9:§ 2.

The mode in which the early Christians spent the Lord's day is thus described by Dr. Jamieson in his *Manners and Trials of the Primitive Christians*:

“Viewing the Lord's day as a spiritual festivity, a season in which their souls were specially to magnify the Lord and their spirits to rejoice in God their Saviour, they introduced the services of the day with psalmody, which was followed by select portions of the prophets, the gospels, and the epistles, the intervals between which were occupied by the faithful in private devotions. The plan of service, in short, resembled what was followed in that of the vigils, though there were some important differences, which we shall now describe. The men prayed with their heads bare, and the women were veiled, as became the modesty of their sex, both standing — a position deemed the most decent, and suited to their exalted notions of the weekly solemnity with their eyes lifted up, to heaven and their hands extended in the form of a cross, the better to keep them in remembrance of Him whose death had opened up the way of access to the divine presence. The reading of the sacred volume constituted an important and indispensable part of the observance; and, effectually to impress it of the memories of the audience, the lessons were always short and of frequent recurrence. Besides the Scriptures, they were accustomed to read aloud several other books for the edification and interest of the people such as treatises on the illustration of Christian: morals by some pastor of eminent reputation and piety, or letters from foreign churches containing an account of the state and progress of the Gospel. This part of the service most necessary and valuable at a time when a large proportion of every

congregation were unacquainted with letters — was performed at first by the presiding minister, but was afterwards devolved on an officer appointed for that object, who, when proceeding to the discharge of his duty, if it related to any parts of the history of Jesus, exclaimed aloud to the people, I Stand up; the gospels are about to be read; and then always commenced with ‘Thus saith the Lord.’ They assumed this attitude, not only from a conviction that it was the most respectful posture in which to listen to the counsels of the King of kings, but with a view to keep alive the attention of the people — an object which, in some churches, was sought to be gained by the minister stopping in the middle of a Scriptural quotation and leaving the people to finish it aloud. The discourses, founded for the most part on the last portion of Scripture that was read, were short, plain, and extemporary exhortations, designed chiefly to stir up the minds of the brethren by way of remembrance, and always prefaced by the salutation, ‘Peace be unto you.’ As they were very short, sometimes not extending to more than eight or ten minutes duration, several of them were delivered at a diet, and the preacher was usually the pastor of the place, though he sometimes, at his discretion, invited a stranger, or one of his brethren known to possess the talent of public speaking, to address the assembly. The close of the sermon by himself, which was always the last of the series, was the signal for the public prayers to commence. Previous to this solemn part of the service, however, a crier commanded infidels of any description *that* might be present to withdraw, and, the doors being closed and guarded, the pastor proceeded to pronounce a prayer, the burden of which was made to bear a special reference to the circumstances of the various classes who, in the primitive Church, were not admitted to a full participation ² the privileges of the faithful. First of all, he prayed, in the name of the whole company of believers, for the catechumens — young persons, or recent converts from heathenism who were passing through a preparatory course of instruction in the doctrines and duties of Christianity that their understandings might be enlightened, their hearts receive the truth in the love of it, and that they might be led to cultivate those holy habits of heart and life by which they might adorn the doctrine of God their Savior. Next, he prayed for the penitents who were undergoing the discipline of the Church that they might receive deep and permanent impressions of the exceeding sinfulness of sin, that they might be filled with godly sorrow, and might; have grace, during the appointed term of their probation, to bring forth fruits meet for repentance. In like manner, he made appropriate supplications for other descriptions of persons, each of

whom left the church when the class to which he belonged had been commended to the God of all grace and the brethren, reduced by the successive departures to an approved company of the faithful, proceeded to the holy service of communion.”

Those who neglected ordinances were severely censured. Absence from church for three consecutive Sundays was to be visited with excommunication. Irregularities during attendance, such as refusing to join in prayers or receive the communion or leaving church during sermon, were strongly condemned. In later times severe measures were employed to secure Sabbath observance, and which could only, in many cases, induce hypocrisy, or mere external attendance at church. The kirk-sessions in 1574 appointed “searchers,” or captors, to make the round of the parish and take notice of such as were “raging abroad.” The strange practice lasted for nigh a century and a half. Some of the records of the period are curious. See Walcott, *Sacred Archaeol.* s.v. *SEE LORDS DAY.*

III. Legal Observance of the Day. — As soon as the Christian religion came to be recognized by the State, laws were enacted for the observance of Sunday. The emperor Constantine made the first law (A.D. 321) to exempt the day from being juridical, as were the others. By this law and others he suspended all actions and proceedings of the law on this day, whether arrests, pleadings, exactions, sentences of judges, executions, excepting only such as were of absolute necessity or of eminent charity, as the manumission of slaves, the appointing of curators and guardians to ordain, and causes relating to matters of preservation and damage, legacies and trusts, exhibiting of wills, and all cases where great damage might be suffered either by delay or by death. Valentinian prohibited all arrests of men for debt, whether public or private, on this day, and Valentinian junior, with Theodosius the Great, appointed all Sundays in the year to be days of vacation from all business of the law whatsoever. In like manner, all secular business or servile employments were forbidden, except only such as men were called to by necessity or some great charity, such as harvesting. By a law of Honorius the judges were enjoined to visit the prisons every Sunday to examine the prisoners and ascertain from them whether the keepers of the prison denied them any office of humanity, and also to give orders that the prisoners; under proper guard, should be allowed to leave the prisons to bathe themselves. Later laws forbade all husbandry on the Lord’s day, allowing only such work as was necessary to

secure food absolutely required. The Christian laws took care to secure the honor and dignity of the Lord's day by forbidding public games, shows, or ludicrous recreations (*Cod. Justii. lib. 3, tit. 12, De Feriis, leg. 11*), and the Church was no less careful to guard the service of this day from the encroachment of all vain pastimes and needless recreations. The Fourth Council of Carthage made a decree (can. 88) excommunicating any person who should forsake the services of the Church to attend a public show.

In England Sunday laws were of early date. The code of Ina, king of the West Saxons (about 693), punished servile work by fine. Alfred the Great (876) forbade work, traffic, and legal proceedings; while the statute 27 Henry IV, c. 5, enacts that all fairs and markets on Sundays, except in harvest, shall cease on pain of forfeiture of goods. The statute 5 and 6 Edward VI, c. 3, makes Sundays, with Christmas and Easter, holydays, but permits work in harvest and in cases of necessity. The statute 1 Elizabeth, c. 2, punishes by fine persons absenting themselves from church without excuse. James I. in 1618, issued his *Book of Sports* (q.v.), in which he declared certain games, sports, etc., lawful on Sundays after divine service. This book was reissued by Charles I in 1638. The statute 29 Charles II, c. 7, enacted "that no tradesman, artificer, workman, laborer, or other person whatsoever shall do or exercise any worldly labor, business, or Fork of their ordinary callings upon the Lord's day, or any part thereof (works of necessity and charity only excepted);" and "that no person or persons whatsoever shall publicly cry, show forth, or expose to sale any wares, merchandise, fruit, herbs, goods, or chattels whatsoever upon the Lord's day or any part thereof." This, somewhat modified by subsequent laws, is the present Sunday law of England, and is the foundation of the laws on the subject in the United States.

In America the Puritan colonists established, to the full extent of their power, the observance of Sunday as the Christian Sabbath. The early laws of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Georgia, South Carolina, and Virginia compelled attendance at church, the Massachusetts law (1782) providing that such attendance was not obligatory where there was no place of worship which the person could conscientiously attend. When the Federal government was formed and the separation of Church and State was fully recognized, the earlier Sunday laws were modified in conformity with this principle. The courts have been careful to distinguish between Sunday observance as a religious and as a civil institution, and to enforce only the latter. The following are the grounds upon which our Sunday laws rest:

The right of all classes, so far as practicable, to rest one day in seven; to worship undisturbed on the day set apart by the majority of the people; the decent respect which should be paid to the religious institutions, of the people; the value to the State of Sunday observance, as contributing to popular intelligence and morality. With the partial exception of Louisiana, Sunday laws exist in every state in the Union. These laws differ somewhat in detail and strictness, but the following general characteristics may be noted: Sunday is everywhere held as a *dies non*; public affairs are suspended; legislatures do not sit; courts are not held, except city police-courts for an hour or two; legal processes are not served. In most of the states common labor and traffic are forbidden; contracts made for service on Sunday are invalid; public amusements are prohibited or restricted. In some states exception is made in favor of those who observe the seventh day of the week. In Louisiana the only Sunday law is that which makes it (with Christmas, New-year's-day, etc.) a public rest-day, and provides that citations shall not issue, nor proceedings be had, nor suits instituted on that day, and that it shall not be reckoned in computing interest and in protests, etc. The Constitution of the United States provides that Sunday shall not be reckoned in the ten days within which the president may return any bill; the Federal courts and offices of the departments are closed; the post-office service is restricted; no session of Congress is held, or, if held on that day, it is considered as being part of the preceding Saturday; and provision is made by an act of Congress for the observance of Sunday by the army and navy. Federal legislation respecting Sunday proceeds, no further. The constitutionality of Sunday law has been decided frequently by the highest courts of the several states. Some of our statutes define the extent of the Lord's day. In Connecticut the courts have defined it as extending only from daybreak to the closing of daylight on Sunday. Generally, in New England, it is from sunset on Saturday to sunset on Sunday; but for many purposes, and probably in most of the states for all purposes, it begins only at midnight between Saturday and Sunday and ends with the next midnight.

In France, during the Revolution, when the Christian calendar was abolished and the decade substituted for the week, every tenth day was made a rest-day, and its observance was enforced by a law (17 Thermidor, an. 6) which required the public offices, schools, workshops, stores, etc., to be closed, and prohibited sales except of eatables and medicines, and public labor except in the country during seed-time and harvest. When the Gregorian calendar was restored, Sunday was recognized in the *Code*

Napoleon (art. 25, 260). The law of Nov. 18, 1814, prohibiting ordinary labor, traffic, etc., and declared by the courts in 1838 and 1845 to be still in force, is, practically, a dead letter.

In Switzerland recent legislation has granted to railway employees and all government office-holders at least one Sunday in every three; and still further restriction of Sunday labor is being sought in some of the cantons. The question is agitated in Belgium and Germany of better protection by law of Sunday rest for operatives. See Cox, *Literature of Sab. Question* (Edinb. 1865); *Amer. Law Rev.* vol. 2; *Prot. Episcopal Quar. Rev.* vol. 7; Hopkins, *Sabbath and Free Institutions*, in doc. 29 of N.Y. Sabbath Committee; Judge W. Alien, opinion in *Lindenmüller vs. The People*, 33 Barbour, 548; Hessey, *Bampton Lectures* (1860); Schaff, *Anglo-Amer. Sabbath* (1863). **SEE SABBATH.**

Sunday, John, or Shah-Wun-Dals

was a native Indian, born in New York State in 1795-6. He belonged to the Missisauga section of the Ojibway nation, and when a young man he served in the British army against the United States. He was converted in 1826, and shortly after was appointed a leader among the converted Belleville Indians. He was the earliest evangelical pioneer to the tribes on the north waters of Lakes Huron and Superior. In 1832 he was received into the Conference and was ordained in 1836, and the same year accompanied Rev. William Lord to England to plead the cause of missions, and remained a year at that work. A large part of his ministerial labor was performed under the direction of Rev. William Case; and he had charge of Alderville, Rice and Mud Lake, and Muncietown circuits. He died Dec. 14, 1875. See *Minutes of the Ontario conference*, 1876, p. 12.

Sunday-school

Among the modern developments of Christianity, Sunday schools, and what is known as the Sunday-school enterprise, are prominent. To persons familiar with their objects and the scriptural precepts by which they are sanctioned, it seems strange that so long a period elapsed before they came into actual existence. That a leading duty of the Church was to teach all nations was made plain in the great commission of our Lord to his disciples. That little children were included in the scope of that commission was evident from the great Teacher's own command to "suffer little children to come unto him and forbid them not," as well as from his

impressive charge to Peter, "Feed my lambs." While evidence is not lacking to indicate that the Christians of the apostolic age both comprehended the duty enjoined by our Lord and illustrated it in adaptation to their circumstances, yet there are too many proofs that in the centuries immediately following, that duty fell into abuse and neglect amid the rapidly growing corruptions of the Church. The ceremonious catechetical system of the 4th and 5th centuries was a labored but poor apology for that neglect, and when it came to an end no substitute was left in its place. Hundreds of years then went by without any general effort on the part of the Church for the religious instruction of children. Following the Reformation of the 16th century catechization in the elements of Scripture doctrine was gradually introduced into most of the Protestant churches, but it was rarely extended to any beyond the recognized children of the Church.

I. *Origin and Early History of the Sunday-school System.* — It was not till near the close of the 18th century that the-modern system of Sunday-school instruction took its rise. Although in numerous instances previously catechization had been practiced on the Lord's day, and in several cases individuals remote from each other in time and locality had assembled children for instruction on that day, yet nothing like a general system of teaching the young on Sundays, whether in secular or religious learning, was known prior to 1780. The system that then arose was purely philanthropic in its design, and in its origin contemplated only local results. From an early period in the 17th century, pin making had been an important industry in the old city of Gloucester, England. This manufacture employed great numbers of small children not only residents of the place, but gathered in from surrounding regions. Vast numbers of these children were wholly uneducated, and, being without parental restraint or moral supervision, they naturally fell into gross disorder and immorality, especially on Sundays, when the factories were not in operation. The first person who undertook to remedy this distressing state of things was Mr. Robert Raikes (q.v.), a printer residing in Gloucester, and a member of the Church of England. He found four persons who had been accustomed to instruct children in reading, and engaged their services to receive and instruct such children as he should send to them every Sunday. The children were to go soon after ten in the morning, and stay till twelve. They were then to go home, and return at one; and after reading a lesson, they were to be conducted to Church. After Church they were to be employed

in repeating the catechism till half after five, and then to be dismissed with an injunction to go home without making a noise, and by no means to play in the street. This was the general outline of the regulations as stated by Mr. Raikes, in his celebrated letter of June 5, 1784, which conclusively identifies him as the originator of the Sunday-school movement.

As has often happened in other cases of great results from small beginnings, there have been various endeavors to fix the origin of Sunday-schools at earlier periods than that named above. Although it is not difficult to establish priority in several cases, yet there is no other instance of an actual Sunday-school from which continuity or serial connection can be traced down to the present time. If therefore, mere priority were in question, it would be necessary to go back to the period of Moses, under whom the catechetical system of the Jews was appointed, culminating in the grand sabbatical year (⁽¹⁶³¹⁾Deuteronomy 31:10-13). But as it is not the origin of catechization (q.v.), which is under consideration, but rather of that form of catechization which, in modern times, is known as the Sunday-school system, it is safe to accept the general verdict of history, according to which Robert Raikes is recognized as its founder. When once the idea of Sunday instruction for the ignorant children of Great Britain was fairly developed, it was seen to have not only great intrinsic merit, but perfect adaptation to other places.. Hence the schools of Mr. Raikes soon began to be imitated in all directions, with results of the most encouraging character. A Sunday-school Society was formed in London, and, in various ways, so general an interest was awakened on the subject that in the course of a few years Sunday schools were commenced in nearly every part of England. They did not, however, become universal, nor in the largest degree useful, until a higher idea than that of mere philanthropy became embodied in them. The plan of employing hired teachers not only made it necessary to raise large amounts of money, but necessarily placed a limit upon their extension and permanence. Besides, it was not possible to secure the best quality of teaching by any appeal to mercenary motives. In discussing this subject at a comparatively early period of the history of Sunday-schools, the Rev. John Angell James said, "Hireling teachers can scarcely be expected to possess either the zeal or the ability of those who now engage in the work from motives of pure benevolence. Gratuitous instruction was 'an astonishing improvement of the system, and which does not appear to have entered into the views of its benevolent author. If we were asked,' says a writer in the *Sunday-school Repository*, whose name stood next to

that of Robert Raikes in the annals of Sunday-schools, we should say, the person who first came forward and voluntarily proffered his exertions, his time, and his talents to the instruction of the young and the poor; since an imitation of his example has been the great cause of the present flourishing state of these institutions, and of all that future additional increase which may be reasonably anticipated.”

While it may not be possible to fix upon any one person as having been the first to commence gratuitous effort in the teaching of Sunday-schools, it is not difficult to determine, from the history of the times, who was probably more instrumental than any other man in establishing and diffusing the system of gratuitous and Christian instruction in those schools. It was the Rev. John Wesley, who, for more than thirty years prior to the first Sunday-school of Raikes, had been in the habit of assembling children in various parts of England for the purpose of religious instruction. It was he who, having recorded in his journal, July 18, 1784, that he found Sunday-schools springing up wherever he went, also recorded these memorable, if not prophetic, words: “Perhaps God may have a deeper end therein than men are aware of. Who knows but some of these schools may become nurseries for Christians?” From that time forward notices of Sunday-schools were frequent in his journals. The following is a brief specimen; “July 27, 1787. — We went on to Bolton. Here are eight hundred poor children taught in our Sunday-schools, by about eighty masters, who receive no pay but what they are to receive from their great Master.” This record corresponds to the statement made in Myles’s *History of the People called Methodists* (Lond. 1803). Having referred to Sunday-schools as an excellent institution begun by Mr. Raikes, the author says, “Mr. Wesley no sooner heard of it than he approved of it. He published an account of it in the *Arminian Magazine* for January, 1785, and exhorted his societies to imitate this laudable example. They took his advice. Laboring, hard-working men and women began to instruct their neighbors children, and to go with them to the house of God on the Lord’s day.” Whatever was done by others, the Methodists, from the beginning, practiced only gratuitous instruction in their Sunday-schools. By them the same institution and modes of instruction were simultaneously introduced into the United States of America, under bishop Asbury, who sustained to the American Methodist societies a similar relation to that of Mr. Wesley in England.

As early as the year 1784 the following paragraph was incorporated in the *Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church*:

“What shall we do for the rising generation? Who will labor for them? Let him who is zealous for God and the souls of men begin now. 1. Where there are ten children whose parents are in society, meet them at least an hour every week. 2. Talk with them every time you see any at home. 3. Pray in earnest for them. 4. Diligently instruct and vehemently exhort all parents at their own houses. 5. Preach expressly on education.”

In sequence of this mandatory rule, addressed primarily to ministers, but involving the co-operation of the laity, Sunday-schools were established in many places. Of one of those schools a very definite and satisfactory record was made. It was taught in 1786, in Hanover County, Va., at the house of Mr. Thomas Crenshaw, who, in 1827, forty-one years later was a living witness of the fact, as was also the Rev. John Charleston, a minister of thirty-nine years service in the Church, who had been converted in that school (Bangs, *Hist. of the M. LE. Church*). Further historic evidence of the early adoption of organized ‘Sunday-school effort by the Church referred to grew out of the fact that persecution arose on account of its endeavors to instruct the colored children of the South. In Charleston, S. C., the Rev. George Daughaday “was severely beaten on the head, and subsequently had water pumped on him from a public cistern, for the crime of conducting a Sabbath school for the benefit of the African children in that vicinity.” Nevertheless, the Methodist Conference, which met in Charleston in February, 1790, resolved to continue the work. Its minute on the subject was in these words:

“*Ques.* What can he do to instruct poor children, white and black, to read?

“*Ans.* Let us labor, as the heart and soul of one man, to establish Sunday-schools in or near the place of public worship. Let persons be appointed by the bishop, elders, deacons, or preachers, to teach *gratis* all that will attend, and have a capacity to learn... The Concil shall compile a proper school-book to teach them learning and piety.” At the period of the origin of Sunday-schools the Methodist Episcopal Church found one of its principal fields of action in the Southern States, being drawn thither by the great spiritual destitution of the inhabitants. But it is easy to understand that, owing to the sparseness of the population and to other reasons, the condition of that region was not favorable to the rapid development

and permanent establishment of Sunday schools. The same thing was, to some extent, true of the entire United States, owing to the general exhaustion of the country following the war of the Revolution and the unsettled condition of affairs in a newly organized government. Hence nearly or quite a quarter of a century passed by before Sunday-schools became common in either the Southern or Northern States.

Meantime they had been making steady and successful progress in Great Britain, where they were promoted by two classes of agencies, the philanthropic and the religious. Owing to the low state of public education in that country, hundreds of thousands of children were wholly dependent upon Sunday-schools for the first elements of instruction. Hence reading and writing were universally taught in the Sunday-schools—the former as essential to the perusal of the Word of God or the Catechism, which from the first were the text-books for all pupils able to use them.

Although much and well-rewarded effort was put forth in behalf of Sunday-schools from purely philanthropic motives, yet the greatest progress made by them and the highest results secured through them were in sequence of avowed and consistent religious effort. When, at length, this species of effort became general, Sunday-schools assumed a position of importance and of promise not before realized. About the same period they began to develop what may be called their cumulative power. This was seen when the first generation, of Sunday-school scholars had grown up to become teachers, and felt themselves moved to do for others what had been done for them. In this manner the teaching force in Sunday-schools became greatly augmented. Besides, cases were not rare in which the grown-up scholars of Sunday-schools became ministers of the Gospel, while others, continuing in secular life, became prominent men in business and in society. The strong and effective support rendered by such persons, as well as by many others of less prominence, gave a new impetus to the Sunday-school enterprise, which has been enlarging and repeating itself ever since.

The enlistment of the press as an auxiliary to Sunday-schools was an event of great importance. For a considerable period Sunday-school work was done at a great disadvantage for lack of suitable books of all kinds, not excepting copies of the Scriptures. The organization of the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1804, and subsequently of numerous other

societies for the publication and diffusion of the Word of God, tended to a general supply of the Holy Scriptures in forms and at prices adapted to extensive use in Sunday-schools. Besides Testaments, Bibles, and elementary instruction books, the first publications introduced extensively into Sunday-schools were called reward-books, on account of their being presented to children as an encouragement for punctual and regular attendance and for the memorization of lessons. At first they were tracts and story-books, in paper covers, of very inferior quality, no others being attainable. About 1810 the Religious Tract Society of London began issuing children's books, prepared and printed specially with reference to Sunday school patronage. The demand for such books increased in the ratio of their production, so that other religious societies, and even miscellaneous publishers, found it to their interest to provide them. At length the idea of introducing circulating libraries into Sunday-schools came into vogue, and with it a still greater publication of books designed for juvenile reading, and also for the instruction-and aid of teachers. —

There are no data for accurately tracing the numerical growth of Sunday-schools in the earlier periods of their history. Nevertheless, it is pleasing to know that some of the workers of those days were not inattentive to the broader aspects of the enterprise in which they were engaged. It was estimated by the Sunday-school Society of London, in 1786, that within five years after the opening of Raikes's first school 250,000 scholars had been enrolled in' the schools then established. About forty years later (1827) the American Sunday-school Union estimated that the aggregate number of scholars enrolled in the Sunday-schools of different countries was 1,250,000.

II. *The Second Period of the Sunday-school Enterprise.* — This enterprise, at the present writing, has had a recognized existence of about one hundred years. In considering its history, it seems proper to divide its first century into two periods of fifty years each. The first, which has been summarily sketched above, may be denominated its initial and formative period. The second, now closing, constitutes its period of adolescence. We must look to the future for its full development.

Owing to causes noticed above, it was not earlier than from 1825 to 1830 that the Sunday-school cause came generally and prominently before the American public. Between the years named two leading Sunday-school unions (q.v.) were organized—one in Philadelphia and one in New York.

About that time several great publishing societies were established that have given much auxiliary aid to Sunday-school efforts. The idea of religious instruction as the one great business of Sunday schools had then found universal acceptance. The development of public secular instruction had by that time become so general, at least in the Northern and Central States of the American Union, that Sunday-schools had little occasion to go out of their proper sphere. The movement in behalf of general education in England had begun, having been greatly stimulated by the results of Sunday-schools. The purchase and use of Sunday-school libraries had become common in both countries, and the means of supplying them with suitable books were improving. In short, the Sunday-school enterprise was fairly launched, but no more than that. All the general improvement and progress of the intervening fifty years, together with the united and consecutive efforts of the multiplied workers in Sunday-schools, have been needed to bring those schools to the position they at present occupy.

There are two methods of indicating the progressive advance and the actual results of Sunday-schools. The one is by general statements, and the other by the comparative showing of such numerical statistics as may be found trustworthy. As neither of these modes is fully adequate, both will here be employed to a limited extent, in order that they may as far as possible supplement each other. Within the last fifty years Sunday-schools have come to be regarded as an essential branch of Church action, not merely in England and America, but throughout the Protestant world, whether in home or mission fields. They have also been adopted by Roman Catholics and Jews in Protestant countries. Not to speak of the influence of Sunday-schools in the last-named bodies, it is safe to say that the great majority of all the ministers, missionaries, and communicants of all the Protestant churches of the world are at this time the *alumni* of Sunday-schools, and, as such, their active friends and supporters. The recognized necessities of these schools have given rise to important changes in church architecture, by which nearly every church is provided with accommodations for the instruction of the young in graded classes, ranging from infancy upwards. They have called into existence not only an extensive literature, but also a varied psalmody, contemplating the special tastes and wants of the young. While in England they have been chiefly limited to the poorer and middle classes of the people, in the United States they have claimed, and in fact assumed, a relation to public (week-day) schools corresponding to that which the Sabbath holds to the secular days

of the week. In this relation they seek to supplement public and general education with the moral and religious influences of Christianity. In this view, they secure the attendance of scholars from the higher as well as lower classes of the community, and enlist for their instruction a quality of talent and an amount of effort which money could never hire.

In passing from general though significant statements like these to such showings as may be made in figures, it seems necessary to explain that Sunday school statistics, as minute and comprehensive as are now seen to be desirable, are very difficult to obtain on a large scale. Only in rare instances have governments been interested to collect them, and comparatively few of the promoters of Sunday-schools have so far recognized their importance as to take the requisite steps for securing them. Consequently, up to the present' time, there has not been a uniformity of method and the extent of co-operation necessary to making up comprehensive exhibits of numbers and results. The most, therefore, that has been up to this time possible in the way of such exhibits has been to form estimates based upon accurate statistics taken within certain-districts or churches, and extending the *pro rata* outward. About the middle of the 19th century an effort was made in England, under government sanction to ascertain the number and attendance of the Sunday-schools of that country. On a given Sunday (March 30, 1851) the Sunday-schools of England and Wales were simultaneously inspected; and there were found in 23,514 schools, 302,000 teachers and 2,280,000 scholars. The number of children enrolled as scholars was 2,407,409, or about three fifths of the number of children between the ages of five and fifteen enumerated by the census taken within the same limits. A similar proportion of children in American Sunday-schools at the same period would have reached the number of 3,000,000. If to those aggregates the probable number of Sunday schools in Scotland, Ireland, and other countries at the same date be added, it seems safe to believe that there were in Sunday-schools throughout the world, at the end of 1850, not less than 6,000,000 scholars. Similar estimates made at the end of another quarter of a century indicate that at the end of 1875 there were in operation in all countries 110,000 Sunday-schools, embracing 1,500,000 teachers and 10,000,000 scholars. One statistician of some prominence has since estimated that there are in the United States alone not less than 98,303 Sunday-schools and 7,668,833 scholars. On that basis the above aggregate for all countries might be enlarged. To illustrate the

thoroughness with which Sunday-school statistics are taken by at least one of the American churches, and also the instructiveness of such statistics when taken through a series of years, we subjoin the official summary of the Methodist Episcopal Church for the year 1889: Sunday-schools, 25,828; Sunday-school officers and teachers, 286,768; scholars, 2,188,077; scholars over fifteen years of age, 493,704; scholars under fifteen, and not in infant classes, 445,502; scholars in infant classes, 491,429; average attendance, 1,434,251; volumes in Sunday-school libraries, 1,871,132; annual expenses of the schools, \$1,658,240; contributions to the Sunday-school Union for establishing new and aiding poor schools, \$22,524.05; officers and teachers who were communicants in the Church, 257,959; scholars who were communicants, 610,861; conversions in connection with the Sunday-schools, 119,654. The total membership of the Church at the same period was 2,237,526, or 49,000 less than the aggregate number of teachers and scholars in the Sunday-schools. A retrospective comparison of the increase of members in the same Church from year to year shows a striking correspondence to the number of reported conversions in the Sunday-schools. To the extent that the above statistics may be considered representative of the condition and work of Sunday-schools in the American churches, they render superfluous any argument to prove the magnitude of that work and its auxiliary power for the promotion of Christian influence.

It is not to be supposed that results of the importance indicated in the foregoing sketch have naturally arisen from the spontaneous growth of Sunday-schools. On the other hand they are only to be attributed to the divine blessing upon the systematic and well-directed efforts of intelligent Sunday-school workers extending through successive years. In fact, a considerable portion of the second half century of Sunday-schools had passed away before it could be said that these schools were thoroughly popular with even the Christian public of America; nor did they become so without great and continuous exertions on the part of enthusiastic friends of the cause. As one great agency for accomplishing that result, Sunday-school conventions were appointed and held in various places and in a great variety of circumstances. There were conventions for cities and towns, for counties, for districts, for conferences, and for states. Some of them were managed by single denominations and some by a union of all denominations. In these conventions, prominent Sunday school workers came in contact with masses of people, answering objections, diffusing

information, and stimulating zeal. Such gatherings gave an opportunity for the discussion of new methods, and became a great agency for the promotion of all real improvements in the organization and conduct of Sunday-schools even in the remotest sections of the land. In proportion as the Sunday-school idea became popular, and agitation in its behalf became unnecessary, conventions of Sunday-school friends and workers began to take the form of institutes after the analogy of teachers institutes designed to elevate the standard of secular instruction. For a long period the most that was thought possible to be done for the higher training and special instruction of Sunday-school teachers, was sought to be accomplished through superintendents and pastors Bible classes. But at length it was found practicable, with no design of superseding the Bible-classes referred to, to secure many of their benefits on a more popular scale, coupled with the enthusiasm derived from the assembly of numbers of people interested in common objects. Hence at Sunday-school conventions and institutes, lectures were given on important topics, apparatus and new publications were exhibited and explained, and model and normal classes were taught and trained by skilled teachers. By these public proceedings, not only was the better classification and instruction of Sunday-schools promoted, but an *esprit du corps* was aroused among teachers; and in many schools normal departments were established for the special instruction and qualification of teachers.

The success of Sunday-school institutes and normal classes reacted upon the conventional idea and caused it to expand into that of Sunday-school assemblies, designed to continue in session from one to three weeks at a time. In connection with the growing American habit of taking summer vacations and of gathering in masses at popular resorts, Sunday-school assemblies, under wise and energetic management, have speedily grown to be influential of great good and promissory of long continuance. The Chautauqua Sunday-school Assembly, held on the borders of a beautiful lake in Western New York, under the presidency of Dr. John H. Vincent, may be considered at once the originator and model of various similar assemblies already held, and now said to be established for regular annual sessions in different parts of the United States; e.g. at Clear Lake, Ia.; Lake Bluff, Ill.; Loveland and Lakeside, O.; the Thousand Island Park in the St. Lawrence River; and at Round Lake, near Saratoga, N. Y. These assemblies are designed to do, for vast and widely separated sections of America, what was contemplated by the London Sunday-school Union in

the erection of a building at 56 Old Bailey, in the heart of London. In that building is a Sunday-school museum and a large hall in which courses of lectures are given, while in other rooms training-classes are taught and competitive examinations held. While the center of a million-peopled city affords some peculiar advantages for the objects above indicated, and specially in being accessible at all seasons of the year, yet the ample spaces and the romantic associations of a beautiful American grove adapted to such uses leave nothing to be desired in view of the objects of the assembly and during the season allotted to it. Many of the constructions are somewhat rude, but the appointments are in excellent taste and constantly improving. Everything, however, is made subservient to the grand idea of intellectual and spiritual improvement, with specific reference to the promotion of Christ's kingdom upon earth through the agency of Christian instruction. No one can properly appreciate the importance and future bearing of the agencies now under notice without considering that each coming generation will require, in its turn, to be trained and fitted for the ever-expanding work of teaching all nations the truths of the Gospel.

It may here be remarked that Sunday-school conventions have not been limited even to large states; in fact, they have been expanded so as to enlist national and even international representation. A World's Sunday-school Convention met in London in 1862, and a German National Sunday-school Convention in Hamburg in 1874. In the United States, in 1875, twenty-one State Sunday-school conventions were held, besides one of a national and one of an international character. The meeting of leading and delegated Sunday-school workers from different churches and nations has had a happy tendency towards the promotion of practical Christian union on the largest scale. One of the best evidences of this may be instanced in the general adoption since 1872 of a system of international lessons for Bible study. Uniform schemes of simultaneous study had been previously adopted to a considerable extent, especially in Great Britain, where they had long been promoted by the London Sunday-school Union, but never officially accepted throughout the kingdom. As early as 1860 Mr. Orange Judd, editor of the *American Agriculturist*, originated a scheme of lessons having all the essential features of the present International Series namely, a: selection of about seven consecutive verses for each week, in historical order, from the several portions of Scripture. At his suggestion Dr. James Strong drew up such a scheme, which was printed in tabular form in the *Agriculturist* for February, 1862, and hundreds of thousands of copies of it

were distributed and used in the Sunday-schools of various denominations throughout the United States. A similar plan was published in the same manner the following year, and in 1862 the first of four consecutive question-books, entitled *Lessons for Every Sunday in the Year*, was prepared under the same auspices, and published in New York. In 1865 the London system, with some modifications, was brought to the attention of the American public by Rev. J. H. Vincent, then editing a Sunday-school periodical in Chicago. The question was soon after proposed by him in a Sunday-school institute, "Is it practicable to introduce a uniform system of lessons into all our schools?" This question was earnestly and hopefully discussed in various ways for several years following; until, at the National Convention at Indianapolis in 1872, it was answered in the affirmative by a large vote. When the project was agreed to by representatives of the leading denominations in America, it was through friendly correspondence endorsed by the London Sunday-school Union, and has since been in actual and extensive use on both sides of the Atlantic. The international use of systems of lessons, prepared by joint committees, has had a happy tendency to promote increased interest in scriptural study throughout the world. This mode of simultaneous study has been greatly popularized by the publication of notes and comments on the uniform lessons in hundreds of periodicals in various countries and in different languages. At the present time, the system of international study seems to have won general favor throughout the Protestant world, and to have the promise of a long, if not permanent, continuance.

In closing this article, it seems proper to say that it is in the United States that the greatest work has been done in the preparation and publication of Sunday-school literature, although not without a great debt of obligation to English writers. Here Sunday school circulating-libraries were first adopted as an essential auxiliary of Sunday-school effort. By this means, the influences of the Sunday-school were projected through the secular days of the week. In this country also, Sunday-school requisites and periodicals, combining both elegance and cheapness, have been published in the greatest profusion. The Sunday-school libraries of the United States have, in fact, become so numerous and important as to have challenged and secured a partial enumeration in the official census of the government. The census of 1870 reported 33,580 libraries, and 8,346,153 volumes in those libraries. This aggregate, large as it is, does not include the State of Connecticut, and for other reasons is evidently far below the facts in the

ease at the present time. No other libraries are so widely diffused as those of Sunday schools; they are not only found in cities, where most great libraries are established, but in the remotest sections and neighborhoods of the land, and everywhere they are free to all who by attendance on Sunday schools become entitled to draw their books for themselves or their friends. In so vast an aggregate of volumes, it would not be strange if there were some of an indifferent or even of a very objectionable character. But such would be only exceptions to the general rule that Sunday-school libraries furnish wholesome and attractive reading to millions of youths and children, many of whom, without them, would have no reading, or only that which is bad.

The most cursory view of the various agencies now in active operation as parts of the Sunday-school enterprise can hardly fail to impress any thoughtful mind with the moral grandeur of that enterprise as a whole. Especially will any true Christian that contemplates the feeble beginning of 1780, in comparison with the vast array of Sunday-school activities and agents at work in 1880, be led to exclaim, What hath God wrought through the instrumentality of those who have endeavored to obey the command "Feed my lambs!" When, moreover, he considers the glorious results of the Sunday-school efforts of the past hundred years, and the cumulative power of those that may be made in the centuries to come, he will see that the problem of the world's conversion is in process of solution. (D.P.K.)

"SUNDAY-SCHOOL SOCIETIES, UNIONS, etc. Associated Christian effort may be designated as the generic agency by which, under the divine blessing, the great results of the Sunday-school enterprise have been accomplished. Such effort has assumed two forms 1, local; 2, general—each correspondent and supplementary to the other. Local associations, whether in neighborhoods or churches, have from the first been necessary as a means of raising the money to found, and of enlisting the teachers to instruct, Sunday-schools. General associations were also, from an early day, seen to be important for the purpose of awakening public interest and of diffusing information both as to the necessity and the best means of instructing in religious truth. They have likewise had an important function to perform in prompting and guiding individual and local effort in the work of organizing and maintaining Sunday-schools, becoming at the same time an important bond of union between great numbers of schools not locally connected. General associations for these objects have assumed, somewhat

interchangeably, the title of societies aid: unions, the latter predominating, apparently, on account of its expressiveness of their character and objects. The most important of those established in England and America will now be enumerated in chronological order.

I. English. —

1. In 1785 “The Society for Promoting Sunday-schools in the British Dominions” was organized in London. It was under the leadership of William Fox, who in various ways proved himself to be a true philanthropist, but specially in his zeal, liberality, and personal efforts for the education and moral elevation of the lower classes of his countrymen. This society, during the first sixteen years of its existence, paid out £4000 for the services of hired teachers in Sunday-schools. When, however, the plan of gratuitous teaching came to be universally adopted, and Christians and churches became generally enlisted in promoting Sunday-schools from purely religious motives, the importance and influence of this society declined until it became extinct.

2. In 1803 “The London Sunday-school Union” was organized. It was composed of lay Sunday-school workers of different denominations of Christians residing within a radius of five miles from the city post office. This limitation was adopted as a measure-of convenience and unity of action, but with no design of limiting the influence of the union to the circle thus described. This union has had an honorable and prosperous career from its origin to the present time. It has never controlled a large amount of funds, nor been able to take statistics on any scale of great importance; but it has steadily and consistently pursued its specific designs, and in so doing has been able, from its central position, to influence favorably the Sunday-school cause not only throughout Great Britain, but throughout the world. The following have been its more important functions;

(1.) The publication of Sunday-school requisites, lesson-papers, and periodicals. Of the latter, *The Sunday school Teachers Magazine* and several juvenile monthlies have long held a high rank.

(2.) The promotion of activity and improvement in the work of Sunday-school instruction. For this object the position of the union, in the practical center not only of London, but of England, has been eminently favorable. This advantage has been diligently and wisely, improved by a succession of intelligent and faithful workers, who, by personal and co-operative efforts,

have kept the standard of Sunday-school instruction continually advancing. As a permanent means to this important end, they have secured the erection of a fine building in a central location, in which they maintain courses of lectures, training and model classes, together with competitive examinations for teachers.

3. In 1810 “The Religious Tract Society” of London was founded. This society, although not bearing the name Sunday-school in its title, or specifically naming Sunday-school objects in its constitution, has nevertheless been, from its origin to the present time, one of the most serviceable auxiliaries to the Sunday-school enterprise. Its publications have been unrivalled for cheapness, elegance, religious character, and adaptation to Sunday-school wants. As such they have challenged and secured the patronage of all Sunday-school workers throughout the British dominions. Vast numbers of them have been reprinted in the United States.

Of several other general associations we are not able to assign the exact date of origin. The order of their establishment is indicated in the list, and the specific object of each is sufficiently expressed by its title. They are as follows: “The Church of England Sunday-school Institute;” “The Ragged Sunday-school Institute;” “The Wesleyan Methodist Sunday-school Union.” The Wesleyan Methodist Church has long had a form of denominational action in behalf of both weekday and Sunday school education. It has, moreover, through its publication office, issued many books for Sunday-schools, as well as requisites and juvenile periodicals. Between the years 1860 and 1870 it thought proper to adopt more specific measures in behalf of its Sunday-school work. Hence the institution of the union last named, and the appointment of a connectional Sunday-school secretary. In general, it may be remarked that the greater part of the churches throughout Great Britain maintain their Sunday-schools-by individual Church effort, often aided by the co-operative influence of local unions.

II. *American.* —

1. Not counting the Church action alluded to in the preceding article, the first general Sunday-school organization established in the United States dated from Jan. 11, 1791. It was formed in Philadelphia, under the title of “The First-day or Sunday School Society.” It was composed of members representing different denominations of Christians, among whom were

several members of the Society of Friends. “The first article of the constitution of this society required that the instruction given in the schools established under its auspices or receiving its beneficence should be confined to reading and writing from the Bible and such other moral and religious books as the society may from time to time direct. The teachers were paid for their services.” Like its predecessor of similar design in London, this society did not have a very long or influential career. Neither did the New York Sunday-school Union, formed in 1816, nor the Philadelphia Sunday and Adult School Union formed in Philadelphia in 1817.

2. In 1824 the last-named association was merged in “the American Sunday-school Union.” This union, like that of London, is composed of laymen belonging to different denominations of Christians; but from the first it has assumed and maintained a far more prominent position and more aggressive modes of action than its English prototype. It has undertaken the double work of the publication of Sunday-school literature and the missionary enterprise of founding Sunday-schools on the frontier and in all destitute portions of the United States. For these objects, it has appealed to its supporting churches for funds. Those appeals have been honored in large amounts from year to year; and thus, during more than half a century, it has carried forward a grand and expanding work in many places where denominational effort could not have commanded success. As an indication of the work it is and has been accomplishing we subjoin its principal items of statistics for the year ending March 1, 1890: Sunday-schools organized, 1685, containing 7353 teachers and 59,432 scholars. Schools aided 1852, containing 12,788 teachers and 120,792 scholars. Miles traveled by its agents and missionaries, 463,243. Addresses delivered, 12,020. Bibles distributed, 6779. Testaments distributed, 9337. Families visited, 42,222. It has expended in missionary operations an aggregate of \$2,471,620, while the value of books and papers it has put in circulation is not less than \$7,000,000. It is easy to perceive that such a system of evangelical effort, steadily and energetically pursued for a long series of years, must result in an amount of good quite beyond the power of figures to enumerate or words to express. When to this grand idea is added that of the influence of a rich and abundant Sunday-school literature, diffused on business principles and through business agencies among the, various Sunday-schools of the land, the mind strives in vain to comprehend the full extent of the significance and hopefulness of this system of effort. From the nature

of its work, the American Sunday-school Union is unable to take what may be called permanent statistics, or to follow the schools it has founded into their subsequent changes and developments. Its office is usually that of a pioneer, making preliminary organizations, which, in the course of years — and often of a very few years — expand, subdivide, and become merged in the more permanent work of the various churches.

3. In 1827 “The Sunday-school Union of the Methodist Episcopal Church” was organized in New York, in a form, which also contemplated the publication and diffusion of religious tracts and the Holy Scriptures. Although all these objects had been previously contemplated and promoted by regular Church action as taken in 1784 and subsequently, it was thought proper, in 1827, to make special efforts in their behalf by the joint and special organization referred to. In 1840 the Sunday-school Union under notice was reorganized as a separate institution, and in 1844 its interests and functions were brought into greater prominence by the appointment of an official Sunday-school editor, who was also made corresponding secretary of the union. These movements were in harmony with the original policy of the Church that instituted them, namely, to promote Sunday-school instruction as a branch of regular Church action. For such action on a large scale circumstances at the last-named period were highly favorable. The Church had then become extended throughout the whole country, so that it could reach almost any inhabited place by its regular agencies. Its plan, therefore, was to stimulate its ministers and members to universal activity, in accordance with its rules, adopted in 1784 and 1790. This plan saved the great expense of sending out and maintaining special Sunday-school missionaries, while, it made sure of responsible and resident agents wherever the work was undertaken. By similar agencies it was sought everywhere to promote a higher grade of Sunday-school activity and improved methods of instruction. For the production of an extensive and varied Sunday-school literature, provided under official editorship, the union was able to avail itself of an organized and-most effective publishing establishment, owned by the Church, with the best of facilities for diffusing its sprinted matter. In these circumstances, all collections for the missionary department of Sunday school effort were applied directly and exclusively to the distribution of books, at cost price, to be used by persons engaged in founding new or maintaining poor schools. Probably no more thorough and efficient system of Church effort in behalf of Sunday-schools was ever organized, inclusive of the system of statistics by which its

workings are shown from year to year. Some of the results of the action of that system, running on an irregular course, may be inferred from the statistical summaries given in the foregoing article.

4. “The Protestant Episcopal Sunday-school Union” was organized in New York, at about the period when the two unions last named had their origin; but, for some reason, it never secured a strong support from the Church in whose interest it was founded and whose name it bore. It acted for a time as a publication society, being often aided by individual congregations in the issue of particular books. After some years of a rather languid existence, its interests were sold out to a private bookseller. A similar result occurred in the Evangelical Knowledge Society, an organization also projected, about 1850, by ministers and members of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the idea of securing and diffusing a more evangelical literature than that furnished by the union last named.

5. It is proper to say here that neither the Presbyterian nor Baptist churches of the United States have organized Sunday-school unions. They have availed themselves to a large extent of the publications of the American Sunday-school Union, and also, in part, of the juvenile literature issued by their respective boards of publication, as well as that of the American Tract Society.

6. In 1832 “The Massachusetts Sabbath-school Society” was founded in Boston, by representatives of the Congregational churches of New England. Its modes of action were denominational, and its publications were numerous and good, but after some years of independent existence the interests of the society were blended with those of the Congregational Publishing Society and the American Home Missionary Society. Neither of those societies publish Sunday-school statistics.

7. “The (Dutch) Reformed Sunday-school Union” was organized in New York about 1850, and for several years proceeded quite actively to promote the Sunday school interests of the Church it represented. It published a small catalogue of Sunday-school books and requisites, but did not long maintain a separate existence, its interests having been merged in those of a publishing society of a more general character.

8. It is not within the scope of this article to notice the numerous local Sunday-school associations that have sprung up in the cities, towns, counties, or even states of the American Union. Many of them have had

but a brief existence. Others have been maintained for continuous years, happily illustrating the principles of Christian union, but rarely engaging in the enterprise of publication. Some of them have collected statistics, but usually within limited spheres.

9. The Foreign Sunday-school Association of New York and vicinity had a germinal existence as far back as 1864, but did not secure an incorporation till 1878. It is composed of practical Sunday-school workers, who, by means of correspondence, co-operation with missionaries, and judicious donations, seek to promote the organization and maintenance of Sunday-schools in countries, foreign to the United States and outside of the British possessions. It claims to have "been the means of planting 1977 Sunday schools in Germany, 1130 in France, 150 in Italy, 30 in Portugal, 40 in Japan, 405 in German Switzerland, besides some schools in China, Greece, Hungary, Holland, and other countries." Its published report for 1879 contains numerous interesting facts, and authorizes the hope that in years to come grand results may ensue from beginnings which are at first necessarily feeble, so far as human agency is involved.

The fact that the Sunday-school enterprise, during the first century of its history, has, with the divine blessing, come so fully to pervade English-speaking countries, and has made a hopeful commencement in many and remote foreign nations, deserves to be taken as a promise of success during the centuries to come of inestimable extent and value. (D. P. K.)

Sunday Service of the Methodist Episcopal Church

was an abridgment of the Prayer-book of the Church of England, prepared by Mr. Wesley. It was arranged for the use of the Methodists in America, when he recommended their organization into a Methodist Episcopal Church. It was entitled *The Sunday Service of the Methodists of North America, with other Services*, and was adopted by the General Conference of 1784. It was published in connection with the *Discipline* (Phila. 1785; Lond. 1786). This appears to have been the last time the *Sunday Service* was published in connection with the *Discipline*, and at the General Conference of 1792 all reference to the use of a Sunday Service was stricken out. It gradually dropped out of use. The M. E. Church, South, in 1866, ordered that the Prayer book as printed by Mr. Wesley in 1786 should be reprinted for the use of their Church, and the same service is used in many Wesleyan churches in England, though generally the churches

using a service prefer the regular English Prayer-book. See Simpson, *Cyclop. of Methodism*, s.v.

Sundays, Special

There are a number of Sundays in the year, which have received names suggested by events happening upon or near those days. We give below a classified list:

ADVENT *SEE ADVENT* (q.v.). The Sundays in Advent are called in the Greek Church by a certain number in connection with St. Luke's Gospel; thus, Advent Sunday is: the "Tenth of Luke." The third Sunday in Advent is called *Gaudete*, from the Introit.

After EPIPHANY *SEE EPIPHANY* (q.v.). It is called in the Greek Church "Sunday after the Lights;" in the north of Italy "Marriage Sunday," from the Gospel. The second Sunday after Epiphany is known as the "Fifteenth of Luke."

Before SEPTUAGESIMA *SEE SEPTUAGESIMA* (q.v.), called in the Greek Church "Sunday of the Publican and Pharisee."

SEPTUAGESIMA *SEE SEPTUAGESIMA* (q.v.), called by the Greeks "Sunday of the Prodigal," and in the West "Close of Alleluia."

SEXAGESIMA *SEE SEXAGESIMA* (q.v.), in the Greek Church "Sunday of Apocreo," because meat is not eaten beyond it. It was also called "Sunday of the Sower."

QUINQUAGESIMA *SEE QUINQUAGESIMA* (q.v.), called *Quinquagesima Poenitentiae*; also *Esto Mihi* (^{<1910>}Psalm 31:2), from the Introit; in Germany "Priest's Fortnight," ecclesiastics commencing their fast on this day; and in the Greek Church *Tyrophagus*, because cheese is no longer eaten. In LENT *SEE LENT* (q.v.).

1. Quadragesima (q.v.), called *Inviocavit* (^{<1915>}Psalm 91:15) in the East "Orthodoxy Sunday" in England (994) "Holy Day."

2. Reminiscere, from the Introit (^{<1926>}Psalm 25:6); and in France "Transfiguration," from the Gospel in the Paris use.

3. Oculi, from the Inuit (^{<1925>}Psalm 25:15); and in the East "Adoration of the Cross."

4. Laetare (²⁸⁰Isaiah 54:1), “Sunday of the Golden Rose” (q.v.); “Refreshment Sunday” (Genesis 43); “Midlent Sunday;” in the Greek Church “Sunday of the Great Canon,” from; a special hymn. In England it was known as “Care-Sunday” (*Kar*, a *penalty*); “Mothering-Sunday” (⁴⁸⁰Galatians 6:21), when all persons made their offerings in the cathedral or mother-church; “Simnel” or “Carling Sunday,” from eating in wheat cakes or beans on this day.

5. Judica (³⁹⁰Psalm 43:1), “Passion Sunday;” “Dimanche Reprus,” from veiling the images; “Sunday of the Quintau” in France, from the sports of the day; “Black Sunday” in Germany, from the veiling of the crosses when the words “Jesus hid himself” were read.

PALM-SUNDAY *SEE PALM-SUNDAY* (q.v.), also “Sunday of the Willow-boughs.” EASTER *SEE EASTER* (q.v.).

1. First Sunday after Easter or Octave, has various appellations; *Dominicca in Albhi.*, persons who were baptized at Easter, laying aside the white robes then received; *Dies Naeophytorum*, the newly baptized being, then recognized as actual members of the Church; *Quinquageasima* (q.v.); *Pascha Clausum*, close of Easter; *Octava Infatitims*, in allusion to the newly baptized: — *Quasimodogetiti*, in allusion to man’s renovation by the Resurrection.

2. The second Sunday was known as that of the “Three Ointment-bearers,” from the Gospel; “Sr. Thonims,” or “Renewal Sunday” (⁴³⁰John 20:27); *Misericordias Domiunis*, from the Introit (¹²¹⁵Psalm 23:5); “Sunday of White Cloths” or “after the exhibition of relics.”

3. “Of the Paralytic” in the Greek Church; in the Latin, *Jubilate*, from the Introit (¹⁰⁶Psalm 62:2).

4. Mid-Pentecost; in the Greek Church “Of the Salmalitan” in the Latin from the Introits, *Cantate* (¹⁸⁰Psalm 98:1); *Rogate* (²¹⁴Song of Solomon 2:14); *Exaaudi* (¹²⁷Psalm 27:7).

5. Rogation (q.v.); in the Greek Church “Of the Blind man.” WHIT-SUNDAY *SEE WHIT-SUNDAY* (q.v.).

TRINITY SUNDAY *SEE TRINITY SUNDAY* (q.v.); in the East “All Saints Sunday;” in France “King of Sundays,” or “Blessed Sunday.” 1. “Sunday of the rich man and Lazarus” was the term used to designate the

first Sunday after Trinity. 15. “Sunday of the Lilies” is the name by which the fifteenth Sunday after Trinity is known.

After Ascension; in’ the East “Sunday of the 31S,” in allusion to the Nicene fathers; at Rome, “Sunday of Roses,” so called by Innocent III in 1130, roses being thrown from the roof of Santa Maria Rotunda, symbolical of the gifts of the Spirit. Sundays after Pentecost, Sundays from Whit-Sunday to Advent; but in England, anciently as now, Sundays after Trinity.

Sunias

an epithet of the Grecian *Minerva*, from her temple at Sunium in Attica (Pausan. 1, 1, 1).

Suinisabtanism

(*συνείσακτος*, *introduced with*), a name given to the practice by which many of the clergy evaded the rigorous laws respecting-celibacy. It is sometimes called *domesticism*, and consisted in keeping female inmates in their dwellings, with whom they professed to live in chaste affection, but who were known to be concubines. Jerome and Chrysostom severely reprehended the clergy on account of the gross licentiousness of which they were guilty, while at the same time they were professing the highest purity. *SEE AGAPETAE.*

Sunna

one of the Norse asas, the daughter of Mundilfare, the star god. Her brother and herself were possessed of extraordinary beauty, which induced their parents to name them the sun and moon (Sol, or Sunna, and Maani); but the gods considered the bestowal of such names a crime, and accordingly kidnapped the children, afterwards placing them in charge of the sun and the moon wagons which were formed out of sparks of fire which flew from Muspelheim into the kingdom of the asas. The horses which drew the wagons were named Alswidur and Arvarkur (the “universal scorcher” and the early wake”). They speeded rapidly on their courses because Skoll and Hate, two mighty giants in the form of wolves, followed swiftly on their heels to devour them. It would seem that the ancient Germans also worshipped the sun under this title as a shining, light-radiating being. *SEE NORSE MYTHOLOGY.*

Sunna

(*Arab. custom, legal usage*) originally denotes among Moslems the sayings and the example of Mohammed and his community, provided they are in accordance with the Koran, the meaning of which, however, is 'itself explained by the Sunna. The term is therefore (though incorrectly) used for the collections of moral and legal traditions traced to the Prophet, which supplement the Koran, somewhat like the Mishna (q.v.), which supplements the laws of the Pentateuch. The Sunna not only comprises religious doctrines and practice, but also civil and criminal laws and the usages of common life—the way to eat and to drink, and to dress, and the like. This tradition is first heard of during the civil wars among the adherents of the new faith, about half a century after the Flight. The single traditions, as we now possess them, rarely exceed six lines. The diction is carefully wrought, and the form is that of a dialogue. For the credibility and canonicity of a tradition it was originally necessary that it should have been *heard* by one truthful witness; but this law was much relaxed in after-time. At the end of the 3rd century (H.), a countless number of individual collections (*Mosnad*), mostly of an apocryphal character, had been produced by different theologians, but the first who sifted them critically, and without regard to any special theological system, was Bochary (d. 256. H.). His collection contains 7275 single traditions, 4000 of which, however, occur twice in the work. Moslim, his pupil, supplemented Bochary with another collection, containing 12,000, again including 4000 repetitions. Besides these, there are four more "canonical" collections by Aba Dawfud (d. 275 H.), Tirmidzy (d. 279), Nasay (d. 303), and Maga (d. 273). The Sunna, as we have it in these collections, contains, broadly speaking, more truth than it is generally supposed to contain, and, critically used, is, besides the Koran, the most authentic source of Islam. A selection from the different collections (both canonical and otherwise), called *Mishcat A Masabih*, has been translated into English by Capt. Matthews (Calcutta, 1809). Fragments from Bochary are found in the German translation, by Von Hammer, in the *Fundgruben des Orients*. **SEE SONNA.**

Sunnites

traditionists, or believers in the Sunna (q.v.); the name of the "orthodox" Moslems, as opposed to the Shiites (q.s.v.). They are subdivided into four principal sects, who, though at issue on different minor points, yet are acknowledged by each other to belong to the faithful and to be capable of

salvation, and they each have a special oratory at Mecca. The first of these sects are the Hanefites, founded by Abu Hanifa, who died 150 years after the Hegira. They are emphatically called “the followers of reason,” while the other three are guided exclusively by tradition. They allow reason to have a principal share in their decisions on legal and other points. To this sect belong chiefly the Turks and Tartars. The second sect are the Malekites, founded by Malek Ibn-Ans, who died at Medina about 180 H. As one of the chief proofs of his real piety and humility, it is recorded that when asked for his decision on forty-eight questions, he would only decide on sixteen, freely confessing his ignorance about the others. In Barbary and other parts of Africa, the greatest part of his adherents are found. Mohammed Al-Shafei, born in Palestine, 150 H., but educated in Mecca, is the founder of the third sects the Shafeites. He was a great enemy of the scholastic divines, and seems altogether to have been of an original cast of mind. He never swore by God, and always took time to consider whether he should at all answer any given question or hold his peace. The most characteristic saying recorded of him is, “Whosoever pretends to love both the work and the Creator at the same time is a liar.” He is accounted of such importance that, according to his contemporaries, “he was as the sun to the world, and as health to the body;” and all the relations of the traditions of Mohammed were said to have been asleep until he came and woke them.’ He appears to have been the first who reduced Moslem jurisprudence into a method, and thus made it, from a number of vague sayings, a science. His followers are now chiefly: found in Arabia and Persia. Ahmed Ibn Hanbal founded the fourth sect, the Hanbalites., He was born 164 H., and was a most intimate friend of Shafei. His knowledge of the traditions (of which he could repeat not fewer than a million) was no less famed than was his piety. He taught that the Koran was not created but everlastingly subsisted in the essence of God—a doctrine for which he was severely punished by the caliph Al-Motasem. On the day of his death, no less than 20,000 unbelievers (Jews, Christians, and Magians) are said to have embraced the Mohammedan faith. Once very numerous, the Hanbalites now are but very rarely met with out of Arabia. On the differences between the Sunnites and Shiites, *SEE SHIITES. SEE SONNITES.*

Sunyabadis

a sect of Hinda Atheists, or rather Nihilists, who held that all notions of God and man are fallacies, and that nothing exists. Whatever we look upon is regarded as vacuity. Theism and Atheism, Maya and Brahm, all is false, all is error.

Suovetaurilia

peculiar sacrifices among the ancients Romans, so named because they consisted of a pig, a sheep, and an ox. These were offered at the general lustration of the Roman people, which took place every five years. The Suovetaurilia, indeed, formed a part of every lustration, and the victims were carried around the thing to be purified, whether it was a city, a people, or a piece of land. The same sacrifices existed among the ancient Greeks, under the name of Trittva. A representation of the celebration of these sacrifices is found on the Triumphal Arch of Constantine at Rome.
SEE SACRIFICE.

Sup

(**δειπνέω**). Our information on this subject is but scanty. The early Hebrews do not seem to have given special names to their several meals, for the terms rendered “dine” and ” dinner” in the A.V. (^{<0400>}Genesis 43:1-6; ^{<0157>}Proverbs 15:17) are in reality general expressions, which might more correctly be rendered “eat” and “portion of food.” In the New Test. we have the Greek terms **ἄριστον**, and **δειπνον**, which the A. V. renders respectively “dinner” and “supper” (^{<0412>}Luke 14:12; ^{<0312>}John 21:12), but which are more properly “breakfast” and, dinner.” There is some uncertainty as to the hours at which the meals were taken. The Egyptians undoubtedly took their principal meal at noon (^{<0416>}Genesis 43:16); laborers took a light meal at that time (^{<0324>}Ruth 2:14; comp. ver. 17); and occasionally that early hour: was devoted to excess and reveling (^{<1006>}1 Kings 20:16). It has been inferred from those passages (somewhat too hastily, we think) that the principal meal generally took place hat noon. The Egyptians do, indeed, still make a substantial meal at that time (Lane, *Mod. Egypt. I*, 189), but there: are indications that the Jews rather followed the custom that prevails among the Bedawin, and made their principal meal after sunset, and a lighter meal at about 9 or 10 A.M. (Burckhardt, *Notes*, 1, 64). For instance, “Lot prepared a feast for the two angels at even”

(^{<0190>}Genesis 19:1-3); Boaz evidently took his meal late in the evening (^{<0837>}Ruth 3:7); the Israelites ate *flesh* in the evening, and *bread* only, or manna, in the morning (^{<0162>}Exodus 16:12); the context seems to imply that Jethro's feast was in the evening (18, 12, 14). But, above all, the institution of the Paschal feast in the evening seems to imply that the principal meal was usually taken then: it appears highly improbable that the Jews would have been ordered to eat meat at an unusual time. In the later Biblical period we have clearer notices to the same effect. Breakfast took place in the morning (^{<0204>}John 21:4,12), on ordinary days not before 9 o'clock, which was the first hour of prayer (^{<0125>}Acts 2:15), and on the Sabbath not before 12, when the service of the synagogue was completed (Josephus, *Life*, § 54); the more prolonged and substantial meal took place in the evening (*ibid.* § 44; *War*, 1, 17, 4). The general tenor of the parable of the great supper certainly implies that the feast took place in the working-hours of the day (^{<0245>}Luke 14:15-24); but we may regard this, perhaps, as part of the imagery of the parable rather than as a picture of real life. **SEE SUPPER.**

The posture at meals varied at different periods. There is sufficient evidence that the old Hebrews were in the habit of *sitting* (^{<0279>}Genesis 27:19; ^{<0796>}Judges 19:6; ^{<0215>}1 Samuel 20:5, 24; ^{<0130>}1 Kings 13:20), but it does not hence follow that they sat on chairs; they may have squatted on the ground, as was the occasional, though not perhaps the general, custom of the ancient Egyptians (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* 1, 58, 181). The table was in this case but slightly elevated above the ground as is still the case in Egypt. At the same time, the chair was not unknown to the Hebrews, but seems to have been regarded as a token of dignity. The Hebrew term is *kisse* (אִסֵּה). There is only one instance of its being mentioned as an article of ordinary furniture viz. in ^{<0340>}2 Kings 4:10, where the A.V. incorrectly renders it "stool." Even there it seems probable that it was placed more as a mark of special honor to the prophet than for common use. As luxury increased, the practice of sitting was exchanged for that of reclining. The first intimation of this occurs in the prophecies of Amos, who rebrotes those "that lie upon beds of ivory, and stretch themselves upon their couches" (^{<0164>}Amos 6:4); and it appears that the couches themselves were of a costly character—the "corners" or *edges* (3, 12: the word is *pedh*, חַפֵּה which will apply to the *edge* as well as to the angle of a couch. That the seats and couches of the Assyrians were handsomely ornamented appears from the specimens given by Layard [*Nineveh*, 2, 300302]), being finished

was not, as the A. V. represents it, “the uppermost room,” but the highest seat in the highest couch—the seat numbered 1 in the annexed diagram. *SEE ACCUBATION.*

Picture for Sup 1

Some doubt attends the question whether the females took their meals along with the males. The present state of society in the East throws no light upon this subject, as the customs of the harem date from the time of Mohammed. The cases of Ruth amid the reapers (^{<8024>}Ruth 2:14), of Elkanah with his wives (^{<9004>}1 Samuel 1:4), of Job’s sons and daughters (^{<18004>}Job 1:4), and the general intermixture of the sexes in daily life, make it more than probable that they did so join, at the same time, as the duty of attending upon the guests devolved upon them (^{<2000>}Luke 10:40), they probably took a somewhat irregular and briefer repast. *SEE DINE.*

Picture for Sup 2

Before commencing the meal, the guests washed their hands. This custom was founded on: natural decorum; not only was the hand the substitute for our knife and fork, but the hands of all the guests were dipped into one and the same dish; uncleanliness in such a case would be intolerable. Hence not only the Jews, but the Greeks (*Od. I*, 136), the modern Egyptians (Lane, 1, 190), and many other nations have been distinguished by this practice; the Bedawin, in particular, are careful to wash their hands *before*, but are indifferent about doing so *after* their meals (Burckhardt, *Notes*, 1, 63). The Pharisees transformed this conventional usage into a ritual observance, and’ overlaid it with burdensome regulations a willful perversion which our Lord reprobates in the strongest terms (^{<4000>}Mark 7:1-13). Another preliminary step was the grace or blessing, of which we have but one instance in the Old Test. (^{<9013>}1 Samuel 9:13), and more than one pronounced by our Lord himself in the New Test. (^{<4053>}Matthew 15:36; ^{<4096>}Luke 9:16; ^{<4061>}John 6:11); it consisted, as far as we may judge from the words applied to it, partly of a blessing upon the food, partly of thanks to the Giver of it. The Rabbinical writers have, as usual, laid down most minute regulations respecting it, which may be found in the treatise of the Mishna entitled *Berachoth*, ch. 6-8. *SEE WASH.*

Picture for Sup 3

The mode of taking the food differed in no material point from the modern usages of the East; generally there was a single dish, into which each guest dipped his hand (^{<4123>}Matthew 26:23); occasionally separate portions were served out to each (^{<4034>}Genesis 43:34; ^{<4024>}Ruth 2:14; ^{<4004>}1 Samuel 1:4). A piece of bread was held between the thumb and two fingers of the right hand, and was dipped either into a bowl of melted grease (in which case it was termed **ψωμίον**, “a sop,” ^{<4133>}John 13:26) or into the dish of meat, whence a piece was conveyed to the mouth between the layers of bread (Lane, 1, 193, 194; Burckhardt, *Notes*, 1, 63). It is esteemed an act of politeness to hand over to a friend a delicate morsel (^{<4133>}John 13:26; Lane 1, 194). In allusion to the above method of eating, Solomon makes it a characteristic of the sluggard that “he hideth his hand in his bosom, and will not so much as bring it to his mouth again” (Proverbs 19. 24; 26:15). At the conclusion of the meal grace was again said, in conformity with ^{<4180>}Deuteronomy 8:10, and the hands were again washed. *SEE MEAL*. Thus far we have described the ordinary meal. On state occasions more ceremony was used, and the meal was enlivened in various ways. Such occasions were numerous, in connection partly with public, partly with private events. In the first class we may place the great festivals of the Jews (Deuteronomy 16; Tob. 2, 1); public sacrifices (^{<4127>}Deuteronomy 12:7; 27:7; ^{<4093>}1 Samuel 9:13,22; 1 Kings 1, 9; 3, 15; Zephaniah 1, 7); the ratification of treaties (^{<4123>}Genesis 26:30; 31:54); the offering of the tithes (^{<4145>}Deuteronomy 14:26), particularly at the end of each third year (^{<4143>}Deuteronomy 14:28). In the second class, marriages (^{<4122>}Genesis 29:22; ^{<4740>}Judges 14:10; ^{<4728>}Esther 2:18; Tob. 8:19; ^{<4122>}Matthew 22:2; John 2, 1); birthdays (^{<4112>}Genesis 11:20; ^{<4804>}Job 1:4; ^{<4145>}Matthew 14:6, 9); burials (2 Samuel 3, 35; ^{<2447>}Jeremiah 16:7; ^{<3904>}Hosea 9:4; Tob. 4:17); sheep-shearing (^{<4122>}1 Samuel 25:2, 36; ^{<4123>}2 Samuel 13:23); the vintage (^{<4027>}Judges 9:27); laying the foundation-stone of a house (^{<4101>}Proverbs 9:1-5); the reception of visitors (^{<4186>}Genesis 18:6-8; 19:3; ^{<4103>}2 Samuel 3:20; 12:4; ^{<4763>}2 Kings 6:23; Tob. 7:9; 1 Macc. 16:15; 2 Macc. 2, 27; ^{<4173>}Luke 5:29; 15:23; ^{<4122>}John 12:2); or any event connected with the sovereign (^{<3175>}Hosea 7:5). “The day of the king,” in this passage, has been variously understood as his birthday or his coronation; it may, however, be equally applied to any other event of similar importance. On each of the above-mentioned occasions a sumptuous repast was prepared; the guests were previously invited (^{<4728>}Esther 5:8; ^{<4123>}Matthew 22:3), and on the day of the feast a second invitation was issued to those that were bidden (^{<4764>}Esther 6:14; ^{<4103>}Proverbs 9:3; ^{<4123>}Matthew 22:3). The visitors were received with

a kiss (Tob. 7:6; ^{<0765>}Luke 7:45); water was produced for them to wash their feet with (^{<0744>}Luke 7:44); the head, the beard, the feet, and sometimes the clothes were perfumed with ointment (^{<0215>}Psalms 23:5; ^{<0106>}Amos 6:6; Luke.7, 38; ^{<0123>}John 12:3); on special occasions robes were provided (^{<0221>}Matthew 22:11; comp. Trench, *On Parables*, p. 230); and the head was decorated with wreaths (^{<0230>}Isaiah 28:1; Wisd. 2, 7, 8; Josephus. *Anf.* 19:9,1). This custom prevailed extensively among the Greeks and Romans. Not only were chaplets worn on the head, but festoons of flowers were hung over the neck and breast (Plutarch, *Symp.* 3, 1, 3; Martial, 10:19; Ovid, *Fas.* 2, 739). They were generally introduced after the first part of the entertainment was completed. They are noticed in several familiar passages of the Latin poets (Horace, *Carm.* 2, 7, 24; *Sat.* 2, 3, 256; Juven. 5, 36). The regulation of the feast was under the superintendence of a special officer, named ἀρχιτρίκλινος (John 2, 8; A.V. “governor of the feast”), whose business it was to taste the food and the liquors before they were placed on the table, and to settle about the toasts and amusements; he was generally one of the guests (Ecclus. 32:1, 2), and might therefore take part in the conversation. The classical designation of this officer among the Greeks was συμποσίαρχος; among the Romans *magister* or *rex convivii*. He was chosen by lot out of the guests (Smith, *Dict. of Antiq.* p. 925). **SEE ARCHITRICLINUS.** The places of the guests were settled according to their respective rank (^{<0143>}Genesis 43:33; ^{<0102>}1 Samuel 9:22; ^{<0129>}Mark 12:39; ^{<0148>}Luke 14:8; ^{<0123>}John 13:23); portions of food were placed before each (1 Samuel 1, 4; ^{<0109>}2 Samuel 6:19; ^{<0103>}1 Chronicles 16:3), the most honored guests receiving either larger (^{<0144>}Genesis 43:34; comp. Herod. 6:57) or more choice (^{<0102>}1 Samuel 9:24; comp. *II.* 7:321) portions than the rest. The importance of the feast was marked by the number of the guests (^{<0122>}Genesis 29:22; ^{<0102>}1 Samuel 9:22; 1 Kings 1, 9, 25; ^{<0169>}Luke 5:29; 14:16), by the splendor of the vessels (^{<0700>}Esther 1:7), and by the profusion or the excellence of the viands (^{<0106>}Genesis 18:6; 27:9; ^{<0169>}Judges 6:19; 1 Samuel.9, 24; ^{<0256>}Isaiah 25:6; ^{<0104>}Amos 6:4). The meal was enlivened with music, singing; and dancing (^{<0105>}2 Samuel 19:35; ^{<0102>}Psalms 69:12; ^{<0162>}Isaiah 5:12; ^{<0106>}Amos 6:5; Ecclus. 32:3-6; ^{<0146>}Matthew 14:6; ^{<0155>}Luke 15:25), or with riddles (^{<0742>}Judges 14:12); and amid these entertainments the festival was prolonged for several days (^{<0700>}Esther 1:3, 4); entertainments designed almost exclusively for drinking were known by the special name of *mishteh* (חַמְצוּמָה). This resembled the *comissatio* of the Romans, which took place after the supper, and was a mere drinking revel, with only so much food as served to whet the palate for wine (Smith, *Dict.*

of *Antiq.* p. 271). —Smith. *SEE BANQUET*. Instances of such drinking-bouts are noticed in ^{<0253>}1 Samuel 25:36; ^{<0132>}2 Samuel 13:28; ^{<0007>}Esther 1:7; ^{<0151>}Daniel 5:1; they are reprobated by the prophets (^{<0351>}Isaiah 5:11; ^{<0106>}Amos 6:6). Somewhat akin to the *mishteh* of the Hebrews was also the *komos* (κῶμος) of the apostolic age in which gross licentiousness was added to drinking, and which is frequently made the subject of warning in the Epistles (^{<5133>}Romans 13:13; ^{<0121>}Galatians 5:21; ^{<0158>}Ephesians 5:18; ^{<0113>}1 Peter 4:3). *SEE DRINK*.

Super-altar

a term given —

1. To a portable altar, placed on the altar itself at the time of the celebration of the Christian Eucharist, or set up separately. Hincmar (867) allowed the use of a consecrated site, marble, or a black stone slab, probably owing to the needs of the Crusaders and the deficiency of churches. It was large enough to contain the chalice and host. *SEE ALTAR, PORTABLE*.

2. Ordinarily and commonly this term is applied to the ledge behind the altar, on which relics, flowers, candlesticks, and the altar-cross stand. It is very frequently so applied in the ancient Church of England.

Superannuated Preachers

are ministers in the Methodist churches who, by reason of age, infirmity, or afflictions, are disabled from preaching, but remain members of the Annual Conferences. In the American churches they retain all the rights and privileges of active ministers except being eligible to appointments. In the English Wesleyan Church, if members of the Legal Hundred or Constitutional Conference, they cease to be members of that body. Their restoration to the effective relation depends upon the vote of the Conference.

I. *Rights, etc.* — When a superannuated preacher lives out of the bounds of his Conference, he is entitled to a seat in the Quarterly Conference, and the privileges of membership in the Church where he resides. He is entitled, if needy, to receive a share of the proceeds of the collection taken in the churches for Conference claimants, and of the chartered fund. Each Quarterly Conference is directed to estimate the amount needed for the

support of these preachers or their widows, and forward a certificate to the Annual Conference. The case is considered by the Conference stewards, and on their report the amount to be distributed is decided by the vote of the Conference.

II. Duties, etc. —It is the duty of the superannuated preacher to forward annually to the Conference of which he is a member a certificate of his Christian and ministerial character, signed by the presiding elder of the district or the preacher in charge of the work where he resides.” Without such certificate he has no claims on the Conference for support. In 1876 there were in the Methodist Episcopal Church 1103 superannuated preachers. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in 1875, reported 259. See *Discipline of the M. E. Church*; Simpson, *Cyclop. of Methodism* s.v.

Superattendens

The Greek word *ἐπίσκοπος*, *episcopus*, has always been retained in the Church to denote the chief minister in: sacred things. It was sometimes translated by Latin writers into *superattendens*, i.e. superintendent. **SEE BISHOP.**

Superbia

the Roman personified pride, a daughter of Ether and Earth.

Supererogation

(*opus supererogationis*). The distinction between *praecepta and consilia evangelica*, or between the positive duties enjoined by the law and the moral requirements of the Gospel, which the faithful are at liberty to comply with or not, referring chiefly to 1 Corinthians 7: 6, and treated in the *Catechism Roman.* 3, 3, 24, is of very ancient origin. Scholastic theology insisted most, particularly on that distinction, and established it in the form in which it has since been held by all orthodox Roman Catholics. If the observance of the obligatory commandments constitutes all the duties of man, then his undertaking to accomplish the non-obligatory *consilia* may be looked upon as a sort of traffic, the object of which is to gain by this accomplishment a certain degree of *merit*. We acquire by it a sort of surplus, and this is what is designated as *opus supererogatioanis*. This doctrine of supererogatory merits is not symbolical, for the Council of Trent does not express itself on that point. On the other hand, the principle

that the righteous may fully satisfy the divine law *prouis vitas statu byworks* done in- God- is fully established by Cone. Trid. Sess., can. 16. This is also the case with the other principle,” *Si quis dixerit, hominis iustificati bona opera ita esse dona Dei, ut non sint etiam bona ipsius iustificati ‘merita,’ aut. ipsum iustificatum bonis operibus non vere mereri augmentum gratiae, vitam aeternam et ipsius vitae aeternae consecutionem atque etiam gloriae augmentum; anathema sit”* (Sess. 6:can. 32). Finally, the symbolic books of the Roman Catholic Church recognize also the voluntary assumption of the vows of obedience, poverty and chastity (Sess. 25:can. 1), of which Bellarmine (*De Monachis, c. 8*) says they are “*nee praecepta nee indifferentia, sed Deo grata et ab illo commendata.*” If a satisfactory fulfillment of the law is possible, if good works constitute a desert, then the scholastic notion of the *opera supererogativa* becomes a natural consequence. This doctrine, in short, is the result of the system. It is the natural consequence of that conception of the law in relation to the justification of man. It is supported by tradition from the time of Alexander of Hales (*Summa*, pt. 4 qu. 23, a. 2, m. 3; Albertus Magnus, *Sent. 4:dist. 20, a.16, 17*; Thomas Aquinas, *Suppl. tert. part. Summae Theol. qu. 13, a. 1*), and has not only never been denied, but always asserted and defended against all attacks by the most eminent theologians of the Roman Catholic Church. The assertion “*ut unus posset pro altero satisfacere,*” in the *Catech. Rom.*, can only be explained in view of that doctrine. If we now inquire further into its consequences as attempted by more modern theologians, Mohler, for instance (*Neue Untersuchungen.*, 2nd ed. p.305 sq.), we find an inextricable confusion in the conception of the law. Mohler starts from the admission that the moral law, as the absolute will of God, and the unity of the human will with the divine by love, which it requires, cannot be surpassed. Yet his conception of the law is erroneous and a mere abstraction, for, on the one hand, he considers it as without limits, infinite; and, on the other, as resolving itself into a number of separate commandments, each of which constitutes a duty. Thus considered no one can do more than the law requires, though any one can do more than is required by the separate commandments taken individually. From the moment that by his entering into communion with Christ love becomes the ruling principle of a man’s life, he has absolutely fulfilled the moral law. Regeneration being presupposed, there are yet different degrees in the effects of love, and these degrees are not regulated by any law. Hence every one may accomplish certain duties as if they were not duties for him, thus overstepping the common limits of duty and attaining to a higher

degree of perfection. According to this argumentation, the moral law would constitute, so to speak, an imaginary quantity, consisting, on the one hand, in the complete body of the divine commandments, and, on the other, in a number of imputations separate from these commandments, and very difficult to define particularly. This, then, brings us back again to the distinction between *princeps* and *consilia*, as the basis of the *opera supererogativa*. Protestantism, on the contrary, books upon the divine law as one indivisible, and being in; this form the rule of all human life and action. Objectively, it is the expression of the idea of that which is good in itself, while subjectively it finds its accomplishment in love. But in order to satisfy the manifold exigencies of life, it presents itself also in the form of a plurality of commandments; These however, are not to be considered as separate from each other, nor, when taken together, as forming an uncommon suitable whole; but, as it is man's duty to do in every circumstance that which is good in itself, *each distinct commandment is to be looked upon as the seal of the complete moral idea, as the whole divine law in its relation to the circumstance under consideration*. As to which of the many commandments finds its application in a given case, this is a question entirely distinct from that, which is objectively to be defined. The perception of it; is given to the regenerate by the Holy Spirit through a conscience filled with love. It is evident that in this system there is no possibility of supposing a human power in those regenerated in Christ by virtue of which they could, under any circumstance, do more than is required of them, i.e. more than that which is absolutely good in itself. Thus, we may not only assert *in abstracto* that the young woman who devotes her life to taking care of the sick, or the missionary, does not thereby attain a higher degree of moral perfection than others who contribute but a rite towards the advancement of the kingdom of God. All depends in this respect on the individual, and on the position in which God has placed him. Thus, a young woman who having an aged mother dependent on her care, should enter an order—such, for instance, as the Sisters of Mercy — would do a bad action, Of the woman who anointed him our Lord said himself, “She hath done what she could” (⁴¹⁴⁸Mark 14:8). In Luke 17:10, he says, “When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants.” Of the stewards, it is required that they should be found faithful, and nothing else. Of Christ himself it is said that he was “obedient unto death, even the death of the cross” (³¹²⁸Philippians 2:8), and to be more than; obedient is impossible, while to be less is, to be disobedient. The contrary doctrine,

which ascribes merits to man aside from the grace of God, is not only immoral, but positively irreligious. It is even illogical when looked at from the Roman Catholic standpoint, since (Mohler, p. 300) no living man ever accomplishes the whole law. See Janow, *De Regulis; Conf. Aug.* art. 27; *Apol. n.* 140; 163, 187, 269; *Art. Smalc.* 3, 3, 322; *Conf. Angl.* 14.

We should neglect one of the principal consequences of the theory of the *opus supererogativum* if we forgot to consider its relation to indulgences (q.v.). While the sacrament of penance and the absolution connected with it grant exemption from sin and from eternal punishment, the Church possesses a means of lessening or even remitting the temporal punishments required by divine justice by means of indulgences. These temporal punishments are otherwise to be undergone partly on this earth, as penances and ecclesiastical expiations (*pusnca vindicativm*), partly afterwards in purgatory (Perrone, 9:2). But whence does the Church possess the power thus to set up as the “representative of God’s mercy and justice for our time,” and as such to exercise such a right of grace as is so far from being ecclesiastical in its character that it extends (under some restriction) even beyond this-life? How can it defend the assumption of a *potstas conferendi indulgentiasa Christo concessa*, mentioned in Conc. Trid. Sess. 25. On this point they refer as was already done by Alexander of Hales, to the *thesaurus supererogationis perfectorum* founded by the suipererogatory merits of Christ and of the saints; “Est indulgentia remissio pœnæ temporalis adhuc post absolutionem sacramentalem peccatis debitæ, in foro interno coram Deo alida, facta per applicatorem thesauri Ecclesiæ a superiore legitimo” (Perrone, 9:1). -That there exists such a fund capable of atoning for all the sins of humanity, of any kind, the basis and foundation of which are the infinite merits of the Son of God as man, and of Christ in his saints (Klee, Dogai. 2, 335), is considered as *fidei proximum*. Aside from the fact that it is implicitly established by the sanction of indulgences (Conc. Trid. Sess. 25:can. 21), it is confirmed by the express declarations of popes Clement VI (*Const. Unigenitus*), Leo X, Pius V, Gregory XIII, Pius VI, and Benedict XIV. See also Alex. Ales. pt. 4 qu. 23, a. 1, m. 1; Albertus Magnus, *Sent.* 4, dist. 20, a. 17, 18; Thomas Aquinas, pt. 3, qu. 25, a. 1; *Sent.* 4 dist. 20, qu. 1, a. 3; *Summ. adv. Gent.* 3, 156; Bonaventura, *Sent.* 4 dist. 20, pt. 2, qu.; Bellarmine, *De Indulg.* c. 2, 3; Veronius, *Regula Fidei*, 2, 4; Bossuet, *Exposition*, § 8; Ballerini [Peter], *Summ. Theol. Prael.* 3. Still there may remain some’ doubt as to whether the *merita* on which the; system of indulgences rests is to be

considered as active performances in the strict sense of the *opus supererogationis*, or as unmerited sufferings, such as those undergone by the saints, and which were not to be considered as punishments, but which thus served to atone beforehand for the faults afterwards committed by the universality of sinners. It is only in the first case that the doctrine of the *opus supererogationis* forms the basis of the system of indulgences, or the notion of the *opus supererogativum* must also embrace the superfluous sufferings of the perfect; and on this the orthodox writers of the Roman Catholic Church do not agree. In ‘their polemical defenses of the doctrine of a fund of merits, they mostly base themselves on the second consideration. If we leave these, we find in their other works so much that is obscure and indefinite on this as well as on most other points that it is impossible for Protestant expositors to attempt to define the doctrine of the Church without being at once accused by Roman Catholics of misunderstanding their authors. The same Mahler who in *Neue Untersuchungen*, § 68, derives the *thesaurus* from the excessive sufferings of some, in § 69, p. 411, considers good works as efficient as undeserved sufferings in freeing the yet ensnared members of the body of Christ. This is still more expressly asserted by Klee (*Dogm.* 2, 334) and Bellarmine (*De Monach.* c. 7:8). And it could not be otherwise, for the *thesaurus*, that basis of indulgences, the product of the “merita Christi et sanctorum, quatenus *hiscsatits fatoriia sunt*,” is alone “norunt theologomunes *opera bona esse meritoria, impetratoria, et satisfactoria.*” Thus the *opera supererogativa* contribute unquestionably to making up the fund of merits imparted to those who need it in the forth of indulgences. “Les bonnes œuvres de tousles hommes, le sang des martyrs, les sacrifices et les larmes de l’innocence s’acclimulent sans relache pour faire equilibre au mal. L’action de graces, la priere, les satisfactions, les secours, les inspirations, la foi, l’esperance et l’amour circulent de lun a l’autre comme des fleuves bienfaisans” (De Maistre, *Soirges de St. Petersburg*).

This doctrine of the *opus supererogationis* was attacked by Wycliffe (*Dial.* p. 287), and sharply criticized in Job. von. Wesel’s *Adv. Indulg. Disput.* The position of the Reformers on that question may be seen in Melancthon (*Loci, De Satisfactione*), and Calvin (*Inst.* 3; 5). It was afterwards treated by Chemnitz (1, *De Bonis Opp.* qu. 3; 2, *De Indulg.*), Chamier (*Panstratia Cathol.* 3, lib. 24, *De Satisfactionibus Alienis*), and Jo Gerhard (*Loc.* 15:9, ed. Cotta). The Synod of Pistoja (*Propos. XLI*), in 1876, took the same views in the Roman Catholic Church. If Protestant

polemists have occasionally failed to observe that the vicarious satisfaction of the saints does not refer to sin itself, but to the temporal consequences of sin pardoned, this has, nevertheless, made no practical difference. We may also notice here the evident incongruity between the Roman Catholic essays on this subject and the fundamental truth of Christ's all-sufficient merits. For, admitting the fundamental distinction made by the Thomists between *meritum de condigno* and *meritum de congruo*, since the merit of Christ remains still the active principle of the supererogatory merits of the saints, the latter cannot increase the *value* of the merits of Christ, but only the *quantity* or *numbers*. "Per modum cumuli adjiciuntur satisfactionibus Christi, quin istis ulla ratione derogetur." The merits of others, consequently, are reversible merely as satisfactory services, not as personal moral actions, and thus are looked upon only as means of application of the merits of Christ as manifested in supererogative works. "Non habent nisi rationem medii, quo Christi pretium nobis applicatur" (Bellarmine, *De Indulg.* 1, 4, n. 4). —Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v. **SEE MERIT.**

Superfrontale

Picture for Superfrontale

a term applied to —

- 1.** The back wall of the altar, which received either stone-reliefs or a metal covering with embossed designs and enamelwork.
- 2.** The modern name for a covering for the top of the altar, which commonly hangs down about six inches all round and is fringed. It is ordinarily made of silk velvet, satin, or damask, and is placed over the three white linen cloths, which customarily cover and preserve the altar slab.

Superhumeral Cloth

a term used to designate *the amice* (q.v.).

Superhumerales

a term for the archiepiscopal *pall* (q.v.).

Superindicta

were taxes imposed by the Roman emperors, beyond the ordinary canonical taxes, upon great exigencies and extraordinary occasions. The

ordinary taxes were called indictions, so those extraordinary were called superindictions. From these the clergy were universally exempted by several laws of the Christian emperors. —Bingham, *Christ. Anti.* bk. 5, ch. 3, § 8.

Superinspector

a word by which Latin writers have translated *episcopus* (ἐπίσκοπος), or *bishop* (q.v.).

Superinstitution

is, in the Anglican Church, the institution to a benefice over the head of a beneficiary supposed to be dead after prolonged absence.

Superintendent

1. The officer of the early Church who was also called *overseer*, or *bishop* (ἐπίσκοπος).
2. The officer in the English Wesleyan Church who has charge of a circuit; he is responsible to the Conference for the maintenance of discipline and order in all the societies of the circuit, and presides as chief pastor in all circuit courts. The superintendent or one of his colleagues must make the circuit plan, arrange for the quarterly visitation of the classes, change or reelect the stewards the nomination being with himself, the vote with the leaders or quarterly meetings. All the minor details connected with the management of the circuit are in his hands.
3. An-ecclesiastical superior in several Reformed churches where episcopacy is not admitted, particularly among the Lutherans in Germany and the Calvinists in some other places. The superintendent is similar to a bishop. only his power is some what more restrained than that of our diocesan bishops. He is the chief pastor, and has the direction pf all the inferior pastors within his district or diocese.

Superior, an official exercising jurisdiction; the chief of a confraternity, brotherhood, sisterhood, monastery, or convent. In most orders the “superior” or other head of a convent is elected by the members of the convent, and the superiors in a province elect the provincial.

Superioress

a female superior of a convent or nunnery.

Supernatural

This is a word which is popularly used in opposition to “natural,” things and events which are not within the ordinary concrete experience and knowledge of mankind being looked upon as forming part of a separate system of things and events. “That is supernatural, whatever it be, that is either not in the chain of natural cause and effect, or which acts on the chain of cause and effect in nature from without “the chain” (Bushnell, *Nature and the Supernatural*). M’Cosh (*On the Supernatural*, p. 146, 147) gives this definition: “We may speak of whatever is supposed to be beyond the *natural asprete-natural*. The phrase will apply not only to the divine action, but to the agency of such beings as ghosts and demons — to b all such operations as witchcraft and necromancy. We may reserve the phrase *supernatural* to the Supreme Being and to the works performed by him, and to the objects created by him beyond the natural a sphere, such as angels and the world to cone. *We* would confine the word *miracle* to those events which were wrought in our world as a sign or proof of God making a supernatural interposition or a revelation to man. We must not look upon creation as *supernatural*, but we do look upon it as miraculous.” So far as our investigation pushes out into the world of nature, we find that law and order exist, and every increase of knowledge reveals to us further illustrations of the assertion that “order is Heaven’s first law.” Belief in the supernatural does not, therefore, require us to believe in any violation of law, since all reasoning which starts from what we know leads to the conclusion that “supernatural phenomena are as much the result of law as phenomena which are called ‘natural.’” **SEE MIRACLE.**

Supernaturalist

a name commonly given in Germany at the end of the last and the beginning of the present century to all who believed in supernatural agency as exerted in the inspiration of the Scriptures, the performance of the miracles therein recorded, etc. Their opponents are called *Antisupernaturalists*.

Supernumerary Preacher

1. In the Methodist Episcopal Church, a “supernumerary preacher is one who, because of impaired health, is temporarily unable to perform effective work. He may receive an appointment or be left without one, according to the judgment of the Annual Conference of which he is a member; but he shall have no claim upon the beneficiary funds of the Church except by vote of the Conference, and he shall be subject to all the limitations of the *Discipline* in respect to reappointment and continuance in the same charge that apply to effective preachers. In case he be left without an appointment, he shall have a seat in the Quarterly Conference, and all the privileges of membership in the place where he may reside (*Discipline*, 18:1). In 1800, on motion of Dr. Coke, supernumerary preachers, their widows and orphans, were to have the same support, which was then accorded to effective preachers. The funds of the Conferences increasing, as well as the advantages of membership multiplying, great difficulties arose, and in 1860 the General Conference abolished the relation so far as the Annual Conferences were concerned. In 1864 the relation was restored with the definition at- present given, with the provision that no supernumerary preacher shall have a claim upon the beneficiary funds of the Church without a vote of the Annual Conference. In 1876 the number of supernumerary preachers was reported at 701.

2. Among the English Wesleyans, in order to: secure the relation of supernumerary the consent must be obtained of the May District Meeting. They receive a maintenance according to the number: of years they have been in the active work. This is derived from the Annuitant Society, which is in reality their own life-assurance fund, and provides, to a certain extent, for the support and education of their children. Upon entering into business they are reckoned as local preachers, after four years as superannuated, and if members of the legal hundred, are superseded. They are under the supervision of the District Meeting: and if their names are on the minutes, they are members of the Quarterly, Local Preachers, and District Meetings. See Simpson, *Cyclop. of Methodism*, s.v.

Superpellice

(or *Superpelliceum*), a SURPLICE *SEE SURPLICE* (q.v.).

Superpositio

a word used in the ancient Church to designate a fast, which lasted not only through the day, but till the morning of the following day, or for several days together, as was usual in the Passion week. The stations, or fasts (on stationary days; terminated at three o'clock in the afternoon. *SEE FASTING; SEE STATION.*

Superpurgation

purgation or cleaning beyond what is needed.

Super-slab, or Super-table

SEE ALTAR, PORTABLE.

Superstition

(*δεισιδαιμονία*, *damon-terror*). Festus, governor of Judaea, informed Agrippa that Paul had disputed with the other Jews concerning matters of their own superstition (⁴²⁵⁹Acts 25:19), in which he spoke like a true pagan, equally ignorant of the Christian religion and of the Jewish. Paul, writing to the Colossians (⁵⁰²³Colossians 2:23), recommends to them not to regard false teachers, who would persuade them to a compliance with human wisdom in an affected humility and superstition; and, speaking to the Athenians, he says, "I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious" (⁴¹⁷²Acts 17:22). The heathen idea of religion has always been one of terror. A superstitious man looks on God as a severe and rigid master, and obeys with fear and trembling. Varro says the pious man honors and loves God, the superstitious man dreads him, even to terror, and Maximus Tyrius observes that a man truly pious looks on God as a friend full of goodness, whereas the superstitious serves him with base and mean flattery. In the New Test., however, the word "superstition" or "superstitious" is used in a less offensive sense. Festus, a governor newly arrived in his province, would hardly have paid so ill a compliment to Agrippa, a king of the Jewish religion, as to call his religion superstitious; and when Paul at Athens tells the Areopagites that they are too superstitious, he uses a word no doubt susceptible of a good as well as of a bad sense, as it would have been highly indecorous, nor less unnecessary, to calumniate the religious disposition of his judges whom he was addressing. If we take the word in the sense of worship or reverence,

Festus may say, "Paul and: the Jews differ in respect of certain objects of spiritual reverence," and Paul may say, "I perceive ye are greatly attached to objects of spiritual reverence," not only without offense, but as a very graceful introduction to a discourse which proposed to describe the only proper object of such reverence. *SEE PAUL.*

The Hebrews were never given to such gross superstition as the heathen nations of antiquity; yet there are traces of the same weakness of the human mind in their various modes of divination (q.v.) and their views of possessed persons (q.v.). A special instance has been found in the case of Azazel (q.v.); also in the satyr (q.v.) and the night-monster (q.v.). *SEE SPECTRE.* The modern Mohammedans are given to superstitions. Those of Egypt may be found in Lane's *Modern Egyptians*, 1, 322, 336, 376; 2, 283, 308, 312. In Palestine the peasantry have numerous superstitions: they believe in incantations, in charms, in divination by sand and other means, and in the evil eye, their children being left purposely dirty, or even be soiled in order to avoid the consequences of an envious look. The belief in spirits is also general. These include, first, the Jan, or powerful daemon, good or bad, the latter kind having for bodies the tall smoke-pillars of the whirlwind, so commonly seen in summer; secondly, the Afrit, who is seemingly equivalent to a ghost; thirdly, the ghou or hag of the cemetery, which feeds on the dead (a place haunted by one of these daemons is carefully avoided, or at least never approached without the most polite salutations, intended to appease the unseen spirit); fourthly, there are Kerad, or goblins, whose name is akin to the Arabic word for monkey; lastly, there is the Shaitan, or Satan, a name often applied to human beings of an evil disposition. (Conder, *Tent Work in Palest.* 2, 233). *SEE DEMON.*

On the general subject, see Xavier, *De Superstitione. Judaeor.* (Hamb. 1720); Reineccius, *id.* (pref. to Christiani's *Werice* [Leips. 1705]); Spizelius, *Δεισιδαμονία Hebraeo-gentilis* (ibid. 1608); Manzel, *De Voce Δεισιδαμονίᾱ* (Rost. 1758); and the monographs cited by Danz, *Wörterb. s.v. Aberglaube.* *SEE WITCH.*

Superstition

(Lat. *superstitio*) had for its ancient sense that of worship over and above that which, was appointed by proper authority. Hence religious systems not recognized by the Roman State were called superstitions, Christianity itself

being for some centuries among the number. The word has been used so indefinitely that it is difficult to determine its precise meaning. It does not seem always to have been used in a bad sense in old English, as is shown by ^{<4172>}Acts 17:22, where it represents, **δεισιδαιμονία**, a word used by the apostle as indicating that the Athenians were a God-fearing people who would not refuse to listen to his appeal about the “unknown God.” Superstition must not be understood to mean an “excess of religion,” as if any one could have too much of true religion, but any *misdirection* of religious feeling, manifested either in showing religious veneration or regard to objects which deserve *none-that* is, properly speaking, the worship of false gods or in an excess of veneration for an object deserving some veneration, or the worship of God through the medium of improper rites and ceremonies” (Whately, *On Bacon*, p. 155). It is generally defined to be the observance of unnecessary and uncommanded rites and practices in religion; reverence of objects not fit for worship; too great nicety, fears, or scrupulousness; or extravagant devotions; or religion wrong directed or conducted. The word may be applied ‘to the idolatry of the heathens, the traditions of the Jews, the unscriptural rites of the Catholics; to the dependence placed by many on baptism, the Lord’s supper, and other ceremonies. It may be extended to those who, without any evidence, believe that prophecies are still uttered or miracles are performed. Some forms of intellectual skepticism involve superstition’ of a far more dangerous kind than that involved in the credulity of ignorant piety, as belief in witchcraft, magic, table-turning, spirit-rapping, etc.

“Superstition,” says Claude, “usually springs either

- (1) from servile fear, which makes people believe that God is: always wrathful, and invents means to appease him; or
- (2) from a natural inclination we all have to idolatry, which makes men think they see some ray of the Divinity in extraordinary creatures, and on this account worship them; or
- (3) from hypocrisy, which makes men willing to discharge their obligations to God by grimace and by zeal for external services; or
- (4) from presumption, which makes men serve God after their own fancies. See Claude, *Essay on the Compositions of a Sermon*, 2, 49, 299; Saurin, *Sermons* (Eng. ed.), 5, 49; Gregory, *Essays*, Essay 3; Blunt, *Dict. of Hist. Theol.* s.v.; Buck, *Dict.* s.v.; Fleming, *Vocabulary of Phil. Science*, s.v.

Supertotus

a long garment like a modern great-coat, resembling a straight-cut cloak in some particulars, worn over the secular and religious dress in medieval times as a protection against the weather.

Superville, Daniel de

a Protestant theologian, was born at Saumur, in August, 1657, of a respectable Dutch family, and, being early designated for the sacred ministry, studied theology at Saumur and Geneva, and in 1683 was called to take charge of the Church of Loudun. On the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, he took refuge in Rotterdam, whence he could not be drawn by offers from Berlin, Loudun, and Hamburg. In 1691 the authorities of the city created for him an express pastorate, which he occupied till his death, June 9, 1728. He was of a sweet disposition, a lively imagination, and a happy delivery. He published several sermons and devotional works, which are enumerated in Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé, s.v.*

Supervisor Cantorum

the master of the choristers.

Supervisor Operis

the superintendent of works, also called *magister operis*.

Suph

(**āw**sa sea-weed, *SEE FLAG*, Jon. 2, 6) is the characteristic epithet of the Red Sea' (q.v.), which abounds in sedge (**Exodus** 10:19, and often). In one passage (**Deuteronomy** 1:1) it has been supposed by some to designate a place, but no locality of that name has been discovered, and most interpreters (with the Sept. and Vulg.) understand it there to stand for the Red Sea (by the omission of **μυι** sea). So in **Numbers** 21:14, **hp**ws, *suphah* (Sept. **Ζωόβ**; Vulg. *Mare Rubrum*), some think a place (perhaps the same) to be indicated, but others with better reason render, the word as an appellative, *storm*, i.e. violence (as in **Job** 21:18, and elsewhere).

Supper

Picture for Supper

δειπνον (^{<4062>}Mark 6:21; ^{<2442>}Luke 14:12, 16; ^{<6127>}John 12:2, etc.; sometimes rendered “feast”), a word used indifferently in the Homeric age for the early or the late meal, its special meaning being the *principal* meal. In later times, however, the term was applied exclusively to the late meal the **δῶρον** of the Homeric age. It was the chief meal of the Jews, and also of the Greeks and Romans, being taken towards or at evening, after the labors of the day were over (^{<4236>}Matthew 23:6; ^{<4123>}Mark 12:39; ^{<2046>}Luke 20:46). In the New Testament, it is also specially spoken of the paschal supper (^{<6108>}John 10:3, 2; 4:21, 20), and of the Lord’s supper (^{<6121>}1 Corinthians 11:20); and of any meal (ver. 21); metaphorically of a marriage-feast, as figurative of the Messiah’s kingdom (^{<6699>}Revelation 19:9); and of heaps of the slain as a feast for birds of prey (ver. 17). *SEE SUP.*

A modern Oriental supper-party is thus described by Lamartine “Our apartments consisted of a pretty court, decorated with Arabic pilasters, and with a spouting fountain in the center falling into a large marble basin; round this court were three rooms and a divan, that is to say, a chamber larger than the others, formed by an arcade, which opened on the inner court, and which had neither door nor shutters to close it. It is a place of transition between the house and the street, serving as a garden to the lazy Mussulmans, its motionless shade supplying for them that of the trees, which they have neither the industry to plant nor energy to go and seek where nature herself causes them to grow. Our rooms, even in this magnificent palace, would have appeared ruinous to the poorest hut of our peasants; the windows had no glass, an unknown luxury in the East, notwithstanding the rigor of winter in these mountains; no beds, tables, or chairs; nothing but the, naked walls, moldering and riddled with rat and lizard holes; and as a floor, the beaten clay, uneven, and mixed with chopped straw. Slaves brought mats of rush, which they stretched upon this floor, and Damascus carpets, with which they covered the mats; they afterwards brought a small table of Bethlehem manufacture, made of wood, encrusted with mother-of-pearl. These tables are not half a foot either in diameter or in height; they resemble the trunk of a broken column, and are not capable of holding more than the tray on which the Mohammedans place the five or six dishes, which compose their repasts.

Our dinner, which was served on this table, consisted of a pilau, of a dish of sour milk mixed with oil, and certain gourds like our cucumbers, stuffed with hashed mutton and boiled rice. This is, in fact, the most desirable and savory food, which one can eat in, the East. No knives, spoons, or forks; they eat with the hands but the repeated ablutions render this custom less revolting for the Mussulmans. *SEE EATING.*

Supper Of The Lord

(Κυριακόν δεῖπνον), so called by Paul in his historical reference to the Passover supper as observed by Jesus on the night in which' he was betrayed (1 Corinthians 11:20; Matthew 26:20-31).

I. Scriptural Statements. — Several controverted points may perhaps be best adjusted by a connected harmony of the last Passover of the Lord, constructed from the evangelic narratives alluding to it, but filling up the various omitted circumstances from the known Passover rites. *SEE PASSOVER.*

“Now, when it was evening, Jesus sat, down with the twelve (Matthew) apostles” (Mark). The first customary washing and purifications being performed, the blessing over the *first cup* of wine, which began the feast, would' be pronounced, probably in the: usual form “We thank thee, O God, our Heavenly Father, who hast created the fruit of the vine.” Considering the peculiarity of the circumstances, and the genius of the new dispensation about to be established that the great Teacher had already declared the superiority of simple forms to the involved traditions of the Jewish doctors, and that his disciples alone were present on this occasion it may be supposed that, after the blessing over the herbs, the recital of the liturgy (or *hagadth*) explanatory of the redemption of their ancestors from Egyptian bondage would be somewhat simplified, and perhaps accompanied with new reflections.

Then probably the *second cup* of wine was mingled, and with the flesh of the paschal lamb, feast-offerings, and other viands, placed before the Lord. “And he said unto them, With desire have I desired to eat, this Paschia with you before I suffer; for I say unto you, I shall no more eat thereof until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.” And he took the [second] cup, and gave thanks, and said, “Take this, and divide among you, for I say unto you, I will not henceforth drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come” (Luke).

When the wine distributed to each would be drunk off, one of the unleavened cakes would next be broken, the blessing said over it, and a piece distributed to each disciple, probably with the usual formula. “This is the bread of affliction which your fathers did eat in the land of Egypt;” i.e. not the identical bread, transubstantiated, but a memorial or sign of it. The company would then proceed with the proper supper, eating, of the feast-offering, and, after a benediction, of the paschal lamb.

The translation of the phrase **δείπνου γενομένου** (which immediately follows) by “supper being ended” has much confused the various narratives, and led many to think that Judas was present at the Lord’s supper, properly so called. The true reading probably is **γινομένου** (not **γενομένου**), as understood by the Arabic and Persic translators, in the sense “while supper was about,” or “during supper-time.”

“And as they were at supper, the devil having now put it into the heart of Judas to betray him; Jesus, knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God, and was going to God, riseth from supper; and,” after due preparations, “began to wash the disciples feet” (John). After this striking symbolic exhortation to humility and mutual service (~~BBB~~ John 13:6-20), “Jesus was troubled in spirit, and bare witness, and said, Verily, verily, I say unto you, that one of you will betray me. Then the disciples looked on one another, doubting of whom he spake” (John). “And they were very sorry, and began each of them to say. unto him, Lord, is it I?” (Matthew). “One of the disciples, leaning back on Jesus’ breast, saith unto him, Lord, is it I? Jesus answered, He it is to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped it. And after dipping the sop he giveth it to Judas Iscariot. Then, Satan entered into him. Jesus saith unto him, What thou doest, do quickly. He then, on taking the sop, went immediately out; and it was right” (John).

The supper would then proceed until each had eaten sufficient of the paschal lamb and feast-offering.

“And as they were eating, Jesus took the bread,” the other unleavened cake left unbroken, “and blessed” God “and brake it, and gave it to the eleven disciples, and said, Take eat; this is my body (Matthew, Mark), which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me” (Luke, Paul, Corinthians 11:24).

The supper being concluded, the hands were usually washed the second time, and the *third cup*, or “cup of blessing” (~~4006~~1 Corinthians 10:16) prepared, over which the master usually gave thanks for the covenant of circumcision and for the law given to Moses. Jesus, therefore, at this juncture, announced, with peculiar appropriateness, his New Covenant.

“After the same manner, also, Jesus took the cup after supper, and, having given thanks, gave it to them, saying, Drink all of you out of it; for this is my blood of ‘the new covenant, which is shed for many for forgiveness of sins (Matt.); this do, as oft as ye drink, in remembrance of me” (~~4123~~1 Corinthians 11:24), “But I say unto you, I shall not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new (καίνον) with you in my Father’s kingdom” (Matthew).

“And when they had sung a hymn” (Matthew), probably the Hallel, our Lord discoursed long with his disciples about his approaching death and departure (~~4131~~John 13:31; 14:31); and when he had finished he said, “Arise, let us go hence.” “And they went out onto the Mount of Olives” (Matthew).

II. Ecclesiastical Usage. — A multitude of disputes and controversies have existed in the Church, from the earliest ages of Christianity, regarding the nature, observance, and elements of the Lord’s supper. On these points the reader may consult the following works: Pierce, Waterland, Cudworth, Hoadle, and Bell, *On the Eucharist*; Orme, *Lord’s Supper Illustrated* (Lonld. 1832); Goodman, *On the Eucharist* (ibid. 1841); Coleman, *Christ. Antiq.*; Halley, *On the Sacraments* (ibid. 1845) De Linde and Mearns, *Prize Essays on the Jewish Passover and Christian Eucharist* (ibid. 1845).

The early Church appears, from a vast preponderance of evidence, to, have practiced communion weekly, on the Lord’s day.

The custom, which prevailed during the first seven centuries, of mixing the wine with water, and in the Greek Church with *hot* water, appears to have originated with the ancient Jews, who mingled their thick wine with water (Mishna, *Terumoth*, 11). Maimonides (in *Chomets ve-Matsah*, § 7) states that the proportion of pure wine in every cup must not be less than the fourth part of a quarter of a hin, besides water which must needs be mingled, that the drinking of it may be *the more pleasant*. The raisin-wine often employed both by the ancient and modern Jews (*Arbah Turim*, § 483, date 1300) contains water of course. Remnants of this custom are still

traceable in the East. The Nestorian Christians, as late as the 16th century, as we find from the old travelers, celebrated the Eucharist in such wine, made by steeping raisins one night in water, the juice being-pressed forth (Osorius, *De Reb. Emanuel.* lib. 3; Boter, *Rel.* 2, 3; Odoard Barbosa, ap. Ramum. 1, 313; Brerewood, *On the Diversities of Languages* [1622], p. 147). The Christians of India (said to be converted by St. Thomas) used raisin-wine, as also do some of the Syrian churches at the present day (Ross, *Pansebeia* [1683], p. 492; Ainsworth, *Travels in Asia Minor* [1842]). The third Council of Braga would not permit the use of the pure "fruit of the vine," for they condemned as heretics; those who used *no other wine* but what they pressed out of the clusters of grapes, which were then presented at the Lord's table (Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 5, ch. 2). The wine used by our Lord was of course fermented, as no other could have been procured at that season of the year, and as it seems to be contrasted with the *new* wine of the heavenly kingdom (~~413~~ Matthew 26:29). **SEE WINE.**

As regards the bread, many of the Eastern churches use unfermented bread in the communion. "The Greek Church adopts a leavened bread, but the Roman Church has it unleavened; and this difference has been the cause of much controversy, though it seems easy to decide which kind was used by Jesus, the last supper having been on one of the days of unleavened bread, when no other kind could be eaten in the land of Judaea." The Protestant churches, generally, pay little regard to the *nature* of the elements, but use the ordinary bread, as well as wine, of the country. It was probably from regarding in a similar way the bread and wine as mere ordinary beverage that some of the ancient sects gave up the wine altogether, and substituted other things. Epiphanius (*Haeres.* 49) and Augustine (*Haeres.* 28) mention an ancient sect of Christians in Phrygia, called Artotyrites, because they used bread and cheese. Others made use of bread and water only; and the third Council of Braga (A.D. 675) condemns a custom of communicating in bread and milk. **SEE LORDS SUPPER.**

Supplicatio

a solemn thanksgiving or supplication to the gods among the ancient Romans, on which occasion the temples were thrown open, and the statues of the gods carried on couches through the public streets that they might receive the prayers of the people. A *supplicatio* was appointed by the

senate when a victory had been gained, or in times of public danger and distress.

Supplication of Beggars

is a book which appeared mysteriously in London about A.D. 1527, setting forth the rapacity and licentiousness of the clergy. It eventually came into the hands of Henry VIII, who, after hearing it read, said, "If a man should pull down an old stone-wall, and begin at the lower part, the upper part might chance to fall upon his head," thus broadly intimating that the clergy were the foundations of the rotten old Church; and should an attempt be made to reform them, the whole structure would tumble down. See Burchard, *Hist. of Congregationalism*, 1, 26.

Supplication of Commons

is a notable book published in 1546, with the full title of *A Supplication of the Poor Commons to the King*. It was a sort of counterpart to the *Supplication of Beggars*, and made complaints against the character and conduct of the clergy, especially the monks. See Strype, *Memoirs*, 1, 608-621; Burchard, *Hist. of Congregationalism*, 1, 33.

Supplications

(Gr. *λιτανεΐαι*), in its original signification is but another name for *prayers* in general, of whatever kind, that either were made publicly in the church or by any private person. The term is applied both to litanies and short prayers, with brief petitions and responses. *SEE LITANY*.

Supralapsarians

persons who hold that God, without any regard to the good or evil works of men, has resolved, by an eternal decree, *supra lapsum*, antecedently to any knowledge of the fall of Adam, and independent of it, to reject some and save others; or, in other words, that God intended to glorify his justice in the condemnation of some, as well as his mercy in the salvation of others; and for that purpose decreed that Adam should necessarily fall. *SEE SUBLAPSARIANS*.

Supramanya

a Hindû deva, son of Siva, and sprung from the eye in the forehead of that god. He fought the giant Sura Parma, and with the most powerful weapon of his father split him in two, after seven days of battle. The festival Kandershasta is celebrated in his honor.

Supremacy, Papal

The papists claim for the See of Rome, represented in the person of the pope, “a principality of power over all others, as the mother and mistress of all Christian churches;” and all other patriarchs are required to receive their palls from the Roman pontiff. This doctrine is chiefly built on the supposed primacy of Peter, of whom the pope is the pretended successor; a primacy so far from being countenanced by Scripture that we find it there absolutely forbidden (~~Q224~~ Luke 22:24; ~~4085~~ Mark 9:35). The authority of the Roman See was first recognized by the fourth Lateran Council, A.D. 1215, and was first protested against by the authors of the Reformation. The title of “mother of churches,” claimed by the Church of Rome, must certainly belong to the Church at Jerusalem, and was given to that Church by the second Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381. *SEE PRIMACY.*

Supremacy, Royal.

In the Church of England all ecclesiastical jurisdiction is annexed to the crown; and it is ordained that no foreign potentate shall exercise any power, civil or religious, within the limits of that kingdom. Canon 2 of the Church of England says:

“Whosoever shall hereafter affirm that the king’s majesty hath not the same authority in causes ecclesiastical that the godly kings had among the Jews and Christian’ emperors of the primitive Church, or impeach ally part of his regal supremacy in the said causes restored to the crown, and by the laws of this realm therein established, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored, but only by the archbishop, after his repentance and public revocation of those his wicked errors.” In the United States, of course, no supremacy or interference in spiritual affairs on the part of the civil authorities is recognized.

Sur

(Heb. *Suir*, רש, *reinoved*, as in ^{<2342>}Isaiah 49:21; Sept. αἱ ὁδοί; Vulg. *Sur*), the name of one of the gates of the Temple at Jerusalem (^{<12316>}2 Kings 23:6); called in the parallel passage (^{<142316>}2 Chronicles 23:5) “the gate of the *foundation*,” דַּשָּׁי (which is the preferable reading), being apparently that which led across to Zion by the causeway or bridge. *SEE TEMPLE*.

Sur

(Σούρ; Vulg. omits), one of the places on the sea-coast of Palestine, which are named as having been disturbed at the approach of Holofernes with the Assyrian army (Judith 2, 28). It cannot be Tyre, the modern *Sur*, since that is mentioned immediately before. Some have suggested *Dor*, others a place named *Sora*, mentioned by Stephanus of Byzantium as ins Phoenicia, Which they would identify with *Athlt*; others, again, *Surafend*. But none of these are satisfactory. The apocryphal character of the book itself makes us suspicious of the accuracy of the name. *SEE JUDITH*.

Sura Deva

in Hindu mythology, is the goddess of wine who sprang out of the milk-sea when the mountain Mandar was cast into it, in order to prepare the drink amrita.

Sura Parpma

in Hindu mythology, is the giant with whom Supramanya (q.v.) fought. After he had been cut into pieces by the latter, one half changed itself into a peacock, and the other half into a cock. Siva used the first as an animal for riding, and the second served as a watcher for the house in which the wagon of Siva stood.

Surcingle

is a band of black silk or stuff, fringed at the ends, and bound round the waists of the clergy so as to confine and keep the cassock in place.

Surenhusius

(*Surenhus*), WILLEM, professor of Greek and Hebrew at Amsterdam, flourished in the end of the 17th and the beginning of the 18th century. He

edited a beautifully printed edition of the *Mischna, sive totius Hebraeorum Juris, Rituum, Antiquitatum, et Legum Oralium Systema, cune Clarissimorum Rabbinoꝝ Mainonidis et Bartenorice Comometariis Integris*, etc. (Amst. 1690-1703, 6 vols. fol.) which has ever since remained the best edition (see Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 2, 886). He published also **הַחֲמֵס הַרְפָּס**, sive **Βίβλος Καταλλαγῆς**, in quo secundum Vett. Theoli. *Heb. formulas allegandi et modos interpretandi conciliantur loca ex V. in N.T. allegata* (ibid. 1713, 4to), a work of unsurpassed value on the subject to which it relates.

Sureties

is a name given to sponsors in virtue of the security given through them to the Church that the baptized shall be “virtuously brought up to lead a godly and a Christian life.” *SEE SPONSOR.*

Surety

(some form of **br̄**; *arb*, to barter, and especially to deposit a pledge, either in money, goods, or in part payment, as security for a bargain; **ἔγγυος**). “Suretyship” in the A. V. is usually the rendering for **י[א]פ[ו]ט**, *tokeim*, literally in marg. “those that strike (hands),” from **[qī]**; to strike (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1517). The phrase: **dy; t̄m̄c̄t̄** *tesumeth yad*. (*Sept.* **παραθήκη**), “depositing in the hand,” i.e. giving in pledge, may be understood to apply to the act of pledging, or virtual, though not personal, surety ship (^{<RB>}Leviticus 6:2 ^{<RB>}Hebrews 5:21]). In the entire absence of commerce, the law laid down no rules on the subject of surety ship; but it is evident that in the time of Solomon, mercantile dealings had become so multiplied that surety ship in the commercial sense was common (^{<RB>}Proverbs 6:1; 12:15; 17:18; 20:16; 22:26; 27:13). But in older times the notion of one man becoming a surety for a service to be discharged by another was in full force (see ^{<RB>}Genesis 44:32), and it is probable that the same form of undertaking existed, viz. the giving the hand to (striking hands with), not, as Michaelis represents, the person who was to discharge the service in ‘the commercial sense’ the debtor-but the person to whom it was due, the creditor (^{<RB>}Job 17:3; ^{<RB>}Proverbs 6:1; Michaelis, *Laws of Moses*, § 151, 2, 322, ed. Smith). The surety, of course, became liable for his client’s debts in case of his failure. In later Jewish times the system had become common, and caused much distress in many instances, yet the duty

of surety ship in certain cases is recognized as valid (Ecclus. 8:13; 29 14, 145, 16,18, 19). *SEE PLEDGE.*

The earliest form of suretyship mentioned in Scripture is the pledging of person for person, as when Judah undertook with his father to be surety for Benjamin (~~11~~¹¹ *br* *I*, *I will exchange for him, put myself in place of him,* ~~443~~Genesis 43:9); and when circumstances emerged which seemed to call for the fulfillment of the obligation, he actually offered himself in the room of Benjamin. In this sense the psalmist asks God to be surety for him for good (~~499~~¹¹⁹ Psalm 119:122), as did also, in his great distress, Hezekiah (~~2384~~Isaiah 38:14), though the sense here is a little weakened in the A.V. by the rendering “undertake for me.” More commonly, however, the kind of suretyship spoken of had reference to pecuniary obligations or debts, and forms the subject of prudential advices and warnings in the book of Proverbs (~~206~~Proverbs 6:1; 11:15; 17:18; 20:16). In the first of these passages, the dangerous practice of entering into sureties is put in two forms—first, “if thou be surety for thy friend,” then “if thou hast stricken thy hand with a stranger;” there being no further difference, between them than that the one has respect to the thing itself the other to the mode of going about it: the person agreeing to become surety gave his hand to his friend. Hence, also, in ~~2078~~Proverbs 17:18, a man “who strikes hands,” that is, readily becomes a surety, is declared to be void of understanding. In the highest sense the term is applied to Christ, who, in his character as mediator, is represented as “the surety (*ἕγγυος*) of a better covenant” (~~3022~~Hebrews 7:22), having made himself responsible for all that in. this covenant was required to be accomplished for the salvation of those who were to share in its provisions. *SEE MEDIATION.*

Surety.

In the ancient Church the clergy were forbidden to be bondsmen or sureties for any other man’s appearance in court, because it was thought that such sort of encumbrances might bring detriment to the Church in distracting her ministers from constant attendance upon divine service.

Surin, Jean Joseph

a French ascetic writer, was born at Bordeaux in 1600, entered the Order of the Jesuits at fifteen years of age, and soon distinguished himself. by his profound piety and knowledge of human nature. In 1634 he was sent to

take charge of the Ursuline convent in London, and began a series of exorcisms against the evil spirits supposed to prevail there, but eventually became himself the victim of the demoniacal possession, and was required to return to Bordeaux. In 1637 he again went to London, and remained there, with partial seasons of lucidity, for many years, but was at length removed from place to place in hopes of relief. He recovered his sanity in 1658, and died at Bordeaux, April 21, 1665, leaving several works on practical religion, which are enumerated in Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Surinam

(*Neg.ro-E.english*) Version. Negro-English, or, as it might-be designated with equal propriety, Negro-Dutch, is the language of the Dutch colony of Surinam in Guiana, and is current among a population of at least 100,000 people. Ever since 1738 there has existed in Surinam a mission of the United Brethren; The language is a compound of English and Dutch; with a sprinkling of Spanish, Portuguese, French, and African or Indian words. Prior to the year 1813, the greater part of the New Test. was translated into that language. In 1828 Moravian missionaries completed a version of the entire New Test. The MS. was sent to Germany, and was revised by Hans Wied, who for upwards of twenty years had resided in Surinam, and who expressed the opinion that the translation was “as perfect as possible.” With the aid of the British and Foreign Bible Society, an edition of 1000 copies was printed in London. This edition was soon exhausted, and, as a result of these publications, more than 12,000 converts were added to the Church. Another edition of the New Test. and Psalms was prepared by the Moravian, missionary Treu, and, with the aid of the Netherlands and the British and Foreign Bible societies, 2000 copies were printed in 1846. Whether the Old Test. has been translated and printed, we are not able to say. (B. P.)

Surius, Laurentius

a Carthusian monk, was the child of Lutheran, or, as others say, of Romish parents. He was born at Lubeck in 1522, and educated at Frankfort-on-the-Oder and at Cologne. At the latter place he became acquainted with Canisius (q.v.), and joined the Roman Catholic Church. In 1542 he entered the Carthusian Order and devoted himself to monastic asceticism and literary labor. He displayed both zeal for Romanism and hatred for the

Reformation, whose leaders he charged with having borrowed their doctrines from Mohammed. Besides translating various mystical writings by Tauler, Ruysbroeck, Suso, etc. Surius composed a *Commentarius Brevis Rerum in Orbe Gestarum ab Anno 1500* (Lov. 1566). This book was designed to oppose the famous Protestant work by Sleidsap (q.v.), but was devoid of only particular value; but it was, nevertheless, carried forward by Isselt and others to 1673. Additional works by Surius are, *Homiliae sive Conciones Preestantissimorum Ecclesiae Doctorum*, etc. (Col. 1569-76). (*Concilia 'Omnia*, etc. (ibid. 1567): — and *Vita Sanctorum ab Aloysio Lipomanno olim Conscriptae* (ibid, 1570-76, 6 vols. fol.), which was repeatedly reprinted, the best edition being that of Cologne, 1618. A seventh vol. was added after the death of Surius by the Carthuhsian Jacob Mosander. Surius died May 23, 1578. See *Biog, Universelle*, tom. 44 (Par. 1826); and Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Surlet

(de Chokier), the name of an old French family, which dates from the year 1170, and culminated in the person of Fastre Bare de Surlet, who died about 1473. The emperor Ferdinand II ennobled the family of Surlet in 1630 with the title *de Chokier*. The following members deserve mention here:

- 1.** JEAN, born at Liege, Jan. 14, 1571, studied at Louvain, and took his degrees at Orleans. He became canon of St. Lambert, abbé of St. Hadelin of Vise, and vicargeneral of the diocese of Liege, where he distinguished himself by his zealous charity and erudition. He died about 1655, leaving several works on ecclesiastical matters, for which see Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s.v.
- 2.** JEAN ERNEST, nephew of the preceding, became canon of Liege and abbé of Vise. He founded the house of the Incurables and that of the Filles Repenties at Liege, and died about 1683.
- 3.** JEAN FREDEIRIC, uncle of Jean, was a learned canon of Liege, who wrote *Enchiridion Praecationum* (Liege, 1636), and died March 15, 1635.

Surname

Names were at first expressive, as those of Scripture. According to Du Cange, surnames were originally written, not after the Christian-name, but above it, and so were “supernomina” over names. The first or Christian name is usually given at baptism. Hereditary surnames did not exist in England till after the Norman Conquest. They are taken from locality, as Field or Forest from occupation, as Fisher or Miller, Pilgrim or Palmer; from personal qualities, as Black or Brown; from natural objects, as Lemon or Lamb, Peel or Hog, Steel or Jewel, etc. As distinct from the surname, the sirname or sire’s name is a natural addition, with son, Mac, or Fitz, O, ap, wich, or sky (all signifying son); as Donaldson or Macdonald, Fitzgerald, O’Connell, Alexandrowich, Petrousky ap Howel becoming Powel, and ap Richard becoming Prichard.

Surplice

(Lat. *superpelliceum*, over the pelisse), a long, loose linen garment worn by clergymen of the Church of England during the performance of divine service. Surplices are also worn by the fellows of colleges or halls, and by all the scholars and students in the universities of Oxford and Cambridge upon Sundays, holidays, and even during their attendance at the college chapels or churches. It is also worn for the service of the choir. Its use dates back to an early day. Paulinus sent a lamb’s-wool coat to Severus, and Ambrose complains of the use of beaver skins and silk dresses. The white garment of the clergy is mentioned by Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome, Clement of Alexandria, Honorius, and Ivo of Chartres. The Council of Basle required the surplice to reach below the middle of the thigh. The Gilbertines wore a hooded surplice. At Burgos, in summer, the canons wear, instead of a cope and mozzetta (their winter habit), a sleeved surplice raised on the shoulders. The name is first mentioned by Odo of Paris and Stephen of Tournay, in the 12th century. The origin of the surplice is thus given by Durand: “It was so called because anciently this garment was put upon leathern coats made of the skins of dead animals (*super tunicas pellicas de pellibus mortuorum animalium fictas*), symbolically to represent that the sin of our first parents, which brought man under the necessity of wearing garments of skin, was now hid and covered by the robe of Christ’s innocence and grace.” The name and color (white) signify holiness of life joined to penitence. The use of the surplice was strongly objected to by the Calvinistic and Zwinglian reformers on the Continent,

and by the Puritans in England, who regarded it as a relic of popery. The argument against it is to be found in Beza, *Tractat. Theolog.* 3, 29; and its defense in Hooker, *Eccles. Polity*, 5, 29. Much controversy has been held of late years as to the propriety of the surplice being worn by the preacher in the pulpit, which is contrary to the more general practice of the Anglican Church. The surplice and alb (q.v.) are slight variations of what was originally one vestment. Foreign surplices are much shorter than those used in England. In Italy the short surplice is called a *cotta*. **SEE ORNAMENTS, ECCLESIASTICAL.**

Surplice-fee

is a fee paid to the clergy for occasional duties. This seems to have been unknown in the ancient Church; indeed; several laws were passed in the early Church commanding the gratuitous permanence of all religious offices.

Surrogate

is a name (meaning one substituted, or appointed in the place of another) commonly applied in ecclesiastical usage to an officer delegated by the bishop to grant licenses for marriages, probates of wills, etc., in large towns. A surrogate is, properly speaking, the deputy or substitute of an ecclesiastical judge.

Sursum Corda

In the ancient service of the Church, it was the duty of the deacon to summon each class of worshippers separately to engage in prayer by saying, "Let us pray." Other forms for announcing the time of prayer were also used, as "Give audience," "Lift your heart" (*Sursum corda*). This rite is described in detail in the eighth book of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, where it is said that the high-priest or celebrant at mass says, "Lift up your hearts," and the faithful respond, "We lift them up unto the Lord." In its English form it is found in the Communion Service of the Church of England.

Surtur

in Noised mythology, is the mighty ruler of Muspelheim, the implacable enemy of the asas, who, in the conflagration of the universe, will lead the armies of the sons of Muspel, join himself with the serpent Midgard and the

wolf Fenris, assail the residences of the gods, besiege all the asas in a tremendous battle, and finally bring on the overthrow of the world. *SEE NORSE MYTHOLOGY.*

Surya

in Hindû mythology, is the sun (not the sungod, for that is called Indra), which in India is an object of worship as the celestial genius. He rides in a car drawn by seven green horses, whose leader is called Arun. A thousand genii are in his train, who adore him and sing hymns to him. Surya is often removed from his car, and has impressed the earth with numerous legends of his power. He has many names, among which, however, the following twelve are chief, indicating his attributes in various relations, and also measurably the months: Varuma, Surya, Vedang, Bhanu, Indra, Ravi, Gobasti, Yama, Svarna reta, Divakai, Mitra, and Vishnu (in the permanent sense of the word). Among all nations we find at the lowest stages the powers of nature, and especially the heavenly bodies, adored as mighty deities. *SEE URANOLATKY.*

Sus

SEE CRANE; SEE HORSE.

Su'sa

(Esther 11:3; 16:18). *SEE SHUSHAN.*

Su'sanchite

(Chald. only in the emphat. plur., *Susankaye*, אַשְׁכַּנְיָאִין; Sept.

Σουσαναχαίτοι; Vulg. *Susanechcei*) is found once only (in ^{<1500>}Ezra 4:9, where it occurs among the list of the nations whom the Assyrians had settled in Samaria, and whose descendants still occupied the country in the reign of the Pseudo-Smerdis). There can be no doubt that it designates *the Susians*, either the inhabitants of the city.

Susa

or those of the country (Susis or Susiana) of which Susa was the capital. Perhaps as the Elamites are mentioned in the same passage, and as Daniel (^{<2000>}Daniel 8:2) seems to call the country Elam and the city Shushan (or Susa), the former explanation is preferable.

SEE SHUSHAN.

Susan'na

(*Σουσάννα* v.r. *Σωσάννα*; i.e. *hNw̄w̄w̄*, *Shoshannadh*, a lily [q.v.]), the name of two females in the Bible. The name likewise occurs in Diod. Sic. as that of the daughter of Ninus (2, 6); and *Sheshan* (~~1~~1 Chronicles 2:31, 34, 35) is of the same origin and meaning (Gesen. *Thesaur.* s.v.).

I. The heroine of the story of the Judgment of Daniel in the Apocrypha, otherwise called.

Susanna, The History Of,

being one of the appendices to the canonical book of Daniel. *SEE DANIEL, APOCRYPHAL ADDITIONS TO.*

1. Title and Position. — This Apocryphal piece has different titles. Sometimes it is called (*Σουσάννα*) *Susanna*, sometimes (*Δανιήλ*) *Daniel*, and sometimes (*Διάκρισις Δανιήλ*) *The Judgment of Daniel*. Equally uncertain is its position. The Vat. and Alex. MSS. and the Vet. Lat. place it before the first chapter of Daniel, while the Sept., after the Cod. Chisianus and Theodotion, ed. Complu., put it after ch. 12.

2. Design. — The object of this attractive story is to celebrate the triumph of womanly virtue over temptations and dangers, and to exalt the wisdom of Daniel in saving the life of the pious heroine. Chrysostom rightly sets forth the beautiful lesson of chastity which this story affords, when he says, “God permitted this trial, that he might publish Susanna’s virtue and the others’ incontinence; and, at the same time, by her exemplary conduct, give a pattern to the sex of the like resolution and constancy in case of temptation” (*Serra. de Susanna*). The story of Susanna is therefore read in the Roman Church on the vigil of the fourth Sunday in Lent, and in the Anglican Church on Nov. 22,

3. Character; Author, Date, and Original Language. — Though the form of this story, as we now have it, shows that it is greatly embellished, yet there is every reason to believe that it is not wholly fictitious, but based upon fact. The paronomasias in Daniel’s examination of the elders, when he is represented as saying to the one who affirmed he saw the crime committed, *ὑπὸ σχῆνον*, *under a mastich-tree*, “the angel of God hath

received sentence of God, *σχίσαι σε μέσον*, *to cut thee in two;*” and to the other, who asserted he saw it committed, *ὑπὸ πρῖνον*, *under a holm-tree*, the angel of the Lord waiteth with the sword, *πρίσαι σε μέσον*, *to cut thee in two,*” only prove that the Greek is an elaboration of an old Hebrew story, but not that it originated with the Alexandrine translator of Daniel. The Song of Solomon may have suggested material to the author. The opinion of Eusebius, Apollinarius, and Jerome, that the prophet Habakkuk is the author of the History of Susanna is evidently derived from the Greek inscription of the History of Bel and the Dragon. *SEE APOCRYPHA.*

II. One of the women who ministered to our Lord’s personal wants out of their private means (^{<AMP>}Luke 8:2, 3). A.D. 28.

Susanna

Picture for Susanna

was held by the ancient Church to be a symbol of resurrection, and also a type of the persecuted Church—the two elders representing the pagans and the Jews. Representations of her are frequently found in France, in cemeteries, on sarcophagi. She is sometimes standing between two old men, sometimes between two trees behind which the men are hiding. Sometimes she is represented as a lamb between a fox, and a leopard. In France she still appears as the representative of the Christian Church, the persecutors being Arians, Goths, and Vandals. —Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. Chret. s.v.*

Suscepirbs

(receivers), a term applied—

- 1.** To deaconesses, who assisted in undressing and dressing candidates for baptism, in anointing, and the like.
- 2.** To sponsors, with special reference to the services rendered immediately before and after the rite of baptism.

Su'si

(Heb. *Susi'*, ~~ysus~~, *horseman*; Sept. *Σουσί*, the father of Gaddi, which latter was the commissioner from the tribe of Manasseh to explore Canaan the first time (Numbers 13:If). B.C. ante 1657.

Susil, Franz

a Roman Catholic divine, was born in 1804 at Neu-Rausnitz, near Austerlitz. In 1827 he received holy orders, and in 1837 was appointed-professor at Brinn. He died June 1, 1868, at Bystric, in Moravia.

Susil was one of the most prominent theologians and poets of Moravia. Of his works, which are all written in the Czechian language, we mention the *Works of the Apostolic Fathers* (1837, and often): — *Ecclesiastical Hymns* (1846; 2nd ed. 1859): — and a *Commentary on the Gospels* (1864-67), 4 vols. See *Literarischer. Handweiser für das katholische Deutschland*, 1868, No. 69, p. 307 sq. (B. P.)

Suso, Heinrich

a Mystic, was born March 21, 1300, at Constance. His real name was *Von Berg*; but, having been greatly influenced by the tender piety of his mother, he assumed her name when her death, in his eighteenth year, caused him to seek satisfaction for his soul in inward peace. He had been a student at Constance and Cologne, and now was strongly influenced by Master Eckart; but imagination and feeling were more powerful with him than the speculative faculty. His mysticism required a concrete form in which to clothe the idea, and such he found in the "wisdom" of the writings of Solomon. Identifying this "eternal wisdom" now with Christ and again with the Blessed Virgin, he expended upon it his love and the devotion of his life. He graved upon his breast, with an iron pencil, the name of Jesus. Having returned to the Convent of Constance, he gave himself to solitary mortifications, and had many visions. While there he also wrote his (German) book *On the Eternal Wisdom*, in 1338, which was designed to teach pious souls how to imitate Christ in his sufferings. Having reached the age of forty years, he concluded his penances and became a preacher, or, as he phrased it, "a knight of God," and his labors were largely beneficial to the community. He entered into relations with other mystical teachers, especially Tauler and Heinrich von Nordlingen. He induced many noble ladies to devote themselves to a quiet and charitable life, aided in the

formation of organizations of the Friends of God (q.v.), and founded a Brotherhood of the Eternal Wisdom, for which: he composed a rule and a number of prayers. These labors exposed him to criticism and even dangers.. He was even accused of disseminating the heretical teachings of the Brothers of the Free Spirit (q.v.). In his latter days he was chosen prior of his convent.

Soon afterwards he related the history of his inner and outer life to his friend the nun Elizabeth Staglin, and she wrote the narrative without his knowledge; but it was subsequently revised and completed by his hand and received into the collection of his works as part first. Part second was the book of *Eternal Wisdom*; part third, his book of *Truth*, like the other in dialogue form, and intended to satisfy the inquiries of a disciple of the truth. The conclusion consists of several miscellaneous letters. Suso died Jan. 25 1365, in the Dominican convent at Ulm. His writings evince no connected system. His matter is generally borrowed, and only the imaginative, romantic style is peculiar to him. His fundamental idea is that of Eckart, that *being forms* the highest; conception, and that *being* is God. All created being is a mirror of God, and to recognize God in this mirror is to *speculate*. No name can exhaust the idea of God. He is equally “an eternal nothing” and the “most essential something;” he is a ‘rings whose center is everywhere and whose circumference is no where.’ To gaze upon God is the highest joy. Creatures are eternal in (God as their “Exemplar,” and they have no distinguishing qualities until alter their “out: flow” from God, When they have entered into the creature state. They all have the yearning to return info their original and restore the interrupted unity. Similar is Suso’s representation of the Trinity. The Son is the Eternal Word which proceeds from the Father; the love which reunites them is the Holy Spirit. The sustained human soul can find no other way to God than Christ, and more particularly than the imitation of his sufferings. The distinction between Creator and creature never ceases, however; so that, despite his mystical spirit, Suso does not cross the line where the pantheistic blending of the created and the Eternal Spirit begins.

Suso was, in brief, the representative of poetic mysticism a real poet, who is unable to apprehend an idea without clothing it in symbolic form; and he was in no true sense either a philosopher or a practical man of affairs. Suso’s writings appeared at Augsburg, 1482 and 1512, fol., Dieppenbrock published them in 1829 at Ratisboil (2nd ed. 1838); in Latin, by SURIUS (q.v.), 1555 aid often. From the Latin they were rendered into French and

Italian, and even into German again. A book, *Von den neun Felsen (Of the Nine Rocks)*, which was long attributed to Suso, was written in 1392 by the Strasburger Rulman Merswin. —Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.*

Suspension, an ecclesiastical act of two kinds:

1. One of the several sorts of punishment inflicted upon offending members of the clergy. This relates either to the revenues of the clergyman or to his office, and hence *is called suspensio a beneficio* and *suspensio ab officio*. Suspension from benefice deprives the offender of the whole or a part of his revenue. Suspension from office is various: *ab ordine*, where a clerk cannot exercise his ministry at all; *ab officio*, where he is forbidden to exercise it in his charge or cure. In all these cases the incumbent retains his order, rank, and benefice in distinction to the penalties of solemn deposal and degradation, by which he forfeits all rights of his order and benefice. All persons who can excommunicate can suspend. Suspension must be preceded, by a monition, and its cause must be stated in the formal act: “Forasmuch as you have been proved to have committed such and such things, therefore we suspend you from the office and execution of your orders.” Every act of jurisdiction, such as absolution, is null and void during suspension, if it has been publicly announced; but the ministration of baptism or communion is valid. Suspension is removed by absolution, by revocation of the sentence, by expiration of its time, and by dispensation.

2. The other sort of suspension, which extends also to the laity, is suspension from entering a consecrated building, church, or chapel, or from hearing divine service, “commonly called mass,” and from receiving the holy sacrament; which, therefore, may be called a temporary excommunication. See Andre, *Du Droit Canonique*, 1, 943; 2, 1110; Maillane, *Du Droit Canonique*, 5, 352; Blunt, *Dict. of Doctrinal Theology*, s.v.; Riddle, *Christ. Antiq.* p. 342.

Suspicion

consists in imagining evil of others without proof. It is sometimes opposed to charity, which thinketh no evil. “A suspicious temper checks in the bud every kind affection; it hardens the heart, and estranges man from man. What friendship can we expect from him who views all our conduct with distrustful eyes, and ascribes every benefit we confer to artifice and stratagem? A candid man is accustomed to view the characters of his neighbors in the most favorable light, and is like one who dwells amid

those beautiful scenes of nature on which the eye rests with pleasure. On the contrary, the suspicious man, having his imagination filled with all the shocking forms of human falsehood, deceit, and treachery, resembles the traveler in the wilderness who discerns no objects around him but what are either dreary or terrible; caverns that open, serpents that hiss, and beasts of prey that howl.”

See Barrow, *Sermons*; Gisborne, *Sermons*; Dwight, *Theology*; James, *On Charity*.

Sustentation Fund

1. *English Wesleyan.* — A fund formed in the several districts which has for its object the raising of such an amount in each district as, being divided among the poorer circuits, will secure to their preachers a much larger salary than could be paid them without supplementary aid. The whole is under the supervision of Conference.

2. *Free Church of Scotland.* A fund provided for the support of ministers of that Church. The idea was probably derived by Dr. Chalmers from the Wesleyans; and a scheme was devised by him and made public before the Disruption, and is now carried into operation throughout Scotland. The amount of this fund for 1873 to 1874 was £152,112.

Sutcliffe (or Soutcliffe)

Matthew, an English divine, was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge. In 1586 he was installed archdeacon of Taunton, and on Oct. 22, 1588, confirmed dean of Exeter. He died in 1629. He acquired some celebrity by his College of Polemical Divines, which came to naught shortly after his death. Among his works are. *A Treatise of Ecclesiastical Discipline* (Lond. 1591, 4to): — *De Presbyterio, ejusque Nova in Ecclesia Christiana Politeia* (ibid. 1591, 4to): — *De Catholica et Orthodoxa Christi Ecclesia* (ibid. 1592, 2 vols.): — *De Pontificis Injusta Dominatione in Ecclesia, contra Bellarminum* (ibid. 1599, 5 vols.): — *De Turco-Papismo, or Resemblance between Mahometanisms and Popery* (ibid. 1599, 4to): — *De Purgatorio, etc.* (ibid. 1599, 4to): — *De Vera Christi Ecclesia* (ibid. 1600, 4to): *De Missa, adversus Bellarmium* (ibid. 1603, 4to): *De Indulgentiis et Jubileo* (ibid. 1606, 2 vols. 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Sutcliffe, Robert Burns

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Yorkshire, England, in 1815, and came to America in 1835, settling in Trenton, N. J. In 1854 he was admitted on trial into the New Jersey Conference, and was actively employed up to the time of his death, which occurred at Vincenttown, Feb. 18, 1874. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1874, p. 36.

Suthdure

(Sax. *south door*), the place where canonical purgation was performed. When a fact charged against a person was unproved, the accused was brought to the south door of his parish church, and then, in the presence of the faithful, made oath of his innocency. This is one reason why large south porches are found in ancient churches.

Suthreh Shahis

a division of the Sikhs in Hindustan whose priests may be known by particular marks. Thus they make a perpendicular black streak down the forehead, and carry two small black sticks, each about half a yard in length, with which they make a noise when they solicit alms. They lead a wandering life, begging and singing songs in the Punjabi and other dialects, mostly of a moral and mystic tendency. They are held in great contempt, and are frequently disreputable in character. They consider Tegh Bahader, the father of Guru Govind, as their father.

Sutphen, Joseph Walworth

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Sweden, N. Y., in 1825. He entered Hamilton College, and graduated in 1847; after which he entered the Union Theological Seminary, in 1848; from whence he graduated in 1851. He was ordained with a view of his entering the foreign field as missionary, and on Nov. 7, 1851, departed for Marsovan, in the Turkish Empire. His service was brief, as he had but scarcely begun his labors when he was called to the heavenly world.

Sutphen, Morris Crater, D.D.

a Presbyterian minister, was born Dec. 1, 1837, at Bedminster, N. J. He united with the Church Aug. 16, 1855. He graduated from Princeton

College in 1856. After teaching in a private family in Virginia, he entered Princeton Theological Seminary, from whence he graduated after a three years course. In both college and seminary he gained a high position as a scholar. He was licensed by the Presbytery of Elizabethtown, at Rahway, N.H., and on May 1, 1860, was ordained by the Presbytery of Philadelphia, and installed as collegiate pastor of the Spring Garden Church in that city, to serve as co-pastor with the venerable John McDowell, D.D., at whose death, Feb. 13, 1863, he became sole pastor. After a pastorate of great fidelity and fruitfulness, in which he became quite popular, he became collegiate pastor with the Venerable J. McElroy, D.D., of the Scotch Church in New York, and was installed April 28, 1866. He was obliged to resign in 1872, on account of aphonia, which a journey to Europe failed to remedy. After his return he spent a winter in Florida, and made an effort to supply the pulpit of the Jacksonville Church, but was obliged to relinquish it. Returning to the North, his health continued to fail, and he died at Morristown, N. J., June 18, 1875. Dr. Sutphen was a talented, popular, and useful preacher, a man of genial spirit, a Christian gentleman, a laborious pastor, and a hard student, and was successful in all departments of Christian work. He was offered the presidency of three colleges, and at one time a professorship in one of the theological seminaries of the Church, but to none of these did he consider his health adequate. He was engaged during the latter part of his life in preparing a *Manual of Family Worship*. (W. P. S.)

Sutra

is the second division of the sacred writings of the Buddhists, addressed to the laity. The following will show how these sacred writings are classified: The *Dharmma*, divided into the *Suttani* and *Abhidhammani*; again divided into— 1. *Winaya*, or discipline; 2. *Sutra*, or discourses; 3. *Abhidharmma*, or pre-eminent truths. The Sutra Pitaka contains seven sections, called *Sangis*; and, including both text and commentary, has 396,500 stanzas. See Hardy, *Eastern Buddhism*.

Sutri

(near Rome), COUNCIL OF (*Concilium Sufrinuma*), was held in December, 1046, by Henry the Black, king of Germany. Gregory VI was invited to this council, and came; hoping to be recognized as sole pontiff; but, finding various difficulties and obstacles in the way, he renounced the

papacy, stripped himself of his ornaments, and gave back the pastoral staff, after having held the papal chair about twenty months. After the council, Henry, accompanied by the prelates who had been present, went to Rome, and by common consent of the Romans and Germans, Suidger was elected pope, who took the name of Clement II, and was consecrated on Christmas day. See Mansi, *Concil.* 9:943; Baronius, *Annal.* A.D. 1046.

Suttee

(Sansk. *sati*, *virtuous*, i.e. wife), the name given in Hindustan to a woman who voluntarily sacrifices herself by burning upon the funeral pyre of her husband, and also to the rite itself. The practice has not been confined to India, where it has had effect for many centuries, but has existed in other countries. Diodorus Siculus gives an instance, which occurred in the army of Eumenes more than 300 years B.C. The period of its origin in India is unknown, though it is certainly of great antiquity. Although the practice is not enjoined by their sacred books, yet it is based by the orthodox Hindus on the injunction of their Shastras, and there can be no doubt that various passages in their Puranas and codes of law countenance the belief which they entertain of its merit and efficiency. Thus the *Brahma Purdna* says, "No other way is known for a virtuous woman after the death of her husband; the separate cremation of her husband would be lost (to all religious intents). If her lord die in another country, let the faithful wife place his sandals on her breast, and, pure, enter the fire." The faithful widow is pronounced no suicide by the recited text of the *Rig-Veda*. The code of Vyasa says, "Learn the power of that widow who, learning that her husband has deceased and been burned in another region, speedily casts herself into the fire." And the code of Angiras, "That woman who, on the death of her husband, ascends the same burning pile with him is exalted to heaven, as equal in virtue to Arundhati (the wife of Vasishtha). She follows her husband to heaven, and will dwell in a region of joy for so many years as there are hairs on a human body, viz. thirty-five millions. As long as a woman (in her successive migrations) shall decline burning herself, like a faithful wife, on the same fire with her deceased lord, so long shall she not be exempted from springing again to life in the body of some female animal. When their lords have departed at the fated time of attaining heaven, no other way but entering the same fire is known for women whose virtuous conduct and whose thoughts have been devoted to their husbands, and who fear the dangers of separation."

The mode of performing suttee varies in some unimportant respects, but its principal features are the same. An oblong space, seven feet by six feet, is enclosed by bamboo stakes about eight feet long, driven into the earth, within which a pile is built of straw, boughs, and logs of wood. After certain prayers and ablutions have been gone through with, the body of the deceased husband is brought from the house and placed upon the pile; sometimes in a little arbor of wreathed bamboos, hung with flowers within and without. Then the wife appears, and is unveiled by the Brahmins, herself removing the ornaments from her person, distributing them among her friends, by whom they are highly prized. She reserves only one jewel, the *tali*, or amulet, placed round her neck by her deceased husband on the nuptial day. Led by the principal Brahmin, she walks three times around the pile, and then ascends to the side of her husband. Embracing the body she lies or sits beside it, whereupon the nearest relative applies the torch. The shrieks of the dying woman, if she utters any, are drowned by the shouts of the spectators and the noise of drums.

Efforts to suppress this rite were made as early as the 16th century by the Mohammedan emperor Akbar, but without much effect. The practice continued to such an extent that between 1815 and 1826 there were 7154 cases reported in Bengal alone. In 1829 lord Bentinck, governor-general, enacted a law declaring all aid assistance, or participation in any act of suttee to be murder, and punishable as such. In 1847, during lord Hardinge's administration, the prohibitory edict was extended to the native states in subsidiary alliance with the government of India, and the practice may be considered to be practically extinct.

An attempt, of late years, has been made by rajah Radhankant Deb to show that in a text belonging to a particular school of the *Black Yajur-Veda* there is really a passage which would justify the practice of suttee; but the text cited by him is of doubtful canonicity; and, moreover, there is a text in the *Rig-Veda* which, if properly read, directs the widow, after attending to her husband's funeral ceremonies, to return home and attend to her domestic duties. See Wilson. *On the: Supposed Vadic Authority for the Burning of Hindu Widows* (Lond. 1862), vol. 2.

Sutton, Alvah A.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Vermont, June 19, 1846. He went to Minnesota in 1869, and engaged in teaching and

farming. In 1873 he took work under the presiding elder, and supplied Long Prairie charge for two years. In 1875 he was ordained deacon, admitted into the Minnesota Conference, and appointed to the Brainerd Mission. He died Feb. 15, 1876. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1876, p. 126.

Sutton, Amos

an English missionary, was born at Sevenoaks, Kent, in 1798. He was ordained for the mission work at Derby in 1824, and sent to Orissa, India. He left this field once for a visit to England and America. His death took place at Cuttack, India, Aug. 17, 1854. He translated the Scriptures into Oriya, compiled an Oriya dictionary, grammar, and lesson-book, besides writing *The Family Chaplain* (Calcutta, 1831-32, 2 vols. 8vo): — *Rise and Progress of the Mission at Orissa* (Phila. 18mo): — *Orissa and its Evangelization* (Derby, Eng. 8vo; Boston, 1850, 8vo): — *hymn-book for Mission Congregations and Guide to the Savior*.

Sutton, Charles Manners, D.D.

an English prelate, was the fourth son of lord George Manners Sutton, and was born in 1755. He was educated at Emmanuel College, Cambridge; appointed dean of Peterborough, 1791; bishop of Norwich, 1792; dean of Windsor, 1794; and archbishop of Canterbury. 1805. He died July 21, 1828. *He published, Five British Species of Orobanche (Transactions of the Linn. Soc. 1797, 4:173): — Sermons (1794, 4to; 17.97; 4to). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.*

Sutton, Christopher

a learned English divine, was a native of Hampshire, and entered Hart Hall, Oxford, in 1582, aged seventeen years, but was soon transferred to Lincoln College. He was made prebendary of Westminster, 1605; prebendary of Lincoln, 1618, and died in 1629. He published, *Disce Mori* (Lond. 1600, 24mo, with several later editions, N. Y. 1845, 16 mo): — *Disce Vivere* (Lond. 1608, 12mo; 1853, 18mo; N. Y. 16mo): — *Godly Meditations upon the Most Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper* (Lond. 1622, 12mo; late editions, 1838, 1847, 1849; Oxf. 1839, 1844, 18mo; N. Y. 1841, 16mo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.*

Sutton, Henry

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born near Princeton, N.J., July 20, 1808. Leaving home, he resided for some time in Trenton, N.J., where he united with the Church. After preaching a year, he entered the Philadelphia Conference on trial in 1835. In 1858 he was made supernumerary, and after sustaining 'that' relation for several years, was placed on the superannuated list, and there remained until his death, in Philadelphia, Pa., March 23, 1876. He was then a member of the Wilmington Conference. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1877, p. 12.

Sutton, Richard

the co-founder of Brasenose College, Oxford, was the younger son of Sir William Sutton. Of the time or place of his birth we have no certain account, but we know that he practiced as a barrister of the Inner Temple. In 1490 he purchased some estates in Leicestershire, and afterwards increased his landed property in different counties. In 1498 he was a member of Henry VIII's privy council, and in 1505 was one of the governors of the Inner Temple. We find him, in 1513, acting as steward of the Monastery of Sion, near Brentford, Middlesex. He died about 1524. His bequests were almost all of a religious or charitable kind; His benefactions to Brasenose College were especially liberal, he having completed the building and doubled its revenues, besides leaving to it several valuable estates. He bore the expense of publishing the very rare book *The Orchard of Syon*.

Sutton, Stephen B.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Clermont County, O., Feb. 14, 1819, and united with the Church in February, 1837. He was licensed to preach March 16, 1844, and was admitted on trial into the Indiana Conference in October, 1851. He died at Martinsville, December, 1863. Mr. Sutton was very successful in his work, having admitted about 1275 persons into the Church. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1864, p. 201.

Sutton, Thomas (1)

founder of the Charterhouse school and hospital, was born at Knaith Lincolnshire, in 1532. He was educated at Eton and Cambridge, but at

what college is uncertain. After traveling abroad for some time, he returned home in 1562; was retained by the duke of Norfolk, and afterwards became secretary to the earl of Warwick and his brother, earl of Leicester. In 1569 he became master of ordnance at Berwick, and shortly after obtained a patent for the office of master-general of the ordnance of the North, which he retained until 1594. He entered into business, and was at the time of his death (at Hackney, Dec. 12, 1611) the richest untitled subject in the kingdom. He endowed the Charterhouse in 1611 with the bulk of his property. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Sutton, Thomas (2), D.D.

an English clergyman, was born at Bampton, Westmoreland, and entered Queen's College, Oxford, in 1602, at the age of sixteen. He became perpetual-fellow in 1611, lecturer of St. Helen's, Abington, Berks, and minister of Calham, and afterwards minister of St. Mary Overies, Southwark. He was drowned at sea in 1623. He published separate *Sermons* (Lond. 1615, 8vo; 1616, 8vo; 1626, 4to; i631, 4to): — *Lectures on Romans, ch. 11* (1632, 4to): — and left in MS. *Lectures on Romans, ch. 12.*, and *Psalm 119*. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Sutton, William

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Virginia about 1783, and in 1810 was licensed to preach. In 1823 he was ordained deacon by bishop M'Kendree, and in 1829 elder by bishop Roberts, and after this gave the Church faithful service for twenty-nine years. He died at London, Madison Co., O., Dec. 13, 1858. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences of the V. E. Church, South*, 1859, p. 190.

Suva

in Japanese mythology, is the god of the chase and the tutelary patron of all hunters. Large processions are annually formed in his honor.

Svadilfur

in Norse mythology, was a famous horse of the giant who built the castle of the gods. He projected a great fortress for the asas who were defending themselves against the ice-giants; and he offered himself as an architect to

erect it, provided they would give him three winters to finish it, and the beautiful Freia as a wife and the sun and moon as servants. By the advice of Loke, the asas accepted the offer, on the condition that he should fulfill it in one winter, and without any other help than the horse Svadilfur. The giant agreed to this, and his horse exhibited such extraordinary strength that he easily lifted stones of the greatest weight, which would have required a hundred horses to carry; and the building was already completed, except a single gate, before the asas had thought it possible. They then threatened Loke with death if he did not break up the contract. Loke thereupon assumed the form of a beautiful mare, and so engaged the stallion Svadilfur that he broke the rope by which he was held and followed Loke, who took him far enough away. From this connection sprang Odin's famous eight-footed horse Sleipner, who was fleeter than the wind and never tired. The architect saw himself deserted by his help, and sought to assume his gigantic form in order to finish the work with all his strength; but in the dilemma of the gods as to whether in that case they should abide by their word, or whether the giant should not be required to finish the work as he was, Thor suddenly appeared with his hammer and slew the giant.

Svaha

in Hindi mythology, was the spouse of the fire-god Agbi.

Svainshaugi

or SWAINS' HILL, in Norse mythology, was a place which appears to have been originally the residence of dwarfs, inasmuch as the *Edda* mentions several of these as coming thence to Orwanga (arrowfield) and Jornwall (iron or battle field).

Svaixdunoka

in Slavic mythology, was the brilliant bride of the star-god. She was worshipped by the heathen Prussians as a friendly, benign goddess, who kept the stars in their courses when her husband dropped their reins in his wild chase on the moon-car through storm and cloud.

Svaixtix

in Slavic mythology, was the god of the stars and of sunlight, whom the ancient Prussians revered in common with the Wends and Slavs in

Pomerania, etc. He was represented in exceedingly rich clothing, had flames and rays about his head, and a tuft of hair on the middle of his crown, which rose like a flame of fire. From old Rhetsean works of art we infer, notwithstanding the inscription which calls him *Belbog* (1. *biali bog*, a good deity, in opposition to *Czernebog*, the evil god), that he was a malicious deity, since he appears as fierce and forbidding; but we must bear in mind that sculpture must rise to a high grade before double and inviting forms can be represented. This Art was at that time in such infancy that we call only wonder how the figures are shapely at all. *Svaixtix* was the most benevolent deity; he illuminated the night by the glimmer of the stars, by the aurora and the snow light, and, like the sun god, imparted growth to seeds and warmth and fruitfulness to the soil.

Svakons

in Lettish mythology, were soothsayers who foretold fortunes from flame and the smoke of a light.

Svalgoni

in Lettish mythology, were priests who understood nuptialceremonies, examined bridegrooms and brides who were about to marry, tied the conjugal knot; and pronounced the blessing upon them in the name of Deity.

Svantevit

Picture for Svantevit

in Slavic mythology, was the most revered and conspicuous of the gods among the Wends. At Arkona, on the island of Rügen, stood his gigantic image, which was far and wide, for the whole southern coast of the Baltic Sea, the central point of worship.

Svantevit was an enormous colossus, which on four necks bore four heads with shorn hair and short beard. His clothing was like that of the Wends in general: a gown extending to the knees, made of cloth or felt, with long wide sleeves; a girdle held it together; the legs were bare; on the feet he wore coarse bark shoes; an immense sword hung at his side; and in the right hand he carried a large bow resting on the ground; his left hand held a cornucopia, which was annually filled with wine. In addition to these insignia, his image, which stood in Rhetra, had also a long- bearded human

head on the breast. Svantenvit was both a good and an evil deity, as the cornucopia and the bow indicated — the latter for war, the former for peace. He overshadowed the whole earth with his four heads; hence his counsel was highly prized and his oracles were the most conspicuous, as his cultus involved earthly power and authority. He was worshipped with drunken revelries, and large offerings, including, not unfrequently, human victims, were made; but, it would seem only when he was angry. His service was attended to by one high-priest, who, on the day of the great harvest festival, personally swept the temple, and that with restrained respiration, so as not to offend the god with his breath. Wine only was poured into his great cornucopia; and from the quantity that remained over from the preceding year an augury was drawn as to the abundance or otherwise of the next year's crop. The temple and the image of the god were destroyed by Waldemar I, on the baptism of the people. The public worship of this god thereafter ceased, although it privately continued, so that even now many old peasants regard the spot with superstitious awe. The interpretation of the name as *Holy Veit* (Sanctus Vitus) is probably only an instance of the corruption or extension of language.

Svartalfhein

in Norse mythology, was the native place of all evil genii or black elves.

Svarthoefde

in Norse mythology was the original ancestor of all magicians, who learned his art from the gods themselves, and transmitted it to his descendants.

Svasudes

in Slavic mythology, was the god of summer, represented by the warm beams of spring that introduced summer. He was worshipped by the Wends and Slavs as a deity of the second rank.

Svava

in Norse mythology, was a beautiful daughter of king Eylimi, who became famous through Helgi Haddinga, the son of Horward, king of Norway. The last had made a vow to call his own the fairest woman of the earth; and thus he already had three wives — Alphilid, the mother of Hedin; Sireid, the mother of Humlung; and Siniriod, the mother of Hilming — when he heard that Sigurlin was the handsomest of women. He immediately wooed

her through the jarl Atli, but was rejected through fear of other suitors. Thereupon he made war upon her father, and at length Seized Sigurlin. She was, howsoever, already the mother of a son, the famous Helgi, who remained quiet until the kindhearted Svava aroused him, gave him the name of Helgi, and allied herself to him as a godmother. Defended by the bad and charming Walkur, and armed with a never-failing sword, Helgi signalized himself by deeds of the greatest heroism; but he was, nevertheless, slain by Atli, the son of Hrodmar. No sooner, however, was Helgi reborn as the son of king Sigmund and the beautiful Borghili than Svava also reappeared in a second incarnation as the Shill virgin Sigrun. Helgi was but one day old when he stood in armor and longed for the battle and victory. He crept, in female attire, into the house of the powerful but wicked king Huindingur, explored it as a waiting-maid, and then attacked and slew him in a dreadful contest. Helgi next wooed the beautiful and formerly loved Svava, now Sigrun; but had yet to undergo many a severe-contest, since she was already betrothed to Hodbrod, a son of king Gramnar of Sweden, but not loved by her. Helgi attacked him also, overcame and slew him in a battle at Frekastein, and was approaching the goal of his wishes when a new obstacle arose in the person of his own brother Hedin. The latter was returning home to Julaabend when he met an ugly old witch, out of the forest, riding on a wolf, which she drove with reins of twisted snakes, and she offered herself as a Walkur to the beautiful youth as a protectress; but when he disdained her, she angrily cried, "Thou shalt pay for this with Braga's cup." When Hedin reached his home; he wildly swore that he would possess himself of Sigrun, his brother's bride, and he accordingly went immediately to seek his brother for that purpose. The latter not only treated him kindly, but, having been already mortally wounded in battle, surrendered her to his brother. When Helgi arrived in Walhalla, all the joys of heaven could not supply the place of the beautiful Sigrun; he therefore returned to his tomb, and rested there all night by the side of the lovely Sigrun till the morning light announced the end of his delight; and, mounting his steed, he returned to the halls of Walhalla. Helgi was a third time born as the *second* Haddinga, while Svava, likewise, a third time appeared as Kara, daughter of Hal'dan, who was king of Denmark, and, with the spouse of his daughter, ruled over land and sea.

Sverga Divi

in Hindu mythology, is a section of genii who execute the immediate commands of Indra, the Indian sun-god. They seem not to have a large form, since they often ask human help in order to defend them against the Assurs, or evil genii.

Sviartovit

(Slavic, *holy warrior*), the most celebrated deity of the ancient Baltic Slavonians, whose temple and idol were at Arkona, the capital of the island of Rügen. This last stronghold of Slavonic idolatry was taken and destroyed, A.D. 1168, by Waldemar I, king of Denmark. *SEE SLAVONIANS.*

Svidor and Svipall

in Norse mythology, are surnames of *Odin*.

Svipul

in Norse mythology, was one of the beautiful Walkurs, or female spirits who order the battle.

Swaddle

(*l t j* ; *to bandage*, *σπαργανόω*; but *j p f*; in ^{^{LXX}Lamentations 2:23, means *to bear, upon the palm*), to swathe an infant with cloths in order to keep its tender limbs from injury, a practice common in the East (^{^{LXX}Ezekiel 16:4; ^{^{LXX}Luke 2:7). *SEE BIRTH.*}}}

Swaddlers

an absurd nickname given by the Irish Roman Catholics to the early Methodists. It is said to have originated from John Cennick preaching a sermon on the Babe “wrapped in swaddling-clothes,” the ignorant Roman Catholics who heard it or heard of it supposing the “swaddling-clothes” to be an invention of the Protestants. In the year 1738 a ballad-singer named Butler actually raised riots in Dublin and elsewhere to the cry of “Five pounds for the head of a swaddler!” and he and his allies called themselves “Antiswaddlers.”

Swahili Version

The Swahili, which was formerly described as *Kisuaheli* (that is, “according to Swahili”), is spoken at Zanzibar and for a considerable distance down the East Coast of Africa, besides being likely to become an important means of communication with inland tribes. The language is evidently an offshoot of the Kaffir family, but is strongly impregnated with Arabic words, being a connecting-link between the two opposite families of speech. A tentative translation of the New Test. was made by the Rev. Dr. Krapf when in Eastern Africa a few years ago, but he never so far perfected his work as to render it prudent to propose its publication. Independently of Dr. Krapf's work, the attention of others had been drawn to this important subject; and when the Rev. Dr. Steere returned to England in 1869 he brought with him a translation of St. Matthew and the book of Psalms, which he had himself prepared during a residence of several years at Zanzibar. In the same year the Gospel of St. Matthew was printed; and as this was the first time any part of the Scriptures had been published in that language, and the circulation must of necessity be limited, only a small edition was issued. In 1871 the book of Psalms was printed, which was followed in 1875 by the publication of St. John's Gospel, and in 1877 by that of St. Luke, the latter as translated by the late missionary Rebmann, but with the orthography made to conform to that of bishop Steere. From the *Report* for the year 1877, we see that a proposal was made to use the Arabic characters for this version, but the committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society could not approve of it, inasmuch as the weight of evidence went to show that any natives who were acquainted with the Arabic characters could read the pure Arabic version, while for the rest the Kisuaheii in Roman characters was far simpler. Altogether the missionaries circulated in about nine years (i.e. since the publication of St. Matthew in 1869 to March 30, 1878) 4048 copies. Thus encouraged, bishop Steere is preparing a translation of the other books of the Bible. (B.P.).

Swaim, John Sanford

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Chatham, N.J., May 1, 1806, and united with the Church at the age of fourteen. He was admitted on trial in the Philadelphia Conference in 1834, and continued actively engaged in the pastorate until 1863. He then entered the Christian Commission, and was appointed to Hilton Head. In 1864 he was made

supernumerary, and appointed missionary to Jacksonville, Fla. Finding the climate congenial to his health, he continued to reside there until his death, Nov. 18, 1875. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1876, p. 42.

Swaim, Samuel Budd, D.D.

an able minister of the Baptist denomination, was born at Pemberton, N.J., June 22, 1809, and was a graduate of Brown University in the class of 1830 and of the Newton Theological Institution in the class of 1833. He was ordained at Haverhill, Mass., Nov. 7, 1833. For some time he was professor in Granville College (now Denison University). In 1838 he took charge of the First Baptist Church in Worcester, Mass., where his ministry was an eminently successful one, and continued sixteen years. From 1854 to 1862 he was pastor in West Cambridge, and then became an agent for the American Baptist Home Missionary Society. His death took place Feb. 3, 1865. (J. C.S.)

Swain, Charles W.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at New Bedford, Mass., Oct. 22, 1793. He united with the Church in Richmond, Clermont Co., O., in 1819, and in 1831 was admitted on trial into the Ohio Conference, and in due time received deacon's and elder's orders. He was actively engaged in the ministry (excepting one year's service as agent of the Ohio Wesleyan University) until the fall of 1855. In 1856 he took a superannuated relation, and made his home in Easton until his death, April 25, 1870. Mr. Swain assisted in organizing a temperance society in New Richmond, O., as early as Sept. 1, 1829, the first of the kind west of the Alleghany Mountains. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1870, p. 166.

Swain, Nathan

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in 1767, and converted when fourteen years of age. In 1799 he was admitted on trial in the Philadelphia Conference, in 1801 admitted into full connection and ordained deacon, and in 1803 ordained elder. He continued effective, with the exception of two years, until 1816, when he took a supernumerary relation, which he sustained until 1832, when he became superannuated, and so remained until his death, March 1, 1845. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 4:14.

Swain, Richard

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was a native of New Jersey. In 1789 he was admitted on trial, in 1791 into full connection, and filled the following stations: Trenton, N. J., in 1789; Flanders, in 1790-91; Middletown Circuit, Conn., in 1792; New London, in 1793; Salem, N. J, in 1794; Burlington, in 1795; Freehold, in 1796; Trenton, in 1797; Freehold, in 1798; Salem, in 1799 and 1800; Bethel, in 1801; Cape May, in 1802; Salem, in 1803. He became supernumerary in 1804-7, and died Jan. 17, 1808. He was a man of great usefulness in the ministry. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1, 159; Stevens, *Hist. of the M. E. Church*, 4:280; Bangs, *Hist. of the M. E. Church*, 2, 252.

Swallow

Picture for Swallow

is the rendering, in the A.'V., of two Heb. words, and possibly the true meaning of a third. None of them, however, are very clearly identifiable according to modern scientific classification.

1. **רְפוּנָה**, *deror*, prop. *liberty* (as often rendered), i.e. strictly *swiftness*, occurs in two passages only with reference to a bird: ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 84:3 (Hebrews 4), “The swallow [hath found] a nest;” ~~Proverbs~~ Proverbs 26:2, “as the swallow by flying.” The ancient versions, in the former passage, understand a *turtle-dove* (Sept. **τρογών**; Vulg. *turtur*), and in the latter a *sparrow* (**στρουθός**, *passer*). The radical signification of the word favors the idea that it may include the swallow, with other swiftly flying or free birds. The old commentators (so the rabbins), except Bochart (*Hieroz.* 2, 590 sq.), who renders it “*columba fera*,” apply it to the swallow, from the love of freedom in this bird and the impossibility of retaining it in captivity (De Wette, Umbreit, Ewald, Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 355). It is more likely that it was so named from its rapidity of flight. It probably, therefore, is more properly the “swift” or “black martin,” and probably the *dururi*, mentioned by Forskal, as migrating to Alexandria from Upper Egypt about the end of October (*Descript. Anim.* p. 10). The frequenting of public buildings by this class of birds (Herod. 1; 159; Elian, *V. H.* 5, 17) is proverbial (Schultens, *Monum. Vett. Arob. Carm.* p. 1; Niebuhr, *Reisen*, 2, 270),. **SEE SPARROW.**

2. **rWg[**; *agur*, the *twitterer*, also occurs twice: ^{<2384>}Isaiah 38:14, “Like a crane [or] a *swallow*, so did I chatter;” ^{<2487>}Jeremiah 8:7, “The turtle and the crane and the *swallow* observe the time.” In both these passages it is associated with a third term, **sWs**, *sus* (v.r. **sWsæsis**), rendered “crane,” but in the former passage the connective **w** (“and,” “or”) is wanting. The Sept. in Isaiah renders both words by the single one **χελιδών**, Vulg. *pullus hirundinis*; and in Jeremiah **χελιδών ἄγροῦ**, *hirn no et ciconia*; thus agreeing with the A.V. in denoting the *swallow*. Bochart, however (*Hieroz.* 2, 614 sq.), maintains that *agur* is the proper Hebrew designation of the crane. He compares the word with the Chald. **aykrwk**, *kurkeya*, the Arab. *kur’ki*, the Gr. **γέρανος**, the Welsh *garan*, and the Germ. *kran*, all of which are, like it, onomatopoeic. The twittering or querulous sound (**āxpx**) and the migratory habit are both characteristics, which meet in the crane; its cry is often compared by the poets with that of a person in distress or grief, and its migratory habits are frequently dwelt upon by ancient writers (Aristot. *Anim.* 8:12; Elian, *Aim.* 3, 13, 23; Pliny, 10:31; Quint. Curt. *Smyrn.* 2, 107; 13:102 sq.). This view has been followed by Rosenmüller, Maurer, and Henderson in their comments on Isaiah. Gesenius, though seeming to favor this view in his commentary on Isaiah, repudiates it in his *Thesaurus*, where he treats *agûr* as a verbal adjective signifying *chattering* or *twittering*, and regards it as an epithet of the swallow in the passage in, Isaiah, and as a designation of the swallow in that in Jeremiah. This is followed by Knobel (*Der Prophet Jesaia erkldrt*). It is in favor of this that in the former the copulative is wanting between the two words; but this may be explained as a case of asyndeton (as in ^{<2385>}Hosea 6:3; ^{<2386>}Habakkuk 3:11, etc.); whereas the insertion of the **w** in the other passage seems clearly to prove that *agûr* and *sus* denote different birds. Hitzig, indeed, proposes to strike out this copula, but without sufficient reason. Maurer derives **rWg[**; from an Arabic root signifying *turbavit aquam*, so as to designate an aquatic bird; Knobel would trace it to another Arabic root meaning *to mourn piteously*. The **sWs**, *sts*, if distinct from the **rWg[**; *agûr* is probably a large species of swallow, and the latter term, when not a mere epithet of the former, probably signifies a peculiar kind of heron. *Sis*, however, may perhaps be an imitative name expressive of the swallow’s voice or twitter; and in Dr. Kennicott’s remark that in thirteen codices of Jeremiah he read *Issi* for *sis*

we find the source of the ancient fable of the Egyptian *Isis* being transformed into a swallow. *SEE CRANE*.

Whatever be the precise rendering, the characters ascribed in the several passages where the names occur are strictly applicable to the swallow, viz. its swiftness of flight; its nesting in the buildings of the Temple, its mournful, garrulous note, and its regular migration, shared, indeed, in common with several others. We may observe that the garrulity of the swallow was proverbial among the ancients (see Nonn. Dionys. 2. 133, and Aristoph. *Batr.* 93). Hence its epithet *κωτιλάς*, “the twitterer,” *κωτιλάδας δὲ τὰς χελιδόνας*, Athen. 622.

See Anacr. 104, and ὀρθρογόη, Hesiod, *Op.* 566; and Virgil, *Georg.* 4:306. Although Aristotle, in his *Natural History*, and Pliny, following him, have given currency to the fable that many swallows bury themselves during winter, yet the regularity of their migration, alluded to by the prophet Jeremiah, was familiarly recognized by the ancients. See Anacreon (*Od.* 33). The ditty quoted by Athen. (360) from Theognis is well known Ἠλθ ἦλθε χελιδὼν καλὰς ὥρας ἄγουσα, Καλοὺς ἐνιαυτούς, ἐπὶ γαστέρα λευκά, ἐπὶ νῶτα μέλαινα. So Ovid (*Fast.* 2, 853), “Praenuntia veris hirundo.”

The species of Syria and Palestine, so far as they are known, appear all to be the same as those of Europe. The following are the most abundant: 1. *Cypselus spus* the common swift or black martin, distinguished by its larger size, short legs, very long wings, forked tail, and by all the toes of the feet turning forward; these, armed with small, crooked, and very sharp claws, enable the bird to hang against the sides of walls, but it cannot rise from the ground on account of the length of its wings. The last two, but more particularly this species, we take to be the *derar*, on account of the name *durari*, already mentioned; which was most probably applied to it because the swift martin prefers towers, minarets, and ruins to build in, and is, besides, a bird to which the epithet “free” is particularly applicable. On the European coast of the Mediterranean it bears the name of *barbota*, and in several parts of France, including Paris, is known by the vulgar name of “le Juif,” the Jew; and, finally, being the largest and most conspicuous bird of the species in Palestine, it is the type of the heraldic martlet, originally applied in the science of blazon as the especial distinction of Crusader pilgrims, being borrowed from Oriental nations, where the bird is likewise honored with the term *hagi*, or pilgrim, to designate its migratory habits.

The *deror* being mentioned as building o0 the altar seems to imply a greater generalization of the name than we have given it; for habits of nesting in immediate contact with man belong only to the house and window swallows; but in the present instance the expression is not meant to convey a literal sense, but must be taken as referring to the whole structure of the Temple, and in this view the swift bears that character more completely than the other. It is not necessary to dilate further on the history of a genus of birds so universally known. 2. *Flirundo rustica*, or *domestica* (Var. *Cahirica*), the chimney swallow, with a forked tail, marked with a row of white spots, whereof *Hirundo Syriaca*, if at all different, is most likely only a variety. 3. *Chelidon urbica*, the martin, or common window swallow. 4. *Cotyle riparia*, sand-martin, or shore-bird, not uncommon in Northern Egypt, near the mouths of the Delta, and in Southern Palestine, about Gaza, where it nestles in holes, even on the sea-shore. Besides these, the Eastern or russet swallow (*Hirundo rufula*, Tem.), which nestles generally in fissures in rocks, and the crag-martin (*Cotyle rupestris*, Linn.), which is confined to mountain gorges and desert districts, are also common. (See *Ibis*, 1, 27; 2, 386.) The crag-martin is the only member of the genus which does not migrate from Palestine in winter. Of the genus *Cypselus* (*swift*), besides the one first noted above, the splendid alpine swift (*Cypselus melba*, Linn.) may be seen in all suitable localities. A third species, peculiar, so far as is yet known, to the north-east of Palestine, has recently been described under the name of *Cypselus Galileensis*. See Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, p. 204; Wood, *Bible Annals*, p. 381 sq.; Lewysohn, *Zoologie des Talmuds*, p. 206. **SEE BIRD.**

Swan

Picture for Swan

is the rendering, in the A. V., of **תִּנְשֵׁמֶת** *tinshemeth*, in two of the three passages where this word occurs, namely, ^{<B118>}Leviticus 11:18; ^{<B146>}Deuteronomy 14:16, where it stands in the list of unclean birds (Sept. **πορφυρίων, ἰβίς**; Vulg., copyingly, *potphyrio, ibis*; Samaritan the same). Bochart (*Hieroz.* 2, 290) explains it *noctua* (owl), and derives the name from **μῖν**; *shacidm*, “to astonish,” because other birds are startled at the apparition of the owl. Gesenius suggests the *pelican*, from **נָח**; “to breathe, to puff,” with reference to the inflation of its pouch. Whatever may have been the bird intended by Moses, these conjectures cannot be admitted as

satisfactory, the owl and pelican being both distinctly expressed elsewhere in the catalogue. Giggeius wavered between these two; and Dr. Mason Harris, seemingly not better informed, and confounding the American ‘red species with the white one of Africa, guessed that *porphyrio* must “mean the *flamingo*. Parkhurst deriving the word from $\mu\psi\eta$, *nashdm*, “to breathe,” was inclined to render *tinshemeth* by “goose;” but as this bird is not by the present Jews deemed unclean, it may be confidently assumed that no mistake in this matter can have occurred during any period, and consequently that the goose cannot have been marked unclean by the law and afterwards admitted among the clean birds with its name transferred to another species. The Hebrew *Dictionary* by Selig. Newman, it is true, renders *tinsheth* “swan;” but the Polyglots show the great uncertainty there is in several of the names of both the chapters in question. The swan, for which some recent scholars contend, asserting that it was held sacred in Egypt, does not occur, so far as has been ascertained, in any Egyptian ancient picture, and is not a bird which, in migrating to the south, even during the coldest seasons, appears to proceed farther than France or Spain, though, no doubt, individuals may be blown onward in hard gales to the African shore. Only two instances of swans have been noticed so far to the south as the sea between Candia and Rhodes: one where a traveler mentions his passing through a flock reposing on the sea during the night; the other recorded by Hasselquist, who saw one on the coast of Egypt. But it may be conjectured that they mistook pelicans for swans, particularly as the last mentioned are fresh-water birds, and do not readily take to the true salt sea. Mr. Strickland, indeed, says of the mute swan (*Cygnus olo*), that it visits Smyrna Bay in winter; and Mr. Yarrell, on the authority of Mr. Bennett, tells us that the hooper (*C. ferus*) sometimes goes as far south as Egypt and Barbary. He adds that “they visit Corfu and Sicily in very severe winters; and Mr. Drummond saw a few on the lakes of Biserta, and one in the Lalke of Tunis at the end of April, 1845.” But these are very rare instances. Nor, if it had been known to the Israelites, is it easy to understand why the swan should have been classed among the unclean birds. The renderings of the Sept., *porphyrio* and *ibis*, are either of them more probable. Neither of these birds occurs elsewhere in the catalogue. The porphyrio, or purple gallinule, cannot have been unknown to the translators, as it was, no doubt, common in the Alexandrian temples, and was then, as it is now, seen both in Egypt and Palestine. $\Pi\omicron\rho\phi\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$, *porphyrio antiquorumsm*, *Bp.*, the purple water-hen, is mentioned by Aristotle (*thist. Anim.* 8:8), Aristophanes (*Av.* 707), Pliny (*Hist. Nat.*

10,63); and is more fully described by Athenaeus (*Deipn.* 9:388). The circumstance of the same Heb. name being given to the chameleon (see below) may have arisen from both having the faculty of changing colors, or being iridescent; the first, when angry, becoming green, blue, and purple-colors which likewise play constantly on the glossy parts of the second's plumage. The porphyrion is superior in bulk to the common water-hen, or gallinule; has a hard crimson shield on the forehead, and flesh-colored legs; the head, neck, and sides are of a beautiful turquoise blue, the upper and back parts of a dark but brilliant indigo. It is allied to the corn-crake, and is the largest and most beautiful of the family *Rallidae*, being larger than the domestic fowl. From the extraordinary length of its toes, it is enabled, lightly treading on the flat leaves of water-plants, to support itself without immersion, and apparently to run on the surface of the water. It frequents marshes and the sedge by the banks of rivers in all the countries bordering on the Mediterranean, and is abundant in Lower Egypt. Athenaeus has correctly noted its singular habit of grasping its food with its very long toes and thus conveying it to its mouth. It is distinguished from all the other species of *Rallidae* by its short, powerful mandibles, with which it crushes its prey, consisting often of reptiles and young birds. It will frequently seize a young duck with its long feet, and at once crunch the head of its victim with its beak. It is an omnivorous feeder, and, from the miscellaneous character of its food, might reasonably find a place in the catalogue of unclean bird. Its flesh is rank, coarse, and very dark-colored. It was anciently kept tame in the precincts of pagan temples, and therefore, perhaps, was marked unclean, as most, if not all, the sacred animals of the heathens were. When, in the decline of idolatry, the dog, peacock, ibis, the purple bird in question, and other domesticated ornaments of the temples had disappeared, Gesner's researches show how early and long the writers of the Middle Ages and of the Revival of Literature were perplexed to find again the porphyrion of the ancients, although modern naturalists have not the shadow of a doubt upon the subject, the species being, moreover, depicted upon Egyptian monuments. The *Porphyrio hyacinthinus* is the species most common in Europe, although there are several others in Asia and Africa; *Porphyrio erythropus*, abundant on the southeast coast of Africa, appears to be that which the pagan priests most cherished.

The same Heb. word *tinshemeth* (תִּנְשֵׁמֶת) as Sept. ἀσπάλαξ v.r. σπάλαξ; Vulg. *talpa*) in ⁽⁸¹¹³⁾Leviticus 11:30, being found among the unclean “creeping things that creep upon the earth,” evidently no longer stands for

the name of a bird, and is rendered “mole” by the A. V., adopting the interpretation of the Sept., Vulg., Onkelos, and some of the Jewish doctors. Bochart has, however, shown that the Heb. *choled* (כֹּהֵל) the Arabic *khuld* or *khild*, denotes the “mole,” and has argued with much force in behalf of the “chameleon” being the *tinshemeth*. The Syriac version and some Arabic MSS. understand “a centipede” by the original word, the Targum of Jonathan a “salamander;” some Arabic versions read *sammaldbras*, which Golius renders “a kind of lizard.” In ^{<BIB>}Leviticus 11:30, the “chameleon” is given by the A. V. as the translation of the Heb. *choach* (חֹאֵךְ), which in all probability ‘denotes some larger kind of lizard. **SEE CHAMELEON.** The only clue to an identification of *tinshemeth* is to be found in its etymology, and in the context in which the word occurs. Bochart conjectures that the root (נָשַׁם; *nashdm*, to breathe) from which the Heb. name of this creature is derived has’ reference to a vulgar opinion among the ancients that the chameleon lived on air (comp. Ovid, *Met.* 15:411, “Id quoque quod ventis animal nutritur et aura,” and see numerous quotations from classical authors cited by Bochart, *Hieroz.* 2, 505). The lung of the chameleon is very large, and when filled with air it renders the body semi-transparent; from the creature’s power of abstinence, no doubt, arose the fable that it lived on air. It is probable that the animals mentioned with the *tinshemeth* (^{<BIB>}Leviticus 11:30) denote different kinds of lizards; perhaps, therefore, since the etymology of the word is favorable to that view, the chameleon may be the animal intended by *tinshemeth* in the above passage. As to the change of color in the skin of this animal, numerous theories have been proposed; but, as this subject has no scriptural bearing, it will be enough to refer to the explanation given by Milne-Edwards, whose paper is translated in vol. 17 of the *Edinburgh New Philosophical Journal*. The chameleon belongs to the tribe *Dendi-osaura*, order *Sazura*; the family inhabits *Asia* and *Africa* and’ the south of *Europe*. The *Chameleo vulgaris* is doubtless the species mentioned in the Bible. See Tristram, *Natiural iistory of the Bible*, p. 249; Wood, *Bible Animals*, p. 87, 488. **SEE LIZARD.**

Swan

(myth. and astron.), a beautiful constellation in the Milky-way, which may be readily known from the five bright stars, arranged in the form of a cross, of which it is composed. It is situated between Cepheus and Vipes, to the east of the Lyre. On bright wintry nights the naked eye may count a

hundred and fifty stars in this large constellation. The Swan commemorates the form chosen by Jupiter when he deceived Nemesis and Leda, or possibly the singing swan, sacred to Apollo, *into* which Orpheus was, at death, transformed.

Swan, Roswell Randall

a Congregational minister, was born at Stonington, Conn., June 16, 1778; was fitted for college by Rev. Hezekiah N. Woodruff, of Stonington, and graduated from Yale College in 1802. He united with the College Church Dec. 1, 1799. His purpose to enter the ministry was not formed until March, 1804, and shortly after he commenced the study of theology under Dr. Emmons, of Franklin, Mass. In October of the same year, after a severe illness, he continued his studies with Dr. Perkins, of West (Hartford). His license to preach was granted him by the Hartford North Association, at Northampton, Feb. 6, 1805. Owing to ill-health, he did not immediately settle, but in December took charge of an academy in Stonington, and supplied the vacant Church there. He was ordained pastor of the Church in Norwalk Jan. 14, 1807, where he continued until his death, March 22, 1818.

See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 2, 485.

Swan, Samuel

a Presbyterian minister, was born in the island of Dominica, Nov. 30, 1798. While Samuel *was* a child his father returned to his native country, Scotland. Here the son received a liberal education, completing his course at the Glasgow *University*. At the age of nineteen he came with the family to Philadelphia, from whence he soon went to Princeton Seminary. He was licensed to preach by the Philadelphia Presbytery April 17, 1823, and received as a licentiate in the Presbytery of Huntington, Pa. He received a call from the Sinking Valley Church, which he declined to accept, and was dismissed to the Redstone Presbytery. His next call was to the churches of Fairfield, Ligonier, and Donegal, which he accepted, and was installed June 17, 1824. He proved to be a devoted, self-denying, and successful pastor, and for seventeen years and a half retained the esteem and growing confidence of his three churches. Becoming seriously crippled by a shivered limb, he was compelled to relinquish so extensive a charge, and he accordingly resigned, and accepted a call to the Johnstown Church, Pa., where he was installed in 1841. Half of his time was occupied by the

Church at Armagh. Here he continued until 1855. In 1856 he removed to Leland, La Salle Co., Ill., where he made an extensive purchase of land; and though he had no pastoral charge, he continued' to preach the Gospel as he had opportunity. From 1869 to 1871 he resided at Aurora, Ill. For the purpose of giving his children an education, he returned East, and, though advanced in years, continued to preach until the end of his pilgrimage, Aug. 5, 1877 (W. P. S.).

Swanger, John P.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Mifflin County, Pa., Feb. 15, 1836. He was converted and united with the Church in 1854; and' in 1859 was received on trial in the East Baltimore Conference. His ministry, however, was of short duration, as he died June 29, 1867, in Baltimore.

See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1868, p. 27.

Swarm

is the rendering, in the A. V., of two very different Hebrew words.

1. **hd[ē** *edâh* (usually rendered "congregation" or "assembly"), is employed to designate the swarm of bees and honey found by Samson in the lion's carcass (⁻⁰⁷¹⁴⁸⁻Judges 14:8). The lion which Samson slew had been dead some little time before the bees had taken up their abode in the carcass, for it is expressly stated that "after a time" Samson returned and saw the bees and honey in the lion's carcass, so that "if," as Oedmann has well observed, "anyone here represents to himself a corrupt and putrid carcass, the occurrence *ceases* to have any true similitude, for it is well known that in these countries, at certain seasons of the year, the heat will, in the course of twenty-four hours, so completely dry up the moisture of dead camels, and that without their undergoing decomposition, that *their* bodies long remain, like mummies, unaltered and entirely free from offensive odor." To the foregoing quotation we may add that very probably the ants would help to consume the carcass, and leave, perhaps, in a short time, little else than a skeleton. Herodotus (5. 114) speaks of a certain Oinesilus, who had been taken prisoner by the Amathusians and beheaded, and whose head, having been suspended over the gates, had become occupied by a swarm of bees; comp. also Aldrovandus (*De Insect.* 1, 110). Dr. Thomson (*Land and Book*, 2, 362) mentions this occurrence

of a swarm of bees in a lion's carcass as an extraordinary thing, and makes an unhappy conjecture that perhaps "hornets," *debabir* in Arabic, are intended, "if it were known," says he, "that they manufactured honey enough to meet the demands of the story." It is known however, that hornets do not make honey, nor do any of the family *Vespidae*, with the exception, so far as has been hitherto observed, of the Brazilian *Nectarina mellifica*. *SEE BEE*.

2. bl [; 'arôb, is the term applied to the fourth of the plagues (q.v.) of Egypt (⁴⁰⁸⁸Exodus 8:8-31; "divers sorts of flies," ⁴⁰⁸⁵Psalm 78:45; 105:31). It is regarded by most interpreters as a species of *gadfly*, or *tabanus* (Michaelis, *Supplem.* p. 1960), such as is still very troublesome to animals in Egypt (Forsk. *Descr. Amnin.* p. 85; Rippell, *Arab.* p. 73). See Bochart, *flieroz.* 3, 472; Werner, in the *Miscell. Lips. Nov.* 3, 201 sq. *SEE FLY*.

Swayze, John J.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Poughkeepsie, N.Y., Aug. 30, 1812. He was received on trial in the Pittsburgh Conference in 1829, and labored with great acceptability, filling the office of presiding elder, nine successive years. He took a superannuated relation in 1852 and died Feb. 18, 1853. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1853, p. 242.

Swayze, William

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Sussex County, N. J., Nov. 18, 1784. In his youth he was led by a pious African; to hear a Methodist preacher near Baltimore, was converted, and soon after felt impressed that it was his duty to preach the Gospel, and labored as a local preacher to great advantage for several years. He was admitted into the New York Conference on trial in May, 1807, and for eight years labored successfully within the bounds of that conference. "He became emphatically a son of thunder, attracting great crowds of people to his ministry, and speaking with a power and pathos that few have ever equaled, moving and exciting many-some to tears, others to cry for mercy, while others would shout for joy" (Gregg, p. 177). In 1816 he was transferred to the Ohio Conference; in 1817 appointed to Columbus Circuit; in 1818 to Deer Creek Circuit, including Chillicothe; in 1820 presiding elder of Ohio District, where "his labors, for almost four years, were crowned with unexampled success." In

1824, by the division made by the General Conference, he fell in the Pittsburgh Conference, and was appointed to Erie District; in 1828 to-Canton District; in 1830, conference missionary; in 1832, retransferred to Ohio Conference; in 1834 to Pittsburgh Conference; after which, he was superannuated until death, March 29, 1841. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 3, 238; Stevens, *Hist. of the M.E. Church*, 4:339-341. (J.L.S.).

Swearing

Picture for Swearing

(some form of **hl a**; or [**biv**; ὄμνυμι]), is an appeal to God in attestation of the truth of what one says, or in confirmation of what one promises or undertakes. The Latin term is *jusjurandum* or *juramentum*. Cicero (*De Officiis*, 3, 29) correctly terms an oath a religious affirmation; that is, an affirmation with a religious sanction. This appears from the words which he proceeds to employ: “Quod autem affirmate, quasi Deo teste, promiseris, id tenendum est. Jam enim non ad iram deorum, quae nulla est, sed ad justitiam et ad fidem pertinet;” which in effect means that an oath is an appeal to God, as the source and the vindicator of justice and fidelity. Hence it appears that there are two essential elements in an oath—first, the human, a declared intention of speaking the truth or performing the action in a given case; secondly, the divine, an appeal to God, as a being who knows all things and will punish guilt. According to usage, however, there is a third element in the idea which “oath” commonly conveys, namely, that the oath is taken only on solemn, or, more specifically, on juridical occasions. The canon law gives all three elements when it represents *judicium veritas, justitia* as entering into the constitution of an oath *judicium*, judgment or trial on the part of society; *veritas*, truth on the part of the oath-taker; *justitia*, justice on the part of God.

The practice of taking oaths existed before the time of Moses. It is found as early as the days of Abraham, who made the oldest servant of his family swear he would select for Isaac a wife of his own kindred (^(024E)Genesis 24:2, 3, 37). It is here observable that the oath is a private, not a judicial one; only that the authority of Abraham, as patriarch, must be taken into account. An oath was sometimes a public and general bond, obliging the parties who took it to a certain course—a case in which it appears to have been spontaneous and voluntary; as when, in Judges 21 the men of Israel

swore, saying, “There shall not any of us give his daughter unto Benjamin to wife” (comp. ver. 5). From ^{<1180>}1 Kings 18:10, it appears to have been customary to require, on occasions of great concern, a public oath, embracing even an entire “kingdom and nation;” but whether taken individually or by some representative we have no means of ascertaining. Such a custom, however, implying as it does a doubt of the public faith of a people, would hardly be submitted to, unless on the part of an inferior.

Oaths did not take their origin in any divine command. They were a part of that consuetudinary law which Moses found prevalent, and was bound to respect, since no small portion of the force of law lies in custom and a legislator can neither abrogate nor institute a binding law of his own mere will. Accordingly, Moses made use of the sanction which an oath gave, but in that general manner, and apart from minute directions and express words of approval, which shows that he merely used, without intending to sanction, an instrument that he found in existence and could not safely dispense with. Examples are found in ^{<0221>}Exodus 22:11, where an oath is ordered to be applied in the case of lost property; and here we first meet with what may strictly be called a judicial oath (^{<0813>}Leviticus 6:3-5).

An oath, making an appeal to the divine justice and power, is a recognition of the divinity of the being to whom the appeal is made. Hence to ‘swear by an idol’ is to be convicted of idolatry. Such an act is accordingly given in Scripture as a proof of idolatry and a reason for condign punishment. “How shall I pardon thee for this? Thy children have forsaken me, and sworn by them that are no gods” (^{<3487>}Jeremiah 5:7; 12:16; ^{<3184>}Amos 8:14; ^{<3005>}Zephaniah 1:5).

This appeal to God was in frequent use among the Hebrews, as a confirmation of both statements (^{<4054>}Matthew 26:74) and promises (^{<0906>}1 Samuel 19:6; 20:17; ^{<0823>}2 Samuel 19:23; 15:21; 1 Macc. 7:35. For covenant oaths, see ^{<0353>}Genesis 31:53 sq.; ^{<0895>}Joshua 9:15; ^{<2104>}2 Kings 11:4; 1 Macc. 7:15; Josephus, *Ant.* 14:1,2. For oaths of allegiance see ^{<0652>}2 Samuel 15:21; Josephus, *Ant.* 15:10, 4) in both public and private life (e.g. ^{<0215>}Judges 21:5; ^{<1180>}1 Kings 18:10; ^{<5105>}Ezra 10:5; and ^{<0257>}Genesis 24:37; 1, 5; ^{<0447>}Matthew 14:7), as also before the Judges (^{<0221>}Exodus 22:11; ^{<0813>}Leviticus 6:3, 5); but the Mosaic law does not attempt to regulate its use. Perjury is forbidden (^{<0892>}Leviticus 19:12), but on religious grounds, as a profanation of God’s name. The usual oath was by Jehovah (^{<0813>}Deuteronomy 6:13; comp. ^{<0142>}Genesis 14:22; ^{<0207>}Judges 21:7; ^{<0817>}Ruth

1:17; ^{<0444>}1 Samuel 14:44; ^{<0897>}2 Samuel 19:7; 1 Kings 1, 29; 2, 23; ^{<2998>}Isaiah 19:18; 65:16; ^{<3002>}Jeremiah 1:2; 38:16), while the apostates swore by strange gods (5:7; 12:16; ^{<3084>}Amos 8:14; ^{<3006>}Zephaniah 1:5). Sometimes an oath was made by- the life of the person addressed (2 Kings 2, 2; 1 Samuel 1, 26; 20:3; comp. Euripides, *Hel.* 835), by the life of the king (^{<0775>}1 Samuel 17:55; 25:26; ^{<0011>}2 Samuel 11:11), or by his head, even when not in his presence (a common oath in Egypt, ^{<0425>}Genesis 42:15, and still used in Persia, Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* 1, 200 sq.; Morier, *Second Journey*; comp. Strabo, 12:557; Herodotus, 4:68; Curtius, 6:11, 18; Lucian, *Catapl.* 11; Suetonius, *Calig.* 27; Vegetius, *De Re Mil.* 2, 5; Tertullian, *Apol.* 52; Zorn, *Biblioth. Antiq.* 1, 812 sq. In the *Gospel according to Nicodemus*, *Pilate swears the safety of Caesar*; comp. Rein, *Rom. Criminalrecht*, p. 534). More rarely, the oath was by the head of the swearer (^{<0155>}Matthew 5:36; comp. Virgil, *En.* 9:300; Ovid, *Trist.* 4:4, 45; Juvenal, 6:17), by some important member of the body, as the eyes (Ovid, *Amor.* 3, 3, 13; Tibullus, 3, 6,47; Plautus, *Mencec.* 5, 9,1); by the earth (Matthew 5, 35; Sil. Ital. 8:105; Euripides, *Hippolytus*, 1029); by heaven and the sun (^{<0153>}Matthew 5:34; Talmud Babyl. *Berach.* 55; comp. Kor. 91, 5; 53, 1; 56, 77; Virgil; *En.* 12:176, 197; 9:429; Aristophanes, *Eq.* 705; Plutarch, 129; Euripides, *Medea*, 746; Pausanias, 8:18, 1; Philostratus, *Her.* 2, 11; and Wettstein, 1, 305); by the angels (Josephus, *War*, 2, 16, 4)... It was a part of the punctiliousness of the later Jews to prefer rather to swear by the sun, the earth, or heaven than by God himself (Philostratus. 2, 271). Some swore by the Temple (^{<0236>}Matthew 23:16; comp. Lightfoot, p. 280), or parts of it (^{<0236>}Matthew 23:16; comp. Wettstein *ad loc.*), or by Jerusalem, the holy city (^{<0155>}Matthew 5:35; Mishna, *Kethuboth*, 2, 9; Lightfoot, p. 280). So among other ancient nations, the altar was touched in swearing (comp. Doughtaeus, *Analect.* 2, 26; Lakemacher, *Observ.* 9:112 sq. on Sil. Ital. 3, 82. On the oath CORBAN *SEE CORBAN* [q.v.], see Josephus, *Apion*, 1, 22, 453).

The form of swearing by Jehovah, always the most usual oath (see above), was very simple, "The Lord do this or that to me if I swear falsely" (^{<0817>}Ruth 1:17; ^{<0889>}2 Samuel 3:9, 35; ^{<1023>}1 Kings 2:23; ^{<1161>}2 Kings 6:31), or "As Jehovah liveth" (*hw̄h̄w̄lyj i* or *pyh̄t̄æ, yj i* ^{<0883>}Ruth 3:13; ^{<0889>}Judges 8:19; ^{<1023>}2 Samuel 2:27; ^{<2886>}Jeremiah 38:16); at greater length, "Jehovah be a true and faithful witness between us" (*tm̄ d [e]w̄nB; hw̄h̄w̄lyj* ^{<2405>}Jeremiah 42:5). Formulas of terrible import were used by the later Jews (see Josephus, *Life*, § 53; comp. Lysias, *Pro. Con. Aristoph.* 32). Of the

ceremonies usually observed by those who took oaths we know but little. In patriarchal antiquity it was usual to put the hand under the thigh (^{<024D>}Genesis 24:2; 47:29). On this practice Abenezers observes, "It appears probable to me that the meaning of this custom was as if the superior said, with the consent of his slave, If thou art under my power, and therefore prepared to execute my commands, put thy hand, as a token, under my thigh." Winer, however, thinks that, as it was usual to swear by the more important parts of the human frame, so this was a reference to the generative powers of man. But see on this interpretation, as well as on the general question of swearing by parts of the body, Meiner, *Gesch. der Relig.* 2, 286 sq. It is, however, certain that it was usual to touch that by which a person swore. Other instances may be seen in Niedek, *De Populor. Adorat.* p. 213 sq., and p. 218, which go immediately to confirm the idea advanced by Winer. The Targum of Jonathan (on ^{<024D>}Genesis 24:2) supposes the hand to have been placed on the section of circumcision (comp. Jerome, *ad loc.*). Gramberg (*Religionusid.* 1, 439) most strangely connects this custom with the licentious worship of Baal and Astarte. (For other views see Dreyer, *Miscel. ib. einige Gegenst. deuteusch. Rechts*, p. 115 sq.; Mahn, in Bertholdt's *Journ.* 7:118 sq.).

The more usual employment of the hand was to raise it towards heaven; designed, probably, to excite attention, to point out the oath-taker, and to give solemnity to the act (^{<014D>}Genesis 14:22, 23). In the strongly anthropomorphic language of parts of the Scripture even God is introduced saying, "I lift up my hand to heaven, and say, I live forever" (^{<034D>}Deuteronomy 32:40). Some suppose that a similar license is employed whenever the Almighty is represented as in any way coming under the obligation of an oath (^{<0226>}Genesis 22:16, 17; ^{<0168>}Exodus 6:8; ^{<0316>}Ezekiel 20:5; ^{<0367>}Hebrews 6:17). Instead of the head, the phylactery was sometimes touched by the Jews on taking an oath (Maimon. *Shebuoth*, c. 11). Even the Deity is sometimes introduced as swearing by phylacteries (*Tanch.* fol. 6:3; *Otho, Lex.* p. 757). "Giving the hand" (^{<0382>}Ezekiel 18:12) was a ceremony used between equals; the violation of this pledge was believed to be a most atrocious crime, and hence the prophet denounces vengeance on the king of Babylon, who had broken a covenant after having "given his hand." We meet with the representation of the pledge given by the joining of hands, in connection with some religious ceremony, on many ancient coins, of which the accompanying engravings are specimens. They are taken from golden coins in the British Museum. *SEE HAND.* Swearing by

dipping the hands in the blood of a victim was the most solemn form of oath among the ancient Greeks, and was chiefly used in concluding alliances offensive and defensive. *SEE COVENANT.*

The Rabbinical writers indulge in much prolixity on the subject of oaths, entering into nice distinctions, and showing themselves exquisite casuists. A brief view of their disquisitions may be seen in Otho, *Lex.* p. 347 sq. Some oaths they, declared invalid: “If any one swear by heaven, earth, the sun, and such things, although there may be in his mind while using these words a reference to Him who created them, yet this is not an oath; or if any one swear by one of the prophets or by some book of Scripture, having reference to Him who sent the prophet and gave the book, nevertheless this is not an oath” (Maimon. *Hal. Shebuoth*, c. 12) S So the Mishna (*Shebuoth*, c. 4): “If any one adjures another by heaven or earth, he is not held bound by this.” It is easy to see that oaths of this nature, with authoritative interpretations and glosses so lax, could hardly fail to loosen moral obligation, and to lead to much practical perjury and impiety. Minute casuistical distinctions undermine the moral sense.: When a man may swear and yet not swear, by the same formula appear to bind himself and yet be free, contract with his associates an obligation from which he may be released by religious authorities, the basis of private virtue and the grounds of public confidence are at once endangered. Besides, the practice of unauthorized and spontaneous oath-taking, which seems even in the earlier periods of Jewish history to have been too common, became, about the time of our Lord, of great frequency, and must have, tended to lower the; religious as well as weaken the moral character. Peter’s conduct is a striking case in point, who “began to curse and to swear, saying, I know not the man” (^{<A1574>}Matthew 26:74). An open falsehood thus asserted and maintained by oaths and imprecations shows how little regard there was at that time paid to such means of substantiating truth. The degree of guilt implied in such lamentable practices is heightened by the emphasis with which the Mosaic law guarded the sanctity of the divine name and prohibited the crime of perjury and profanation (^{<A1211>}Exodus 20:7; ^{<B1912>}Leviticus 19:12; ^{<B1511>}Deuteronomy 5:11; Matthew 5, 33).

The levity of the Jewish nation in regard to oaths, though reprovved by some of their doctors (Otho, *Lex.* p. 351: Philo, 2, 194), was notorious; and when we find it entering as an element into popular poetry (Martial, 11:9) we cannot ascribe the imputation to the known injustice of heathen writers towards the Israelites. This national vice, doubtless, had an

influence with the Essenes (q.v.) in placing the prohibition of oaths among the rules of their reformatory order. Modern Orientals habitually use the exclamation *Inshallah* (“in the name of God”) on the most trivial occasions.

That no case has been made out by Christian commentators in favor of judicial swearing we do not affirm; but we must be excused if we add that the case is a very weak one, wears a casuistical appearance, and as if necessitated in order to excuse existing usages and guard against errors imputed to unpopular sects, such as the Quakers and Mennonites. In inferential and merely probable conclusions, such as the case consists of, may be allowed to prevail against the explicit language of Jesus and James, Scripture is robbed of its certainty, and prohibitions the most express lose their force. For instance, it has been alleged that our Lord himself took part in an oath when, being adjured by the high-priest, he answered “Thou hast said” (⁴¹⁶⁶Matthew 26:63, 64). But what has this to do with his own doctrine on the point? Placed at the bar of judgment, Jesus was a criminal, not a teacher, bound by the laws of his country which it was a part of his plan never unnecessarily to disregard to give an answer to the question judicially put to him, and bound equally by a regard to the great interests which he had come into the world to serve. Jesus did not swear, but was sworn, The putting the oath he could not prevent. His sole question was, Should he answer the interrogatory? a question which depended on considerations of the highest moment, and which he who alone could judge decided in the affirmative. That question in effect was, “Art thou the Messiah?” His reply was a simple affirmative. The employment of the adjuration was the act of the magistrate, to have objected to which would have brought on Jesus the charge of equivocation, if not of evasion, or even the denial of his “high calling.” The general tendency of this article is to show how desirable it is that the practice of oath-taking of all kinds, judicial as well as others, should at least be diminished till, at the proper time, it is totally abolished; for whatsoever is more than a simple affirmation cometh from the Evil One, *ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ*. (⁴¹⁶⁷Matthew 5:37), and equally leadeth to evil. See Lydii *Diss. de Juramento*; Nicolai, *De Juram. Hebræorum, Græcorum, sRomeanorum, aliorumque Populorum*; Seldeii *Diss. de Juramentis*; Molembecii *De Juramento per Genium Principis*; Speiceri *Diss. de Juramento per Anchialum*— all of which may be found in vol. 26 of Ugolino’s *Thesaurus Antiq. Sacr.* See also Hansen, *De Juranment. Vett.* in Grsevius, *Thesaurus*; Carpzov,

Appar. p. 652 sq.; Steinler, *De Jurejur. Sec. Discip. Heb.* (Lips. 1736); Purmann, *De Jurejur. ex lMente f' ebr.* (Franakf. 1782); Valckenaer, *De Ritib. in Jurejur. a Vet. Hebr. et Grt c. Observ.* (Eraneck. 1735; and in Oelrich's *Collect.* I.,2, 1.75 sq.); especially Bassek, *De Jurejur. Ve. impr. Rom.* (Traj. ad Rh. 17.27); Lasaulx, *Ueb. d. Eid bei d. Griech., (Watirzb.* 1844).; *Ueb. d. Eid bei d. Rom.* (ibid. 1844); Otho, *Lex.' Rabbin.* p. 347 sq. more recent authority. may be found in Stiaudlin; *Geschichte der Vorstell.* s.v. "Eide;" see also Tyler, *Oaths: their Origin, etc.* **SEE OATH.**

Swearing, Profane,

was severely condemned in the ancient Church, and seems to have been a common practice. Swearing, or foolish or wicked adjurations by any creature or daemon, by the emperor's genius, by angel and by saint, were reprobated. Perjured persons were placed under special penance. Profanity is also punishable by the civil law of Great Britain, and by the laws of some of the states of the United States.

Sweat

(**h**[z; Genesis 3, 19; [**z**ý, ^{<344B>}Ezekiel 44:18; **ιδρώς**, ^{<4224>}Luke 22:44) was one of the physical phenomena attending our Lord's agony in the garden of Gethsemane as described by Luke (^{<4224>}Luke 22:44): "His sweat was as it were great drops (literally clots, **θράμβοι**) of blood falling down to the ground." The genuineness of this verse and of the preceding has been doubted, but is now generally acknowledged. They are omitted in A and B, but are found in the Codex Sinaiticus (**a**), Codex Bezae, and others, and in the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Curetonian Syriac. See Tregelles, *Greek New Test.*; Scrivener, *Intrad. to the Crit. of the New Test.* p. 434), and Tregelles points to the notation of the section and canon in ver. 42 as a trace of the existence of the verse in the Codex Alexandrinus.

Of this malady, known in medical science by the term *disapedesis*, there have been examples recorded both in ancient and modern times. Aristotle was aware of it (*De Part. Anim.* 3, 5). The cause assigned is generally violent mental-emotion. "Kannegiesser," quoted by Dr. Stroud (*Phys. Cause of the Death of Christ*, p. 86), remarks, 'Violent mental excitement, whether occasioned by uncontrollable anger or vehement joy, and in like manner sudden terror or intense fear, forces out a sweat, accompanied with signs either of anxiety or hilarity.' After ascribing this sweat to the unequal

constriction of some vessels and dilatation of others, he further observes: ‘If the mind is seized with a sudden fear of death, the sweat, owing to the excessive degree of constriction, often becomes bloody.’ Dr. Millingen (*Cariosities of Medical Experience*, p. 489, 2nd ed.) gives the following explanation of the phenomenon: “It is probable that this strange disorder arises from a violent commotion of the nervous system, turning the streams of blood out of their natural course, and forcing the red particles into the cutaneous excretories. A mere relaxation of the fibers could not produce so powerful a revulsion. It may also arise in cases of extreme debility, in connection with a thinner condition of the blood.” The following are a few of the instances on record which have been collected by Calmet (*Diss. sur la Sueur du Sang*), Millingen, Stroud, Trusen (*Die Sitten, Gebrdiuche und Krankheiten d. alt. Hebr.* [Breslau, 1853]), in addition to those given under BLOODY SWEAT *SEE BLOODY SWEAT*. Schekius (*Obs. Med.* 3, 458) says that in the plague of Miseno in 1554 a woman who was seized sweated blood for three days. In 1552 Conrad Lycosthenes (*De Prodigis*, p. 623, ed. 1557) reports, a woman sick of the plague sweated blood from the upper part of her body. According to De Thou (I, 11:326, ed. 1626), the governor of Montemaro, being seized by stratagem and threatened with death, was so moved thereat that he sweated blood and water. In the *Helanges d’Histoire*, (3, 179), by Dom Bonaventure d’Argonne, the case is given of a woman who suffered so much from this malady that, after her death, no blood was found in her veins. Another case of a girl of eighteen who suffered in the same way is reported by Mesaporiti, a physician at Genoa, accompanied by the observations of Valisneri, professor of medicine at Padua. It occurred in 1703 (*Phil. Trans.* No.303, p. 2144). There is still, however, wanted a well-authenticated instance in modern times observed with all the care and attested by all the exactness of later medical science. That given in Caspar’s *Wochenschrift*, 1848, as having been observed by Dr. Schneider, appears to be the most recent, and resembles the phenomenon mentioned by Theophrastus (*London Med. Gaz.* 1848, 2, 953). For further reference to authorities, see Copeland, *Dict. of Medicine*, 2, 72.

Swedberg, Jesper

bishop of Skara, in Sweden. His father’s name was *Jacobson*, but, according to a frequent Swedish custom, the son, on taking his degree at the university, assumed the name of Swedberg. He was born Aug.

28,1653, in the province of Dalecarlia. Having received a university education, he was ordained in 1685, and became successively court chaplain, professor of theology in the University of Upsalas (1692), and provost of the cathedral there. He was a pious, eloquent, and active man, a somewhat voluminous writer, chiefly on devotional subjects. He stood high in his native country, and many of his hymns are still among the favorite ones in the Swedish Lutheran service. He was the father of Emanuel Swedenborg. He was made bishop of Skara in 1702, about the time that he visited England. The Swedish Church in London and the Swedish congregations settled on the banks of the Delaware, in America, were placed by the king under his episcopal supervision; and his letters to the latter colony, still preserved in the records of the Church at Wilmington, show a warm interest in their affairs. From the information which he had obtained from this correspondence he published a work concerning America, a copy of which is in the library of Harvard College. He also published a *Psalm-Book* (1694), which was suppressed as pietistic; and the first *Swedish Grammar* (1722). Bishop Swedberg died July 26,1735. (W.B.H.)

Sweden

a kingdom in the northern part of Europe. In conjunction with Norway it forms the Scandinavian Peninsula, occupying itself the larger part of this peninsula. Its geographical position is between lat. $55^{\circ} 20'$ and $69^{\circ} 00'$ N. and long. $11^{\circ} 10'$ and $24^{\circ} 10'$ E. and it extends not far from 1000 miles from north to south, and in its greatest breadth, 300 miles from east to west. It is bounded on the north by Norwegian Lapland, east by Russia, south by the Gulf of Finland and the Baltic, and west by the Sound, the Cattegat, and Norway. The country has the characteristic features of all northern regions. Many parts of it, especially in the north, are barren and unproductive. Its immense forests are a source of great revenue, the wood being, used not only for fuel, but entering quite generally into the construction of the exterior as well as the interior parts of all buildings, and furnishing also a profitable article for export. All the grains peculiar to northern countries are, raised in Sweden, not only in sufficient quantity for home consumption, but also for export. In some of the metals it is very rich, and no small part of the wealth of the country comes from the working of mines of gold, silver, iron, copper, etc. The description which has been given of Norway, so far as the natural productions of the country are

concerned, will apply to Sweden, and renders any minute detail in this respect unnecessary. *SEE NORWAY.*

The great political divisions of Sweden are three Gothland, Svealand, and Norrland. Gothland has thirteen subdivisions, Svealand eight, and Norrland five; the whole giving an area of 167,477 square miles, and having a population of a little more than four millions and a quarter. The largest city is Stockholm, having a population in 1883 of 194,469. The only other city of considerable size in Sweden is Gothenburg, which has a population of 81,203; but there are quite a large number of cities and towns having a population of over 12,000.

I. History. — The early history of Sweden is involved in great obscurity, nor do we find much in that history that will interest the general reader until we come down to the time of Gustavus Vasa, who, with great heroism, made an attack on Christian II, and succeeded in obtaining the throne in 1523. The next character that stands out prominently on the pages of Swedish history is Gustavus Adolphus, the great champion of the Protestant faith, and the powerful foe with whom Austria had, to contend during the important period of the Thirty Years War. Gustavus was most fortunate in his counselors and statesmen, especially in his chancellor, the wise and good Oxenstiern (q.v.), who, after the death of his sovereign at the battle of Lutzen in 1662, was entrusted with the management of affairs during the minority of Christina, the daughter of Gustavus, who succeeded to the throne. Passing over a few years, we come to the period during which the celebrated Charles XII sat on the throne, whose wonderful martial exploits form one of the most brilliant pages of modern history. At the commencement of his reign the kingdom of Sweden was at the height of its power and of its glory. When he closed his administration, and, by his death, Sweden came under the dominion of his sister, Ulrica Eleonora, its prospects were far from flattering. She surrendered herself to the control of her husband, Frederick of Hesse-Cassel, whose administration of the affairs of Sweden was most unfortunate and humiliating. In making terms of peace with the enemies with whom she had been at war for so long a time, cessions of large territories which were once within the boundaries of the kingdom had to be made. Ulrica dying without issue, the throne passed into the hands of Adolphus Frederick, in fulfillment of one of the terms of peace prescribed by the empress of Russia in the treaty of 1743. His reign of twenty years was one of constant commotion and trouble. At his death,

in 1771, his son Gustavus III succeeded to the crown and reigned twenty years, when he was assassinated, and his son Gustavus IV, a minor in age, came to the throne, with his uncle, the duke of Saermannland, as regent. For various reasons the young king, after a few years, was compelled to abdicate, and his uncle, the regent, under the title of Charles XIII, became king. Upon his decease, Feb. 5, 1818, the French marshal Bernadotte was elected king, taking the title of Charles XIV. During his reign of twenty-six years, Sweden enjoyed a good degree of prosperity, and recovered, in considerable measure, what she had lost under the reigns of his predecessors. At his death, in 1844, his son Oscar I succeeded him and perfected the plans of his father for developing the resources of the country and adding to its material wealth. His reign lasted fifteen years (1844-59), during the last two of which, on account of his ill-health, his son and successor had acted as regent. This son, Charles XV, was king for thirteen years (1859-72). During his administration, liberal ideas gained the ascendancy, and the result was the introduction into the government of many constitutional reforms. Charles died in 1872, and was succeeded by the present king, Oscar II.

II. Religion. — Christianity was first introduced into Sweden in the year 830 by Anshar, a monk of Corbey, Westphalia, although the Swedish historians assert that many of the people embraced the Gospel still earlier, and that in 813 a church was erected at Linkoping by Herbert, a Saxon-ecclesiastic. The labors of Anshar were followed up by his successor, Rembert, who founded several churches, but gained few converts. Several of Rembert's successors failed to prosecute the work, and Christianity became almost extinct; and it was not until 1026 that Sweden became a Christian state. The Reformation commenced in Sweden in 1524 under Gustavus I, who secretly encouraged the preaching of Lutheran doctrines, in order, when he had formed a party of sufficient strength, to seize the revenues of this dominant Church and abolish its worship. One of the most popular and able missionaries of the Reformation was Olaf Petri, who published the New Test. in the Swedish language. The bishops called upon the king to suppress the translation, who treated their proposal with indifference, and consented to a public disputation at Upsala between the Romish and Protestant parties. This controversy tended to open the eyes of the people to the errors of the Romish creed, and they welcomed the missionaries to their houses. Gustavus seized at once two thirds of the whole ecclesiastical revenues, and authorized the clergy to marry and mix

with the world. He also declared himself a Lutheran, nominated Lutherans to the vacant sees, and placed Lutherans in the parish churches. In the course of two years the Romish worship was solemnly and universally abolished, and the Confession of Augsburg was received as the only rule of faith. John, who succeeded to the throne in 1569, had married Catharine of Poland, a Roman Catholic, and soon displayed a decided leaning towards the old faith. In the fervor of his zeal he prepared a new liturgy, entitled "Liturgy of the Swedish Church, Conformable to the Catholic and Orthodox Church." This liturgy was rejected by the mass of the clergy of both churches, and even the papal sanction was refused. Still, the king so far prevailed as to induce the Swedish Church to revise its liturgy, and to declare all opposed to revision guilty of schism. On his death, his brother Charles became regent, and one of his first acts was to induce the Synod of Upsala (1593) to abolish the liturgy prepared by the late king and depose those ecclesiastics who had defended it. Sigismund, hearing of these proceedings, came to Sweden and inaugurated violent measures in behalf of the Romish faith, which were so generally opposed by clergy and people that he returned in disgust to Poland. Charles took up the work of reform, caused a decree to be published in 1600 that the Confession of Augsburg should be the only rule of faith in Sweden, that all Romish priests should leave the country in six weeks, and prescribing general conformity under penalty of banishment. Under queen Christina the Church sank into a deplorable condition of spiritual declension and decay. There was a religious awakening, however, under the preaching of Ulstadius, who suffered for his zeal by a long imprisonment. To put an end to what was called in ridicule *Pietism*, an act was passed in 1713, and a still more stringent one in 1726, prohibiting, under heavy penalties, all private religious meetings or conventicles. These harsh measures and the desire for true spirituality led a number of the people to seek permission to have the old books used in the churches of their parishes, or to have regularly ordained pastors serve them, promising themselves to maintain them, in addition to paying all dues, as formerly, to the parish priest. This was refused, and they withdrew from the worship of the national Church, enduring many disabilities, as denial of marriage, fines, and penalties. It was not till 1873 that dissenting ministers were allowed to marry.

The established Church of Sweden is Lutheran, all sects of Christians, however, being tolerated. The king nominates the archbishop and the bishops from a list of names presented to him by the ecclesiastical

authorities. The archbishop of Upsala is the head of the Swedish Church, having under him eleven bishops. All ecclesiastical matters of importance are subject to the decision of the king. A revolution in religious matters is now going on in Sweden, which cannot fail, in time, to make itself felt in its influence on the future destiny of the national Church. Especially prosperous have been the missionary operations of- the Baptists under the labors of the Rev. Andreas Wiberg and his fellow-laborers. Thousands of converts have been gathered into Baptist churches, and the work of evangelization seems to be but in its infancy.

In 1854 the Rev. O. P. Petersen was commissioned by the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church to open missions in the Scandinavian missionary; he had, as an assistant missionary, Peter Larssen, who went to Sweden and visited several families at Calmar. A mission was begun in 1864 at Wishy, in the island of Gothland, and from that time the work has been very prosperous. The General Conference of 1876 ordered the Swedish mission to be organized into an Annual Conference, which was effected under the presidency of bishop Andrews at Upsala, Aug. 7, 1876. The following is a summary of the statistics of the mission for 1889: Number of ministers, 63; local preachers, 117; Sunday-schools, 202; teachers and officers, 1097; Sunday-school scholars, 14,417; members and probationers, 15,786; churches, 84; probable value of churches, \$197,534.

III. Education. —To the credit of Sweden it is to be said that she has provided most liberally for the education of the young. There is a common school system, instruction being gratuitous, and children not attending the regular government schools are obliged to furnish certificates that they are under the tuition of private teachers. The result of all this careful and systematic attention to education is that seldom is a Swede found who cannot read and write. The higher seats of learning are well patronized. The University of Upsala takes high rank among the literary institutions of Northern Europe. Its home is in the town from which it takes its name Upsala, forty-five miles north-west of Stockholm, a place of some 20,000 inhabitants. The attendance of students is large; as high sometimes as 1500, who gather here not only to pursue the regular course of collegiate study, but to listen to lectures from the professors of theology law, medicine, and philosophy. The university has a valuable library of over 150,000 volumes, several museums and collections, a botanical garden, and an observatory. Both the army and the navy are well represented by schools, the former

having two well-conducted institutions, one at Carlberg and another at Marieberg, designed especially for the training of officers of the engineering and artillery departments, and the latter having a school for naval 'cadets at Stockholm, There are to be found in Sweden-as there are in all countries where the people are well educated-in all towns and villages, libraries, museums of art, etc., societies for the promotion of science and literature, publications in the form of newspapers and periodicals of many kinds, so that the diffusion of knowledge is widespread and healthy.

IV. Literature. —See Adlerfeldt, *Histoire Militaire de Charles XII* (Paris, 1741, 3 vols. 12mo); Brown, *Memoirs of the Sovereign of Sweden and Denmark* (Lond. 1804, 3 vols. 8vo); Arndt, *Erinnerungen aus Schweden* (Berlin, 1818, 8vo); Dunham, *History of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway* (Lond. 1833-34, 3 vols. 12mo); Gall, *Reise durch Schweden in 1836* (Bremen, 1838, 2 vols. 12mo); Laing, *Tour in Sweden in 1838* (Lond. 1839, 8vo); Sylvanus, *Rambles in Sweden and Gothland, with Etchings by the Way-side* (ibid. 1847, 8vo); Tham, *Beskrifning ofver Sveriges Rike* (Stockh. 1849-56, 7 vols. 8vo); Marryatt, *Year in Sweden and Gothland* (Lond, 1862, 8vo).

Swedenborg, Emanuel

the founder of the New Jerusalem Church (q.v.), was born in Stockholm, Sweden, Jan. 29, 1688. His ancestry were not noble, but of high respectability among the miners of the great Stora-Kopparberg, in the province of Dalecarlia. His father, Jesper Swedberg (q.v.) or Svedberg, married Sarah, daughter of Albrecht Behm, assessor of the Royal Board of Mines. Emanuel was their second son and third child. After the elevation of the father to the prelacy as bishop of Skara, the name was changed and the family ennobled by queen Ulrica Eleonora in, 1719. Reared amid pious influences, the accounts we have of his earliest years seem to indicate a childhood of unusual thoughtfulness and susceptibility to religious impressions. He says of himself, "From my fourth to my tenth year my thoughts were constantly engrossed by reflecting on God, on salvation, and on the; spiritual affections of man. I often revealed things in my discourse which filled my parents with astonishment, and made them declare, at times, that certainly the angels spake through my mouth." Great care was bestowed on his education, which was acquired principally at the University of Upsala, where he took his degree of Ph.D. in 1709, in his

twenty-second year. He then visited England, spending a year at Oxford and three more on the continent of Europe. At this time he was already a member of the Royal Society of Sciences of Upsala, corresponding with it while abroad. He sought everywhere the society of the learned, and commenced publishing works almost immediately on his return, some of them poetical, others mathematical. His mind took an industrious and practical turn, and for many years he was almost wholly employed in scientific pursuits, in mining, engineering, and physiological studies. His family connections were influential — one sister married Eric Benzelius, afterwards archbishop of Upsala; another was the wife of Lars Benzelstierna, governor of a province, whose son became a bishop; while other members of the family rose to ecclesiastical and civil dignities. He had a large circle of friends among the nobility and higher classes, and enjoyed abundant patronage at court. His rank entitled him to a seat in the Swedish Parliament, and about 1721 he was appointed by Charles XII assessor of the Board of Mines, which made him also a member of the Cabinet. In 1724 he was solicited to accept the professorship of mathematics in the University of Upsala, but preferred the position he already occupied.

Twelve years later we find him beginning to publish his philosophical works, first, *Opera Philosophica. et Mineralia* (Leipsic and Dresden, 3 vols. fol.), under the patronage of the duke of Brunswick; afterwards, his *Principia: The Principles of Natural Things, or New Attempts at a Philosophical Explanation of the Phenomena of the Elementary World: — then came Outlines of a Philosophical Argument on the Infinite, and the Final Cause of Creation, and on the Intercourse between the Soul and the Body: — followed, a few years later, by the Economy of the Animal Kingdom* (Amsterdam, 2 vols. 4to); and the *Animal Kingdom* (vol. 1, at the Hague; vol. 2, Lond. 1745). There were many other tracts, essays, and volumes of minor importance, his last work of this nature being *the Worship and Love of God*. These works are generally acknowledged as belonging to the highest order of philosophical thought. His declared object in all his investigations was to behold the wisdom and goodness of the Creator in all his works; giving his life to the discovery of truths, determined to rise through their different degrees to those of the highest order, for the sake of doing something useful to mankind and advancing the best interests of society. The accounts show him to have been at this

period a man of solid virtue, piety, and decorum. These are the “rules of life” which he wrote down and preserved for his own guidance:

1. Often to read and meditate on the Word of God.
2. To submit everything to the will of Divine Providence.
3. To observe in everything a propriety of behaviors and always to keep the conscience clear.
4. To discharge with fidelity the functions of my employment and the duties of my office, and to render myself in all things useful to society. He was a member of the principal scientific and philosophical societies of Northern Europe.

In 1745, at the age of fifty-seven in the full maturity of his powers, in the enjoyment of honorable station, and of an enviable reputation at home and abroad for worth, learning, and extraordinary capacity he ceased from his other labors and began to devote himself to theology, to the promulgation of the doctrines of the New Jerusalem Church. Having been, as he declared, called by the Lord to be the messenger of a New Dispensation of Heavenly and Divine Truth, he was no longer at liberty to pursue his former courses of occupation and study, but thenceforward applied himself, with all the diligence of his character, to the duties of his new office. The following are some of his own words with respect to this “call” and mission, written to Rev. Dr. Hartley, rector of Winwick, England, in reply to inquiries. After speaking of the circumstances of his previous career, he continues, “But I regard all that I have mentioned as matters respectively of little moment; for, what far exceeds them, I have been called to a holy office by the Lord himself, who most graciously manifested himself in person to me, his servant, in the year 1743, when he opened my sight to the view of the spiritual world, and granted me the privilege of conversing with spirits and angels, which I enjoy to this day. From that time I began to print and to publish various *arcana* that have been seen by me or revealed to me as, respecting heaven and hell, the state of man after death, the true worship of God, the spiritual sense of the Word, with many other most important matters conducive to salvation and true wisdom.’ The only reason of my later journeys to foreign countries has been the desire of being useful, by making known the *arcana* entrusted to me.” At another time, late in life, he writes, to the landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt, “The Lord, our Savior, had foretold that he would come again into the

world, and that he would establish there a new Church. He has given this prediction in the Apocalypse (Revelation 21 and 22), and also in several places in the evangelists. But, as he cannot come into the world again in person, it was necessary that he should do it by means of a man, who should not only receive the doctrine of this new Church in his understanding, but also publish it by printing; and so the Lord had prepared me for this office from my infancy; he has manifested himself in person before me, his servant, and sent me to fill it. This took place in the year 1743. He afterwards opened the sight of my spirit, and thus introduced me into the spiritual world, and granted me to see the heavens and many of their wonders, and also the hells, and to speak with angels and spirits, and this continually for twenty-seven years. I declare, in all truth, that such is the fact. This favor of the Lord in regard to me has only taken place for the sake of the new Church which I have mentioned above, the doctrine of which is contained in my writings.” Except in this chief object and in the character of his writings, his habits of life underwent no change. His outward demeanor remained the same, with an increase of spiritual piety and prayerfulness, the same dignity and quiet urbanity of manner marked his intercourse with others, the same solid sense and enlightened intelligence characterized his conversation. His intercourse with the best society of the realm and the most eminent men of his time was uninterrupted. He retained his seat in the Swedish Parliament, and became more prominent in State affairs than he had ever been before.

Swedenborg’s first theological publication, and his largest work, is the *Arcana Caelestia*, or *Heavenly Mysteries*, a commentary, in eight quarto volumes, on the book of Genesis, with a large part of Exodus; in which, with many other observations and doctrines, the text is unfolded as to what he calls its “spiritual sense.” The design seems to be to discover a Christian meaning and application in all things of the “law and the prophets;” the method pursued does not appear to be much unlike that of other Christian commentators, except in the extent to which the principles of symbolism are carried and the results arrived at. He maintains that such a secondary sense runs through all the books given by immediate divine dictation Law, Former Prophets, Later Prophets, and Psalms—and that these books are written according to a uniform law, called that of “correspondence,” or the law of universal analogy between spiritual and natural things, which law it is one great object of his writings to unfold. His

citations and comparison of Scripture texts are remarkably full and exhaustive.

From the time of his alleged “call,” he wrote and published almost constantly until his death. The *Arcana* was finished in 1756. His succeeding works are, *An Account of the Last Judgment, and the Destruction of Babylon.; showing that all the Predictions in the Apocalypse are at this Day Fulfilled: Being a Relation of Things Heard and Seen* (Lond. 1758): — *Concerning Heaven and its Wonders, and concerning Hell; from Things Heard and Seen* (ibid. 1758): — *The Four Leading Doctrines of the New Jerusalem, viz. Concerning the Lord, Sacred Scripture, Faith, and Life* (Amster. 1763) *Angelic Wisdom concerning the Divine Love and the Divine Wisdom* (ibid. 1763): — *Angelic Wisdom concerning the Divine Providence* (ibid. 1764): — *The Apocalypse Revealed, wherein are Disclosed the Arcana there Foretold, which have hitherto Remained Concealed* (ibid. 1766): *The Apocalypse Explained according to the Spiritual Sense; in which are Revealed the Arcana which are there Predicted and have been hitherto Deeply Concealed* (published after his death, in 5 vols. 8vo), a much larger and fuller work than the preceding: — *The Delights of Wisdom concerning Conjugal Love*; after which follow: — *the Pleasures of Insanity concerning Scortatory Love* (Amster. 1768). *The True Christian Religion, containing the Universal Theology of the New Church, Foretold by the Lord in ^{<2>1713} Daniel 7:13,14, and in ^{<2013> Revelation 21:1, 2} (ibid. 1771), contains his body of divinity, and is divided into fourteen chapters, under appropriate heads. There are also a number of minor treatises and tracts. All these works were written originally in Latin, and were distributed by the author to the principal universities and seats of learning.</sup>*

In addition to his philosophical acquirements, Swedenborg was learned also as a Hebrew and Greek scholar. He died in London, March 29, 1772, maintaining to the last the truth of his alleged disclosures. He did not attempt to collect congregations, nor organize a church. For an account of the followers of his doctrines, *SEE NEW JERUSALEM CHURCH.* (W.B.H.)

Sweet, Elisha

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Gorham, Ontario Co., N. Y., in 1810. He was admitted into the Genesee Conference

in 1847, in which conference and the East Genesee he spent his ministerial life, three years of which he was superannuated. He died Sept. 7, 1869. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1870, p. 281.

Sweet, John Davis

a Baptist minister, was born at Kingston, Mass., Oct. 16, 1838. He was the son of a Unitarian clergyman. From his early life he developed a marked taste for literary pursuits, and in his preparatory studies took high rank as a scholar. In the fall of 1857 he entered Harvard College, one year in advance, and distinguished himself by his application to his college tasks. Having overworked himself, he sought to recruit his health by foreign travel. Returning home, he embarked in business; but, his friends urging him to direct his attention to the ministry, he abandoned his secular pursuits, and was ordained as pastor of the Baptist Church in Billerica, Mass., in October, 1863, where he remained nearly five years 1863-68, securing in a marked degree the affection of his Church and the respect of the people of the village in which he had his home. He was publicly recognized as pastor of the First Baptist Church in Somerville, Mass., May 4, 1868. He had commenced his work in the new field of his labor, and was prosecuting it with rare success, when he was stricken down by disease. One of the last records which he made in his diary a few days before his death was the following: "In looking over my ministry of nearly seven years, I feel I ought to drop on my knees and thank God that he ever called me to this glorious work. Some are always speaking of the trials of the ministry; but I can say, on reviewing mine, that it has been one bright day, with few clouds to dim the brightness. I love the work." He died in August, 1869. See Warren ^p [G. F.], *Memorial Sermon*. (J. C. S.)

Sweet Cane

SEE CANE.

Sweet Singers

a small Scottish sect, called from their founder, John Gib, the GIBBITES *SEE GIBBITES* (q.v.). They forsook all worldly business, and professed to be entirely devoted to fasting and prayer in the open fields. The name "Sweet Singers" was given to them from their habit of "wailing a portion" of the more mournful psalms. They renounced and denounced the use of metrical psalms, the translation of the Bible, Longer and Shorter

Catechisms, the Confession of Faith, the Covenant, names of months and days, the use of churches and church-yards; all kinds of tolls, custom, and tribute, all sports, and, indeed, everything and everybody but themselves. They finally undertook a pilgrimage to the Pentland Hills, where they remained some days, with a resolution to sit till they saw the smoke of the desolation of Edinburgh, which their leader had predicted. They were committed to prison in Edinburgh in April. 1681, but were soon, released. See Blunt, *Dict. of Sects*, s.v.; *M'Crie, Scottish Church History*, 2, 195. SWEET SINGERS, the English RANTERS *SEE RANTERS* (q.v.) of the 17th century, so called by some contemporary writers.

Sweet Wine

SEE WINE.

Sweetman, Joseph

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Freehold, Monmouth Co. N.J., March 9, 1774. His mother was a granddaughter of Walter Kerr, who was banished from Scotland for his unwavering adherence to Covenanter principles and his opposition to prelacy. When Joseph was about three months old, his parents removed to Charlton, Saratoga Co., N.Y. He graduated at Union College in 1797, being one of the three students that composed the graduating class, and receiving its first honors. He studied theology privately, was ordained by Albany Presbytery, and installed pastor of Salem Church, Washington Co., N.Y., Sept. 17, 1800. On account of failing health, he resigned his pastoral charge Oct. 8, 1817, and was never again installed pastor of a Church, but from that time till his death devoted himself to aiding young men in preparing for the ministry. He was the founder of the "Sweetman Scholarship" in Princeton Theological Seminary, N.J. He died Dec. 10, 1863. Mr. Sweetman was vigorous in intellect and eloquent in manner. He was a very benevolent man: that he might have to give, he was industrious, economical, and prudent. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1863, p. 57; also 1864, p. 198.

Sweetser, Seth, D.D.

a Congregational minister, was born at Newburyport, Mass., March 15, 1807. He was prepared for college in Newburyport Academy, under the tuition of Leonard Withington, D.D., and graduated from Harvard College in 1827. He then taught school for two years (1827-29) in Geneseo, N. Y.,

after which he returned to Harvard College as a tutor, remaining there until 1831, when he entered Andover Theological Seminary, where, after a full course of three years, he graduated in 1834. He was ordained Nov. 23, 1836, and was called to Gardiner, M.E. where, after preaching two years, he was dismissed, Nov. 8, 1838, to the pastorate of the Calvinist Church, Worcester, Mass., was installed Dec. 19 of the same year, and remained in this office until his death, having had a colleague after 1874. Here the great work of his life was done. He was a trustee of Leicester Academy and of Phillips Academy, Andover, from 1850, and president of the latter board from 1864. He was a trustee of the Worcester Free Industrial Institute and of Worcester Memorial Hospital. He was also a member of the council of the, American Antiquarian Society, a corporate member of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions from 1854, one of the vice-presidents of the American Home Mission Society from 1864, and president of the American Education Society. From 1866 to 1873 he was overseer of Harvard College, during which time he published various *Reports, Sermons, and Addresses*; also several articles in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*. He died from the effect of a spinal injury and pulmonary disease combined March 24, 1878. (W.P.S.)

Swell

in music, a set of pipes in an organ with a separate key-board, and forming a separate department, which are capable of being increased or diminished in intensity of sound by the action of a pedal on a series of shades or shutters overlapping each other like Venetian window-blinds, within which the pipes in question are enclosed. On a well-constructed swell a practiced performer can imitate not only a gradual *crescendo* and *diminuendo*, but also a *forzando*, a very small opening sufficing to make an immediate burst upon the ear; while, when the shutters are closed, an imitation of an echo is produced.

Swelling

(^{וַאֲגַ} *gaon*, “excellency,” “pride,” etc.) OF JORDAN is a phrase occurring in the A.V. at ^{וַאֲגַ} Jeremiah 12:5; 49:19; 1:44, but which should be rendered “*pride of Jordan*,” as in ^{וַאֲגַ} Zechariah 11:3. It refers to the verdure and thickets along the banks, lined with willows, tamarisks, and cane, in which the lions once made their covert; but has no allusion to

overwhelming billows from a rise of the waters (Reland, *Palaest.* p. 274).
SEE JORDAN.

Swert (or Sweerts), Francis

a Flemish historian and antiquary, was born in Antwerp in 1567. He devoted much of his time to study, and published a great many works which brought him considerable reputation: *Narrationes Historicae in Deorunt Dearumque Capita*, etc. (Antwerp, 1602, 4to): — *Lacrime in Funere Ab. Ortelii, cum Ortelii Vita* (1601, 8vo): — *Meditationes J. Cardinalis de Turrecremata in Vitam Christi, cum Vita. Ccrd.* etc. (Cologne, 1607, 12mo): — *Selectae Orbis Christiane Delicice* (ibid. 1608, 1625, 8vo). He died in 1629.

Swift, Elisha Pope, D.D.

an eminent divine of the Presbyterian Church, was born at Williamstown, Mass., Aug. '12, 1792.. His paternal grandfather was the Hon. Heman Swift; his father, the Rev. Seth Swift, pastor at one time of the Congregational Church in Williamstown; and his mother was a descendant of Rev. John Eliot, well known in the annals of American history as the "Apostle to the Indians." He graduated with honor at Williams College, Sept; 1, 1813, and at the Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J. in 1816 was licensed by New Brunswick Presbytery at Lawrenceville, N. J., April 24, 1816, and on Sept. 19 of the same year he met the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions at Hartford, Conn., and was accepted as a foreign missionary, though he was informed that he could not be sent abroad for some months. On Sept. 3, 1817, he was ordained by a Congregational council as an evangelist to the Heathen, the late Lyman Beecher, D.D., preaching the ordination sermon in Park Street Church, Boston, Mass. The interval between his licensure and his entering a permanent field of labor, a period of some two and a half years, was filled up with laborious efforts in behalf of the foreign missionary cause traveling, for the most part, on horseback, preaching almost daily, collecting funds, forming auxiliary societies, and awakening the people everywhere to the claims of this great enterprise. At length he was obliged, on account of the want of funds on the part of the board, to relinquish his long-cherished desire of being a foreign missionary. In October, 1818, he became pastor of the Church in Dover, where he labored diligently, but under great discouragements; in November, 1819, he was installed by a committee of

the Redstone Presbytery as pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh, Pa., and immediately entered upon his labors in that community, which he subsequently adorned and blessed until he became secretary and general agent for the Western Foreign Missionary Society, March 1, 1833. "This society," to use his own language, has since become, as it was intended at its very outset it should, the Board of Foreign Missions of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church" (a history of which is published in the *Presb. Hist. Almanac* for 1861). He was also deeply interested in theological education, and took an active part in the establishment of the Allegheny Theological Seminary, Allegheny, Pa.; and was connected with it from its inception until his death, a period of forty years. He was one of the first directors, also an agent to collect funds, and the first instructor in theology, which office he held: for about two years and for which he declined to receive any remuneration. In 1835 he received a unanimous call to become the pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Allegheny, and after about twelve months, during which time he made such arrangements as to secure the continued efficiency of the Missionary Society, he accepted the invitation, and was installed in this, his last, longest, and most important pastorate. He died April 3, 1865. Dr. Swift was a man of uncommon power of intellect and unusual tenderness of heart. As a Christian he was pre-eminent for his humility and devotion. He took a deep interest in all educational, eleemosynary, or Christian enterprises, and was a patriot in the truest sense of the term. He was a leader in all the various courts of the Church, made so by the breadth of his views, the wisdom of his counsels, the integrity and loveliness of his character, and his manifest freedom from all selfishness and ambition. It was, however, as a preacher that he shone most conspicuously. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866. p. 172.

Swift, Job

a Congregational minister, was born at Sandwich, Mass., June 17 (O. S.), 1743, and removed in early youth to Kent, Conn. He graduated from Yale College in 1765, having made a profession of religion while in college. He studied theology under Dr. Bellamy, was licensed to preach in 1766, and in 1767 became pastor of the Church in Richmond, Mass. After a pastorate of seven years he left Richmond, and, having preached in different places for about a year, became pastor in Amenia, N. Y. In the spring of 1783 he removed to Manchester, Vt., where he preached between two and three

years. On May 31, 1786, he was settled over the Church in Belington, from which he made many missionary tours into the western and northern sections of the state. Leaving Bennington June 7, 1801, he removed to Addison, on Lake Champlain, where he purchased a farm. He established a Church there and officiated as its pastor, and also continued his missionary labor. He died on- a missionary tour at Enosburg, Oct. 20, 1804. Mr. Swift acted as a chaplain in the army during most of the Revolutionary war. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 1, 640.

Swift, Jonathan, D.D.

Picture for Swift

a prelate and satirist, was born in Dublin Nov. 30, 1667, and when about a year old was carried by his nurse to Whitehaven, Cumberland, England, where he was kept for three years. His father, who died three months before he was born, left his family in great poverty, and they were supported by relatives. Swift, when, six years old, was sent to the school of Kilkenny, and remained there until, removed to Trinity College, Dublin, which he entered as a pensioner, April 24, 1682. He received his degree of A.B. Feb. 15, 1685, but he remained in the college until 1688, when he went to England to visit his mother, and was on her recommendation admitted into the house of Sir William Temple. In 1694 he went to Ireland, took orders in the Church that of deacon Oct. 18, 1694, of priest Jan. 13, 1695 and obtained a small living, which he threw up in two years and returned to England. He lived as a friend with Temple until the death of the latter, Jan. 27, 1698, and in 1699 accompanied lord Berkeley to Ireland as his chaplain and private secretary. Being deprived of this office, he was given the rectory of Agher, and the vicarages of Laracor and Ruthbeggan, worth altogether £230 a year. The prebend of Dunlavin was bestowed upon him soon afterwards. He still continued to reside with lord Berkeley until 1700, when the latter returned to England and Swift took possession of Laracor. He performed his duties as a country clergyman with exemplary diligence. His appointment to the deanery of St. Patrick's was made Feb. 23, 1713, and early in June he left England to take possession. He soon returned to England on a political mission, and again visited England to solicit the remission of the "first-fruits." In 1741 Swift's memory failed, his understanding was much impaired, and he became subject to violent fits of passion which soon terminated in furious lunacy. In 1742 he sank into a state of quiet idiocy, and died Oct. 19, 1745. Dr.

Samuel Johnson (*Lives of the English Poets*) gives the following estimate of dean Swift: "He was a churchman rationally zealous; he desired the prosperity and maintained the honor of the clergy; of the Dissenters he did not wish, to infringe the toleration, but he opposed their encroachments." To his duty as dean he was very attentive. In his Church he restored the practice of weekly communion, and distributed the sacramental elements in the most solemn and devout manner with his own hand. He came to Church every morning, preached commonly in his turn, and attended the evening anthem, that it might not be negligently performed. The suspicions of his irreligion proceeded in a great measure from his dread of hypocrisy; instead of wishing to seem better, he delighted in seeming worse than he was. In London he went to early prayers lest he should be seen at Church; he read prayers to his servants every morning with such dexterous secrecy that Dr. Delany was six months in his house before he knew it. He gave great attention to political matters, and, indeed, it is to his political writings that he is principally indebted for his fame. In addition to these works, some poems, etc., he published several *Sermons* and *Tracts* upon religious and ecclesiastical matters. — Of his works several editions have been printed, that of Sir Walter Scott being considered the best (Edinb. —1819, 19 vols. 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; *English Cyclop.* s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s.v.

Swift, Seth

brother of Job Swift, was a Congregational minister. He was born in Kent, Conn., Oct. 30, 1749, graduated at Yale in 1774, studied theology under Dr. Bellamy, and was ordained pastor of the Church in Williamstown, Mass., May 27, 1776, which charge he retained until his death, Feb. 13, 1807. He was greatly beloved by his people, and honored and revered by the whole community. See *Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 1,645.

Swift Beast

SEE CAMEL.

Swinden, Tobias

an English clergyman, was rector of Cuxton, Kent, in 1688, and vicar of Shorne in 1689. He died in 1719. He published, *Sermon on* ~~the~~ Luke 11:2 (1713, 8vo): — *An Enquiry into the Nature and Place of Hell*, which he

located in the sun (Lond. 1714,8vo; translated into French by Bion [Amst. 1728, 8vo], and German). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit, and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Swine

Picture for Swine

(~~ryzjæ~~ *chazir*; Sept. **ςς, ὕειος, σῶς**; New Test. **χοῖρος**). Allusion will be found in the Bible to these animals, both in their domestic and in their wild state. See Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, p. 145; Wood, *Bible Animals*, p. 292.

1. The flesh of swine was forbidden as food by the Levitical law (~~6107~~ Leviticus 11:7; ~~6148~~ Deuteronomy 14:8). The abhorrence which the Jews as a nation had of it may be inferred from ~~2364~~ Isaiah 65:4, where some of the idolatrous people are represented as “eating swine’s flesh,” and as having the “broth of abominable things in their vessels;” see also 66:3, 17, and 2 Macc. 6:18, 19, in which passage we read that Eleazar, an aged scribe, when compelled by Antiochus to receive in his mouth swine’s flesh, “spit it forth, choosing rather to die gloriously than to live stained with such an abomination.” The use of swine’s flesh was forbidden to the Egyptian priests, to whom, says Sir G. Wilkinson (*Anc. Egypt.* 1, 322), “above all meats it was particularly obnoxious” (see Herodotus, 2, 47; Elian, *De Nat. Anim.* 10:16; Josephus, *Apion*, 2, 14), though it was occasionally eaten by the people. The Arabians also were disallowed the use of swine’s flesh (see Pliny, *H. N.* 8:52; Koran, 2, 175), as were also the Phoenicians, Ethiopians, and other nations of the East.

No other reason for the command to abstain from swine’s flesh is given in the law of Moses beyond the general one which forbade any of the mammalian food which did not literally fulfill the terms of the definition of a “clean animal,” viz. that it was to be a cloven-footed ruminant. The pig, therefore, though it divides the hoof, but does not chew the cud, was to be considered unclean; and consequently, inasmuch as, unlike the ass and the horse in the time of the Kings, no use could be made of the animal when alive, the Jews did not breed swine (Lactant. *Instit.* 4:17). It is, however, probable that dietetical considerations may have influenced Moses in his prohibition of swine’s flesh. It is generally believed that its use in hot countries is liable to induce cutaneous disorders; hence in a people liable to

leprosy the necessity for the observance of a strict rule. "The reason of the meat not being eaten was its unwholesomeness, on which account it was forbidden to the Jews and Moslems" (Sir G. Wilkinson's note in Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, 2, 47). Ham. Smith, however (Kitto, *Cyclop.* s.v.), maintains that this reputed unwholesomeness of swine's flesh has been much exaggerated; and recently a writer in Colburn's *News Monthly Magazine* (July 1, 1862, p. 266) has endorsed this opinion. Other conjectures for the reason of the prohibition, which are more curious than valuable, may be seen in Bochart (*Hieroz.* 1, 806 sq.). Calüstratus (apud Plutarch. *Sympos.* 4:5) suspected that the Jews did not use swine's flesh for the same reason which, he says, influenced the Egyptians, viz. that this animal was sacred, inasmuch as by turning up the earth with its snout it first taught men the art of ploughing (see Bochart, *Fieroz.* 1, 806, and a dissertation by Cassel, entitled *De Judcebrum Odio et Abstinencia a Porcina ejusque Causis* [Magdeb.]; also Michaelis, *Comment. on the Laws of Moses*, art. 203, 3, 230, Smith's transl.). Although the Jews did not breed swine during the greater period of their existence as a nation, there can be little doubt that the heathen nations of Palestine used the flesh as food. See Plumptre, *Bible Educator*, 1, 280 sq.

At the time of our Lord's ministry it would appear that the Jews occasionally violated the law of Moses with respect to swine's flesh. Whether "the herd of swine" into which the devils were allowed to enter (⁽⁴¹⁸²⁾Matthew 8:32; Mark 5, 13) were the property of the Jewish or Gentile inhabitants of Gadara does not appear from the sacred narrative; but that the practice of keeping swine did exist among some of the Jews seems clear from the enactment of the law of Hyrcanus, *ne cui porcum alere liceret*" (Grotius, *Ann. of. ad Matthew* loc. cit). Allusion is made in 2 Pet. 2:22, to the fondness which swine have for "wallowing in the mire;" this, it appears, was a proverbial expression, with which may be compared the *amica luto sus*" of Horace (*Ep.* 1, 2,26). Solomon's comparison of a "jewel of gold in a swine's snout" to a "fair woman without discretion" (⁽⁴¹¹²⁾Proverbs 11:22), and the expression of our Lord, "neither cast ye your pearls before swine," are so obviously intelligible as to render any remarks unnecessary. The transaction of the destruction of the herd of swine already alluded to, like the cursing of the barren fig-tree, has been the subject of most unfair cavil: it is well answered by Trench (*Miracles*, p. 173), who observes that "a man is of more value than many swine;" besides which it must be remembered that it is not necessary to suppose that our

Lord *sent* the devils into the swine. He merely permitted them to go, as Aquinas says, “quod autem porci in mare prsecipitati sunt non fuit operatio divini miraculi, sed operatio demoanum e permissibne divina;” and if these Gadarene villagers were Jews and owned the swine, they were rightly punished by the loss of that which they ought not to have had at all. See Tacit. *Hist.* 5, 4; Juven. *Sat.* 14:98; Macrobian. *Sat.* 2, 4; Josephus, *Ant.* 13:8, 2; Philo, *Opp.* 2, 531; Mishna, *Baba Kama*, 7:7; Talm. Hieros. *Shekal.* fol. 47, 3; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* p. 315 sq.; Otho, *Lex. Rab.* p. 530 sq.

2. The wild boar of the wood (^{BOAR}Psalm 80:13) is the common *Sus scrofa* which is frequently met with in the woody parts of Palestine, especially in Mount Tabor. The allusion in the psalm to the injury the wild boar does to the vineyards is well borne out by fact. “It is astonishing what havoc a wild boar is capable of effecting during a single night; what with eating and trampling underfoot, he will destroy a vast quantity of grapes” (Hartley, *Researches in Greece*, p. 234). *SEE BOAR.*

Swinerton, Asa V.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Danvers, Mass., in 1802. He joined the New England Conference on trial in 1831. When the Providence Conference was formed in 1841, he continued on the district of which he was presiding elder, and thus became a member of the latter Conference. He continued to labor, with the exception of one year (supernumerary), until 1863, his death taking place at Monument, Mass., Oct. 12 of that year. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1864, p. 51.

Swiney, Samuel T.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in West Feliciana Parish, La. Of the circumstances of conversion, etc., we have no particulars. He joined, probably, the Mississippi Conference in 1856, and after a number of years became supernumerary, and died Aug. 14, 1869. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M. E. Church, South*, 1869, p. 341.

Swinnock, George

an English clergyman, was vicar of Great Kymble, Bucks, from which he was ejected for nonconformity in 1662. He afterwards became pastor at Maidstone, where he died in 1673. His writings are: — *Heaven and Hell*

Epitomized (Lond. 1659, 8vo; 1663,4to): — *Christian Man's Calling* (in 3 pts. 4to: 1, 1662; 2, 1663; 3, 1665): — also *Sermons*. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.*

Swinton, John

an English divine and antiquary, was born in 1703 at Bexton, Cheshire. He was educated at Wadham College, Oxford, was chaplain to the factory at Leghorn, and died April 4, 1777, keeper of the university records at Oxford. He contributed vols. 6 and 7 (the *Life of Mohanmmed* and:the *History of the Arabs*) to the *Modern Universal History*, and wrote many-learned dissertations on Phoenician and other antiquities. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors s.v.*; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict. s.v.*

Swithin, St.

an English ecclesiastic of the 9th century, was chaplain to king Egbelt, and tutor to his son Ethhewolf, by whom he was made chancellor. He had the charge of the education of king Alfred, whom he accompanied to Rome. In 852 he was consecrated bishop of Winchester. William of Malmesbury records of him that he was “a rich treasure of all virtues, and those in which he took most delight were humility and charity to the poor.” The origin of the tribute called “Peter’s pence” (q.v.) has often been assigned to Swithin, and he is said to have procured an act of the Witenagemote enforcing, for the first time, the universal obligation of paying tithes. Swithin died July 2, 862. See Mrs. Jameson, *Legends of the Monastic Orders*, p. 89.

Swithin’s Day

The following is said to be the origin of the old adage “If it rains on St. Swithin’s Day, there will be rain more or less for forty succeeding days.” In the year 865 St. Swithin, bishop of Winchester to which rank he was raised by king Ethelwolf the Dane was canonized by the then pope. He was singular for his desire to be buried in the open church-yard, and not in the chancel of the minster, as was usual with other bishops, which request was complied with; but the monks, on his being canonized, taking it into their heads that it was disgraceful for the saint to lie in the open church-yard, resolved to remove his body into the choir, which was to have been done with solemn procession on July 15. It rained, however, so violently on that day, and for forty days succeeding, as had hardly ever been known, which

made them set aside their design as heretical and blasphemous; and instead they erected a chapel over his grave, at which many miracles are said to have been wrought. The value to be placed upon the popular notion that if it rain on July 15 it will do so for forty succeeding days may be learned from the following facts from the Greenwich observations for twenty years. It appears that St. Swithin's Day was wet in 1841, and there were 23 rainy days up to Aug. 24, 1845, 26 rainy days; 1851, 13 rainy days; 1853, 18 rainy days; 1854, 16 rainy days; and in 1856, 14 rainy days. In 1842 and following years St. Swithin's Day was dry and the result was, in 1842, 12 rainy days; 1843, 12 rainy days; 1844, 20 rainy days. 1846, 21 rainy days; 1847, 1.7 rainy days; 1848, 31 rainy days; 1849, 20 rainy days; 1850, 17 rainy days; 1852, 19 rainy days; 1855, 18 rainy days; 1857, 14 rainy days; 1858, 14 rainy days; 1859, 13 rainy days; and in 1860, 29 rainy days. These figures show the superstition to be founded on a fallacy, as the average of twenty years proves rain to have fallen upon the largest number of days when St. Swithin's day was dry.

Switzerland

the *Helvetia* of the Latins, is one of the smallest of the European states, lying between $45^{\circ} 49'$ and $47^{\circ} 50'$ N. lat., and $5^{\circ} 55'$ and $10^{\circ} 30'$ E. long., its extreme length from E. to W. being 210 miles, and its extreme breadth not far from 140 miles. It has an area of nearly 16,000 English miles, and is bounded north by Germany, from which it is separated by the Rhine and Lake Constance; on the east by Austria, the valley of the Rhine and the Rhaetian Alps being the dividing line between the two countries; on the south by Italy and France, and on the west by France. It is the most mountainous country in Europe, being covered throughout its entire extent by the Alps, which are grouped into several branches. The highest and best-known peaks of the Alps in Switzerland are Matterhorn, or Mont Cervin, Finster-Aarhorn, and Jungfrau. Mont Blanc was once included in the mountains of Switzerland; but at the close of the Franco-Italian war it was transferred to France. The principal lakes of Switzerland are Lake of Neufchatel, Lake of Geneva, Lake Thun, Lake Lucerne, Lake Zurich, and Lake of Constance. Its great rivers are the Rhine and the Rhone, with their many tributary streams. The glaciers are the great feeders of these streams and rivers, and are in themselves objects of great interest to the lover of nature. The climate of Switzerland is generally cold, as might be expected, the region of perpetual snow being more extensive than in any other

mountain system in Europe. In the lowlands and valleys the temperature is warmer, and many of the productions which grow so luxuriantly in Italy are raised there. Agriculture furnishes the chief employment to the inhabitants of this country. There are some kinds of manufactures carried on which are productive, such as cotton, embroidery, and silk stuffs of various kinds. The Swiss also; pay great attention to the manufacture of watches, the annual production; in fine, of the cantons being not far from seventeen and a half millions of dollars.

I. History. — Our earliest knowledge of Switzerland carries us back to the time when the inhabitants were alluded to in Roman history as the Helvetia. In those early days, not far from a century before the commencement of the Christians era, they successfully resisted the attacks of the Romans. The *Commentaries* of Caesar give us interesting accounts of the attempts of the legions under his command to subdue these hardy dwellers of the mountains and valleys of Helvetia. After many years, by degrees, the Roman arms brought these proud-spirited foes into subjection, and for several centuries the conquerors held dominion over the country. Invasions from the northern tribes of Europe laid waste many sections of the land. These barbarians of the North were at last all brought under the power of the Franks, and Christianity became the prevailing faith. Without tracing the political history of Switzerland through the various phases through which it passed during several centuries, it may suffice to say that it became a federal republic in 1848, and the people are now living under a revised constitution, which was accepted by them in the spring of 1874. This constitution guarantees to the inhabitants of the twenty-five cantons into which Switzerland is divided those rights and immunities which are found in all properly constituted republics. All citizens are equal in the eye of the law. Privileges of place or birth have ceased. Absolute, liberty of conscience everywhere prevails. The press is free. The right of association is guaranteed, with the exception that the Jesuits and organizations kindred to them are forbidden. The capital of the confederated states is Berne.

II. Religion. — Christianity was first introduced into Switzerland about A.D. 610 by St. Gall, a native of Ireland and pupil of Columbian. He was one of twelve Irish monks who labored to disseminate Christianity throughout Europe. They first took up their residence at the head of Lake Zurich, and, burning with zeal, set fire to the pagan temples, casting the idols into the lake. Driven away by the inhabitants, they settled at

Bregentz, but at the end of two years were banished from this place also, and all left for Italy except St. Gall, who was too ill to be removed. He repaired to a sequestered spot, and with a few adherents built the Monastery of St. Gall in the canton of the same name. After his death, several of his scholars and monks from Ireland continued his work, until paganism lost its hold and Romanism was substituted in its place.

With reference to the Reformation, D'Aubigne says: "From 1519 to 1526 Zurich was the center of the Reformation, which was then entirely German, and was propagated in the eastern and northern parts of the confederation. Between 1526 and 1532 the movement was communicated from Berne; it was at once German and French, and extended to the center of Switzerland, from the gorges of the Jura to the deepest valleys of the Alps. In 1532 Geneva became the focus of the light and the Reformation, which was here essentially French, was established on the shores of the Lemman Lake and gained strength in every quarter." The main instrument in commencing and carrying forward the work of Reformation in Switzerland was Ulric Zwingli (q.v.). In 1513 he commenced the study of the Greek language; and from 1516, when he began to expound the Word of God as preacher in the Abbey of Einsiedeln, Zwingli dates the Swiss Reformation. The influence of the pure faith was soon extensively felt, so that, by the year, 1522, we find Erasmus estimating "those" in the cantons "who abhorred the see of Rome" at about 200,000 persons. Gradually changes in the mode of worship were introduced. In 1523 we find the Council of Zurich requiring that "the pastors of Zurich should rest their discourses on the words of Scripture alone;" the abolition of images in churches soon followed; marriage was no longer prohibited to the clergy; and in 1525 the mass was superseded by the simple ordinance of the Lord's supper. In Appenzell the Reformation began, about 1521, in Schaffhausen- about the same time. The sacramentarian controversy between Luther and Zwingli, and their respective followers, was detrimental to the cause of truth in both Germany and Switzerland and in the latter, as well as in the former, the rise of the Anabaptist body was both a source of injury and reproach. In the year 1527 Berne became professedly a Reformed canton, and for mutual security allied itself, in 1529, with the canton of Zurich. In 1530, at the Diet of Augsburg, when the Lutheran Confession was presented, the Swiss divines presented another drawn up by Bucer, known, from the four towns it represented namely, Constance, Strasburg, Lindau, and Meiningen as the Tetrapolitan Confession. The two confessions only differed as to the sense

in which Christ was understood to be really present in the Lord's supper. At this time, also, Zwingli individually presented a confession, to which we find Eck replying. The five Romish cantons, having made ample preliminary preparations, determined by force of arms to check the further progress of Reformed principles in the confederation. The French sympathies of Zwingli, and his hostility to Charles V, deprived the Protestant cantons of German support in the approaching conflict. The Protestant cantons formed a confederacy, and by a resolution adopted at Aarau, May 12, 1531, instituted a strict blockade of the five cantons. Goaded on by the consequent famine and its attendant miseries, these last determined on war, and entered the field on Oct. 6 of the same year, the first engagement, taking place at Cappel, proving most disastrous to Zurich and fatal to Zwingli. The Reformation now took the direction of Geneva, its opinions being first proclaimed by William Farel about 1532. He was banished, but was succeeded by Anthony Fromment, who soon shared the same fate. The following year they were recalled, and the bishops fled. In 1535 the Council of the city proclaimed their adherence to the Reformed faith. The following year witnessed the arrival of John Calvin, and on July 20, 1539, the citizens abjured popery and professed Protestantism. Prior to this, a reaction of the popish and conservative elements in the State led to such dissensions and opposition that Calvin and Farel were banished, but, at the earnest entreaty of the citizens, the former returned in 1541. Whatever difference of opinion there may be with reference to the theological views of the great Genevan Reformer, there can be none as to his intellectual ability, and his wonderful organizing and executive power. His legal training (in early life he had studied law) qualified him to frame a civil code for Geneva, the good effects of which were apparent in the improved state of public morals. "Through his influence," says Hase, "Geneva became a republic firmly established, governed by an oligarchy, pervaded by an ecclesiastical spirit, and renowned in the history of the world. Thither resorted all who during that age were persecuted for their faith, and it became the acknowledged center of a Reformed Church." *SEE CALVIN*. For some years after the death of Calvin (1564), the religious history of Switzerland is closely identified with that of the Catholic reaction from the Reformation. Hopes which had been cherished with regard to the rapid progress of a purer form of Christianity in Germany and France and Switzerland were doomed to be disappointed. For many years the Roman Catholic power in the last of these countries seemed to have the predominance. Towards the close of the 17th century, the strife between

the two great religious parties, the papists and the Protestants, began to assume a more open character, and in 1703 the Catholic and the Protestant cantons took up arms against each other. A civil war was carried on for several years. At last, in 1712, a fierce battle was fought at Villmergen, and victory was on the side of the Protestants. The Catholics were completely routed, and two thousand of their number were left dead on the battle-field. *SEE REFORMATION.*

At present, a majority of all the inhabitants of Switzerland are Protestants. In eleven of the cantons the Catholics outnumber the Protestants, although the ecclesiastical government is in a certain sense under the control of the cantonal government. The pope has attempted to do certain things in the regulation of the affairs of those over whom he claims to exercise jurisdiction, but his acts have been declared illegal by the civil authorities, and they are null and void. The "Old Catholics" have obtained possession of several parish churches in three or four of the cantons. The present constitution of Switzerland grants complete and absolute liberty of conscience and of creed. No one can incur any penalties whatsoever on account of his religious opinions. No one is bound to contribute to the expenses of a Church to which he does not belong. Free worship is guaranteed, civil marriage is compulsory, and subsequent religious service is optional. The cantons have the right to maintain peace and order between different religious communities, and to prevent encroachments of ecclesiastical authorities upon the rights of citizens. Bishops must receive the approval of the federal government. Liberty of press, petition, and association is guaranteed; but Jesuits; and all religious orders and associations which are affiliated to them, are prohibited. Of late years much evangelizing work has been done by the Presbyterians, Baptists, and Methodists. In 1849, the Methodist Episcopal Church organized the "Germany and Switzerland Mission," which in 1856 was constituted the German Mission Conference, with Switzerland as one of its districts. The following are its statistics for 1889: Number of preachers, 25; local preachers, 5; Church members, 4846; probationers, 906; Sunday-schools, 186; Sunday-school scholars, 13,398; churches, 28; value of churches, \$1,018,435. There is also a Methodist book establishment at Mremen and a theological school at Frankfort-on-the-Main. See *3Memoires et Documents publiés par la Sociéti d'Histoire et d'Archeologie de Geneve* (Geneva, 1841-47. 5 vols.); Wilson, *Hist. of Switzerland*, in Lardner's *Cabinet Cyclopedia*; Gailleur, *La Suisse* (ibid. 1855-56, 2 vols. 4to); Inglis,

Switzerland (Lond. 1840, 8vo); Shaw, *History of Switzerland* (N. Y. 1875).

Sword

Picture for Sword 1

in the A.V., is the usual rendering of **brj**, *chereb* (from **brj**; *to lay waste*), which was simply a large *knife*, as it is rendered in Joshua 5, 2; ^{<1018>}Ezekiel 5:1 2. Less frequent words are **j [r**, *retsach*, ^{<1020>}Psalm 42:10 [11], a *crushing* or outbreak (“slaughter,” ^{<1027>}Ezekiel 21:27); **j l v**, *shelach* (^{<1038>}Job 33:18; 36:12; ^{<1038>}Joel 2:8), a *dart*, as elsewhere rendered; N.T. **ῥομφαία**, a *sabre*, or long and broad sword (Luke 2, 35; ^{<1016>}Revelation 1:16; 2:12, 16; 6:8; 19:15, 21); elsewhere **μάχαιρα**, a *dagger*, or short sword. *SEE ARMOR.*

1. The first mention of this principal offensive weapon in Bible history is in the narrative of the massacre at Shechem, when “Simeon and Levi took each man his sword, and came upon the city boldly and slew all the males” (^{<1035>}Genesis 34:25). But there is an allusion to it shortly before in a passage undoubtedly of the earliest date (Ewald, 1, 446, note): the expostulation of Laban with Jacob (^{<1036>}Genesis 31:26). After this, during the account of the conquest and of the monarchy, the mention of the sword is frequent, but very little can be gathered from the casual notices of the text as to its shape, size, material, or mode of use. Perhaps if anything is to be inferred it is that the *chereb* was not either a heavy or a long weapon. That of Ehud was only a cubit; i.e. eighteen inches, long, so as to have been concealed under his garment, and nothing is said to lead to the inference that it was shorter than usual, for the “dagger” of the A. V. is without any ground, unless it be a rendering of the **μάχαιρα** of the Sept. But even assuming that Ehud’s sword was shorter than usual, yet a consideration of the narratives in ^{<1026>}2 Samuel 2:16, and 20:8-10, and also of the ease with which David used the sword of a man so much larger than himself as Goliath (^{<1075>}1 Samuel 17:51; 21:9, 10), goes to show that the *chereb* was both a lighter and a shorter weapon than the modern sword. What frightful wounds one blow of the sword of the Hebrews could inflict, if given even with the left hand of a practiced swordsman, may be gathered from a comparison of ^{<1018>}2 Samuel 20:8-12 with ^{<1015>}1 Kings 2:5. A ghastly picture is there given us of the murdered man and his murderer. The unfortunate Amasa actually disemboweled by the single stroke, and “wallowing” in his

blood in the middle of the road the treacherous Joab standing over him, bespattered from his “girdle” to his “shoes” with the blood which had spouted from his victim!

The *chereb* was carried in a sheath (ר [י]י ^{<0975>}1 Samuel 17:51; ^{<1008>}2 Samuel 20:8, only; דן ^{<1307>}1 Chronicles 21:27, only) slung by a girdle (^{<0253>}1 Samuel 25:13) and resting upon the thigh (^{<0988>}Psalm 45:3; ^{<0786>}Judges 3:16), or upon the hips (^{<1008>}2 Samuel 20:8). “Girding on the sword” was a symbolical expression for commencing war, the more forcible because in times of peace even the king in state did not wear a sword (1 Kings 3, 24); and a similar expression occurs to denote those able to serve (^{<0780>}Judges 8:10; ^{<1305>}1 Chronicles 21:5). Other phrases, derived from the *chereb*, are, “to smite with the edge” (literally mouth; comp. στόμα; and comp. ‘devour,’ ^{<2002>}Isaiah 1:20) of the sword “slain with the sword” “men that drew sword,” etc.

Swords with two edges are occasionally referred to (^{<0786>}Judges 3:16; ^{<0906>}Psalm 149:6), and allusions are found to “whetting” the sword (^{<0534>}Deuteronomy 32:41; ^{<0668>}Psalm 64:3; ^{<3209>}Ezekiel 21:9). There is no reference to the material of which it was composed (unless it be ^{<2004>}Isaiah 2:4; ^{<2180>}Joel 3:10); doubtless it was of metal, from the allusions to its brightness and “glittering” (see the two passages quoted above, and others), and the ordinary word: for blade, viz. **bhī i** “a flame.” From the expression (Joshua 5, 2, 3) swords of rock,” A.V. “sharp knives,” we may perhaps infer that in early times the material was flint. Smith. *SEE KNIFE*.

Picture for Sword 2

2. The Egyptian sword was straight and short, from two and a half to three feet in length, having generally a double edge, and tapering to a sharp point. It was used for cut and thrust. They had also a dagger, the handle of which, hollowed in the center, and gradually increasing in thickness at either extremity, was inlaid with costly stones, precious woods, or metals; and the pommel of that worn by the king in his girdle was frequently surmounted by one or two heads of a hawk, the symbol of Phrah, or the Sun, the title given to the monarchs of the Nile. It was much smaller than the sword: its blade was about ten or seven inches in length, tapering gradually in breadth, from one inch and a half to two thirds of an inch, towards the point; and the total length, with the handle, only completed a foot or sixteen inches. The blade was bronze, thicker in the middle than at

the edges, and slightly grooved in that part; and so exquisitely was the metal worked that some retain their pliability and spring after a period of several thousand years, and almost resemble steel in elasticity. Such is the dagger of the Berlin collection, which was discovered in a Theban tomb, together with its leather sheath. The handle is partly covered with metal, and adorned with numerous small pins and studs of gold, which are purposely shown through suitable openings in the front of the sheath; but the upper extremity consists solely of bone, neither ornamented nor covered with any metal casing. Other instances of this have been found; and a dagger in Mr. Salt's collection, now in the British Museum, measuring eleven and a half inches in length, had the handle formed in a similar manner. There was also a falchion called *shopsh*, or *khopsh*, resembling in form and name the **κοπίς**, or *chopper*, of the Argives, reputed to be an Egyptian colony. It was more generally used than the sword, being borne by light as well as heavy-armed troops; and that it was a most efficient weapon is evident as well from the size and form of the blade as from its weight, the back of this bronze or iron blade being sometimes cased with brass (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt. 1*, 358).

Picture for Sword 3

3. Assyrian swords, like the scepters, as seen on the monuments, were often richly decorated. The hilt was generally ornamented with several lions heads, arranged to form both handle and cross-bar. The scabbard or sheath was elaborately embossed or engraved (Layard, *Nineveh*, 2, 234).

Picture for Sword 4

4. The Greek and Roman sword (*gladius*, **ξίφος**, poet. ἄορ, **φάσγανον**, a glaive, by the Latin poets called *ensis*) had generally a straight two-edged blade, rather broad, and nearly of equal width from hilt to point. The Greeks and Romans wore them on the left side, so as to draw them out of the sheath (*vagina*, **κολέος**) by passing the right hand in front of the body to take hold of the hilt with the thumb next to the blade. The early Greeks used a very short sword. Iphicrates, who made various improvements in armor about B.C. 400, doubled its length. The Roman sword was larger, heavier, and more formidable than the Greek (see Smith, *Dict. of Antiq.* s.v. "Gladius"). The swords of the most ancient times were made of brass or copper, hardened by some process now unknown; and this continued to

be the case long subsequently with the Greeks and Romans, as well as among the Phoenicians (Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, note at ^{<610>}Numbers 31:8).

Picture for Sword 5

5. The sword is the symbol of war and slaughter (^{<135>}Leviticus 26:25; ^{<345>}Isaiah 34:5; ^{<697>}Revelation 19:17,18), of divine judgment (^{<634>}Deuteronomy 32:41; ^{<973>}Psalms 17:13; ^{<412>}Jeremiah 12:12; Revelation 1, 16), and of power and authority (^{<534>}Romans 13:4). The Word of God is called “the sword,” i.e. the weapon or instrument, of the Spirit (^{<467>}Ephesians 6:17).

Sword, Brothers Of The,

Picture for Sword

was an order of knight sword-bearers, founded at the beginning of the 13th century in Livonia; hence the order was sometimes called Livonian Brethren of the Sword. In 1237 the Order of the Teutonic Knights amalgamated with them, and they together gradually subdued all the territories surrounding the Gulf of Riga.

Sword-dance

in Hinduism, is a religious dance performed by Hindu, bayaderes who have dedicated themselves to some deity, and involving the display of great skill. Swords are fastened, edge upward, to two long poles, which are inclined against a wall so as to form two half-ladders. The bayaderes ascend these and dance on them, assuming the most graceful attitudes, and displaying inimitable skill and grace of bodily form. While the art of dancing on such vibrating blades may be exceedingly difficult, the reward of the dancers is correspondingly great, so that they are not unfrequently enriched by the receipts from a single performance.

Swords

and a ducal cap are blessed on Christmas eve, at the midnight mass, by the pope, in order to be sent to favored kings, as Edward IV, 1478; Henry VII, 1505; Henry VIII, 1517. The last gift of this kind was made by Leo XII to the due d'Angouleme in 1825.

Swormstedt, Leroy

a prominent minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Maryland Oct. 4, 1798. When eighteen years of age he professed conversion, and was licensed to preach Jan. 2, 1818. His entrance into the itinerant work was through the Ohio Conference in August, 1818. He was ordained deacon in 1820, and elder in 1822. In 1830 he was appointed presiding elder, and occupied that office until elected assistant agent of the Western Book Concern. After filling this position for eight years, he was elected principal agent in 1844, and continued to be such until 1860, when he took a superannuated relation. After this he declined rapidly in health, and died Aug. 27, 1863. Mr. Swormstedt was a man of vigorous health, scrupulously punctual, an energetic and methodical preacher and a rigid disciplinarian. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1863, p. 144.

Syagrius, St.

a French prelate, was born at Autun about 520, of a Gallo-Roman family, and was raised to the episcopal see of Autun about 560, being ordained by Germain, bishop of Paris. His house was a kind of school, where many distinguished ecclesiastics were educated; and he founded likewise a hospital, and adorned the churches of the same city. He deeply sympathized with the conquered Franks. He was active in the ecclesiastical affairs of his time, and died Aug. 27, 600. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale s.v.*

Sybaris

in Greek mythology, was a monster who occupied a cave on Parnassus and devastated the land around. By the command of the oracle a youth was to be sacrificed to him, and the task fell by lot upon Alcyoneus, son of Diomus, who, adorned with a garland, was brought to the cave; but, charmed with the beauty and youth of the victim, Eurybatus took the garland, went into the cave, fought the monster, and hurled it down a precipice.

Sycamine

Picture for Sycamine 1

Picture for Sycamine 2

(**συκάμινος**; *Vulg. morus*) is mentioned once only in the Bible, viz. in ^{<2176>}Luke 17:6, “If ye had faith as a grain of mustard-seed, ye might say to this sycamine-tree, Be thou plucked up,” etc. There is no reason to doubt that the **συκάμινος** is distinct from the **συκομωραία** of the same evangelist (19, 4), although we learn from Dioscorides (1, 180) that this name was sometimes given to the **συκόμορος**. *SEE SYCAMORE*. The sycamine is the mulberry-tree (*morus*), as is evident from Dioscorides, Theophrastus (H. P. 1, 6, 1; 10. 10; 13, 4, etc.), and various other Greek writers (see Celsius, *Hierob.* 1, 288). A form of the same word, **συκαμηνήα**, is still one of the names for the mulberry tree in Greece (see Heldreich, *Nutzpflanzen Griechenlands* [Athens, 1862], p. 19: “*Morus alba* L. and *M. Nigra* L., ἡ **Μορηά**, **Μουρηγιά**, and **Μουρηά**, also **Δυκαμηνήα**; *pelasg. mure*”). In his learned essay on the *Trees and Shrubs of the Ancients* (1865). Dr. Daubeny adopts the distinction pointed out by Bodoeus and confirmed by Fraas: the *sycamorus* of the Romans, the **συκόμορον** or **συκάμινος (ἐν Αἴγυπτία)** of Dioscorides, the **συκάμινος Αἴγυπτία** of Theophrastus. is the sycamore-fig, or *Ficus sycomorus* of modern botany. On the other hand, the **συκάμινος** of the Greeks, used simply and without the qualification “Egyptian,” the **συκαμηνέα** of Dioscorides, is the *morus* of the Romans—our mulberry. Dr. Sibthorpe, who traveled as a botanist in Greece for the express purpose of identifying the plants known to the Greeks, says that in Greece the white mulberry-tree is called **μουρέα**; the black mulberry-tree, **συκαμενία**. Not only is it the species whose fruit is prized, but it may be questioned whether the *Morus alba* had found its way into those regions before the introduction of the silk-worm had made its favorite food an object of cultivation. Believed to be a native of Persia, the mulberry, commonly so called, *Morus nigra*, is now spread over the milder regions, of Europe, and is continually mentioned by travelers in the Holy Land. As the mulberry-tree is common, as it is lofty and affords shade, it is well: calculated for the illustration of the above passage of Luke. See Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, p. 396; Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2, 296. *SEE MULBERRY*.

Sycamore

Picture for Sycamore 1

Picture for Sycamore 2

is the invariable rendering, in the A. V., of the Heb. **חֲמֻצְיָה** *ashikmah'* (which, however, occurs in the sing. only in the *Talmud, Shebiith*, 9, 2; the Bible employs indifferently the masc. plur. **חֲמֻצְיָהִם** *ashikzmm*, ^{<1102>}1 Kings 10:27; ^{<1378>}1 Chronicles 27:28; ^{<4015>}2 Chronicles 1:15; 9:27; ^{<2390>}Isaiah 9:10; ^{<1082>}Amos 5:2, 14; and the fem. plur. **חֲמֻצְיָהוֹת** *ashikmoth* (^{<1987>}Psalms 78:47), and of the Greek **συκομοραία** (^{<2904>}Luke 19:4). The Sept. always translates the Heb. word by **συκάμινος**, *sycamine*, meaning doubtless the Egyptian tree, the **συκάμινος Αἴγυπτία** of Theophrastus, which is really the sycamore (Dioscorides, 1, 180). See Gesenius, *Thesaur. Heb.* p. 1476 *b*; Rosenmüller, *Alterthumskunde*, 4:281 sq.; Celsius, *Hierioh.* 1, 310). The *sycamore*, or *fig-mulberry* (from **σῦκον**, *fig*, and **μόρον**, *mulberry*), is in Egypt and Palestine a tree of great importance and very extensive use. It attains the size of a walnut-tree, has wide-spreading branches, and affords a delightful shade. On this account it is frequently plaited by the waysides. Its leaves are heart-shaped, downy on the underside, and fragrant. The fruit grows directly from the trunk itself on little sprigs, and in clusters like the grape. To make it eatable, each fruit, three or four days before gathering, must, it is said, be punctured with a sharp instrument or the finger-nail (comp. Theophrastus, *De Caus. Plant.* 1, 17, 9; *Hist. Pl.* 4:2, 1; Pliny, *H. N.* 13:7; Forskal, *Descr. Plant*, p. 182). This was the original employment of the prophet Amos, as he says 7:14 (“a gatherer,” **מִלְבָּשׁ**, Sept. **κνίζων**. the exact term employed by Theophrastus). Hasselquist (*Trav.* p. 260; Lond. 1766) says, “The fruit of this tree tastes pretty well; when quite ripe it is soft, watery, somewhat sweet, with a very little portion of an aromatic taste.” It appears, however, that a species of gall insect (*Cynips sycomori*) often spoils much of the fruit. “The tree,” Hasselquist adds, “is wounded or cut by the inhabitants at the time it buds, for without this precaution, as they say, it will not bear fruit” (p. 261). In form and smell and inward structure it resembles the fig, and hence its name. The tree is always verdant, and bears fruit several times in the year without being confined to fixed seasons, and is thus, as a permanent food-bearer, invaluable to the poor.

In Lower Egypt it buds in March, and ripens early in June and by the poor of that country as well as of Palestine enormous quantities are consumed. The wood of the tree, though very porous, is exceedingly durable. It suffers neither from moisture nor heat. The Egyptian mummy coffins, which are made of it, are still perfectly sound after an entombment of thousands of years. It was much used for doors and large furniture, such as sofas, tables, and chairs (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* 2, 110).

So great was the value of these trees that David appointed for them in his kingdom a special overseer, as he did for the olives (^{<1373>}1 Chronicles 27:28); and it is mentioned as one of the heaviest of Egypt's calamities that her sycamores were destroyed by hailstones (^{<1378>}Psalm 78:47). The modern Haifa was the city of *sycamores* (*Sycominon*, Keland, *Palaest.* p. 1024), and the remains of its grove are still recognizable (Stanley, *Sinai and Pal.* p. 145). It was into a sycamore in the plain of Jericho that Zaccheus climbed in order to get a sight of Jesus passing by (^{<1394>}Luke 19:4); and at the broken aqueducts of Herod's Jericho Mr. Tristram lately found "a fine old sycamore fig-tree, perhaps a lineal descendant, and nearly the last, of that into which Zacchaeus climbed (*Land of Israel*, p. 509). That which is called sycamore in North America, the *Occidental plane* or *button-wood tree*, has no resemblance whatever to the sycamore of the Bible. The name is also applied to a species of maple (the *Acer pseudo-platanus*, or *fals plane*), which is much used by turners and millwrights. See Mayer, *De Sycamoro* (*Lips.* 1694); Warnekros, *Hist. Nat. Sycomori*, in the *Repert für bibl. Lit.* 11:224 sq. 12:81 sq.; Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, p. 397 Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1, 22 sq. **SEE FIG.**

Syceas

in Greek mythology, was one of the Titans whom, when Jupiter pursued him his mother, Earth, received into her womb.

Sy'char

(**Συχάρ** in a, A, C, D; but rec. tex **Σιχάρ** with B; Vulg. *Sichar*; but Codd. Am and Ftild. *Sychar*; Syriac *Socar*), a place named only in ^{<1405>}John 4:5, as "a city of Samaria called Sychar, near the ground which Jacob gave to Joseph his son; and there was the well of Jacob." Sychar was either a name applied to the town of Shechem, or it was an independent place.

1. The first of these alternatives is now almost universally accepted. In the words of Dr. Robinson (*Bibl. Res.* 2, 290), “In consequence of the hatred which’ existed between the Jews and the Samaritans, and in allusion to their idolatry, the town of Sichem received among the Jewish common people, the byname Sychar.” It seems to have been a sort of nickname (perhaps from רִקְוָה, *sheker*, “falsehood,” spoken of idols in ^{<4018>}Habakkuk 2:18; or from רִוְכָאֵשִׁיכְכֹר, “drunkard,” in allusion to ^{<2301>}Isaiah 28:1, 7), such as the Jews were fond of imposing upon places they disliked; and nothing could exceed the enmity which existed between them and the Samaritans, who possessed Shechem (^{<4019>}John 4:9). It should not be overlooked that John appears always to use the expression λεγόμενος, “called,” to denote a sobriquet or title borne by place or person in addition to the name, or to, attach it to a place remote and little known. Instances of the former practice are 11:16; 20:24; 19:13, 17; of the latter, 11:54. The son of Sirach speaks of “the foolish people that dwell in Sikima” (1,28). See Lightfoot, *Opera*, 2, 586; Lange, *Life of Christ*, 2, 337; Hengstenberg, *On St.* ^{<4015>}John 4:5. Jerome, in speaking of Paula’s journey, says, “She passed *Sichem*, not, as many erroneously call it, *Sichar*, which is now *Neapolis*” (*Epist. ad Eustoch.* in *Opp.* 1, 888, ed. Migne). In his questions on Genesis he says that, according to Greek and Latin custom, the Heb. *Sichem* is written *Sicima*; but that the reading *Sichar* is an error: he adds that it was then called *Neapolis* (*Opp.* 2, 1004, ed. Migne). So Adamnan writes to Arculf, who traveled in the 7th century: “He visited the town called in Hebrew *Sichem*, but by the Greeks and Latins *Sicima*, and now more usually *Sychar*” (*Early Travels*, Bohn, p. 8). In the 12th century Phocas says, “*Sichar* was the metropolis of the Samaritans, and was afterwards called *Neapolis*” (Reland, *Palaest.* p. 1009).

On the contrary, Eusebius (*Onomast.* s.v. Συχάρ and Λουζά) says that Sychar was in front of the city of Neapolis; and, again, that it lay by the side of Luza, which was three miles from Neapolis. Sychem, on the other hand, he places in the suburbs of Neapolis by the tomb of Joseph. The Bordeaux Pilgrim (A.D. 333) describes Sechim as at the foot of the mountain, and as containing Joseph’s monument and plot of ground (*villa*). He then proceeds to say that a thousand paces thence was the place called Sechar. Moreover, had such a nickname been applied to Shechem so habitually as its occurrence in John would seem to imply, there would be some trace of it in those passages of the Talmud which refer to the Samaritans, and in which every term of opprobrium and ridicule that can be

quoted or invented is heaped on them. It may be affirmed however, with certainty that neither in Targum nor Talmud is there any mention of such a thing. Lightfoot did not know of it. The numerous treatises on the Samaritans are silent about it, and recent close search has failed to discover it. *SEE SHECHEM.*

But Jerome's view soon became the prevailing one, and has continued to be so. Robinson adheres strongly to it; and in regard to one of the chief objections urged on the other side, that Jacob's well, which stands at the entrance into the valley where Shechem or Nablus is situated, is about a mile and a half from the town, so that a woman would hardly have gone so far to draw water, since there was plenty of good water near at hand, he thinks that the town probably had extensive suburbs in the Gospel age which did not exist in the time of Eusebius and might have approached quite near to the well of Jacob—just as Jerusalem anciently extended much farther north and south than at the present day (*Researches*, 3, 121). Porter takes the same general view, and says, in regard to the distance of the well, that persons who use such arguments know little of the East. The mere fact of the well having been Jacob's would have brought numbers to it had the distance been twice as great. Even independent of its history, some little superiority in the quality of the water, such as we might expect in a *deep* well, would have attracted the Orientals, who are, and have always been, epicures in this element (*Handbook for Pal.* p. 342). It may be added that there is no need for supposing this well to have been the one commonly frequented by the people of Nablus. The visit of the woman to it may have been quite an occasional one, or for some specific purpose.

2. It has been thought that Sychar may be identified with the little village of *Askar*, on the south-eastern declivity of Molmut Ebal (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 350; Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2, 206). The etymology, however, is against it, and also the topography. Our Lord was on his way to Galilee. The great road runs: past the mouth of Wady Nablus. Jacob's well is on the southern side of the opening; and *Askar* about half a mile distant on the northern side. The main road passes quite close to both. Our Lord sat down by the well while the disciples turned aside into the city to buy bread. Had *Askar* been the city, this would have been unnecessary for by continuing their route for a short distance farther they would have been within a few paces of the city. There is, besides; a copious spring at *Askar*. — In the *Quarterly Statement* of the "Pal. Explor. Fund," for July, 1877, p. 149 sq., Lieut. Comuder gives a further description of the village of

Askar, and some additional reasons for identifying it with Sychar; but they are not conclusive.

Sy' cliem

(~~4176~~ Acts 7:16). *SEE SHECHEM*.

Sy' chemite

(Judith 5, 16). *SEE SHECHEMITE*.

Sycites

in Greek mythology, was a surname of *Bacchus* in Lacedaemon, as having been the first to plant the fig (συκῆ).

Sydesmen

(more properly *Synodsmen*) are Church officers; anciently appointed to assist the church-wardens in making presentments of ecclesiastical offences at the bishop's *synods* or visitations. By the 90th canon, they are to be chosen yearly, in Easter week, by the parish priest and parishioners, if these can agree; otherwise they are to be appointed by the ordinary of the diocese. Of late years this office has; devolved on the church-wardens. The old English term for sydesmen was "sithcondmen," or "sithcundmen."

Sye'lus

(Συήλος v.r. Ἡσύηλος and ἡ σύνοδος), a corrupt Greek form (1 Esdr. 1, 8) for *Jehiel* (q.v.) of the Heb. (2 Chronicles 358).

Sye'ne

(*Heb. Seveneh*, ~~hmes~~] Sept. Συήνη; Vulg. *Syene*), a town of Egypt on the frontier of Cush, or Ethiopia. The prophet Ezekiel speaks of the desolation of Egypt "from Migdol to Seveneh, even unto the border of Cush" (29, 10), and of its people being slain "from Migdol to Seveneh" (30, 6). Migdol was on the eastern-border, *SEE MIGNOL*, and Seveneh is thus rightly identified with the town of Syene, *wihichi* was always the last town of Egypt on the south, though at one time included in the name Nubia. Its ancient Egyptian name is *Sun* (Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschrift.* 1, 155, tab. 1, No. 55), preserved in the Coptic *Sonan*, *Senon*, and the Arabic *Aswdn*. The modern town is slightly to the north of the old site, which is marked by an

interesting early Arab burial-ground, covered with remarkable tombstones having inscriptions in the Cufic character. Champollion suggests the Coptic derivation *sa* "causative," and *buen or ouen*, "to open" as if it signified the opening or key of Egypt (*L'Egypte*, 1, 161-166), and this is the meaning of the hieroglyphic name. It is the natural *boundary* of Egypt at the south (Ptolemy, 9:5; *Pliny, Hist. Nat.* 5, 10; 12:8 Strabo, p. 787, 815), being situated at the foot of the first cataract on the Nile (Murray, *Handbook for Egypt*, p. 463). See *Jour. Sac. Lit.*, Oct. 1851, p. 158. **SEE EGYPT.**

Syene

is represented by the present *Aswan* or *Essoudh*, which exhibits *few* remains of the ancient city, except some granite columns of a comparatively late date and the shrine of a small temple. This building has been supposed by late travelers to *have* contained the famous well of Strabo (*Geog.* 17 p. 817), into which the rays of a vertical sun were reported to fall at the summer solstice a circumstance, says the geographer, that proves the place "to lie under the tropic, the gnomon at midday casting no shadow." But although excavations have been carried on considerably below the pavement, which has been turned up in search of the well it was thought to cover, no other results have been obtained than that this shrine was a very improbable site for such an observatory, even if it ever existed; and that Strabo was strangely misinformed, since the Egyptians themselves could never in his time have imagined this city to lie under the tropic; for they were by no means ignorant of astronomy, and Syene was, even in the age of Hipparchus (B.C. 140, when the obliquity of the ecliptic was about 23° 51' 20"), very far north of that line. The belief that Syene was in the tropic was, however, very general in the time of the Romans, and is noticed by Seneca, Lucan, Pliny, and others. But, as, Sir J. G. Wilkinson remarks, "a well would have been a bad kind of observatory if the sun had been really vertical; and if Strabo saw the meridian sun in a well, he might be sure he was not in the tropic" (*Mod. Egypt and Thebes*, 2, 286). The same writer adds, "Unfortunately, the observations of the ancient Greek writers on the obliquity of the ecliptic are not so satisfactory as might be wished; nor are we enabled, especially as La Grange's theory of the annual change of obliquity being variable is allowed to be correct, to ascertain the time when Aswan might have been within the tropic, a calculation or traditional fact in which, perhaps, originated the erroneous assertion of Strabo." The latitude

of Aswan is fixed by Wilkinson at 240 5' 30", and the longitude is usually given as 32° 55'.

Sygn

in Norse mythology, was one of the female asas, goddess of justice, who takes charge of decisions and prevents any one denying anything. She guarded the doors of the palace of Wingolf, so that foreigners could not enter unawares.

Sykes, Arthur Ashley

an English divine, was born in London about 1684. He was educated at St. Paul's School, and was admitted to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 1701, taking his degree of A.B. in 1704-5 and A.M. in 1708. After leaving college he served as assistant in St. Paul's School, but was collated to the vicarage of Godmersham, Kent, in 1712-13, by archbishop Tenison. In April, 1714, he was instituted to the rectory of Dry-Drayton, Cambridgeshire, and in the August following resigned the vicarage of Godmersham. He was instituted to the rectory of Rayleigh, Essex, November, 1718, and resigned the living of Dry-Drayton. In December following he was appointed afternoon preacher of King Street Chapel, Golden Square, a chapel of ease to St. James's, Westminster. The morning preachership becoming vacant in 1721, Mr. Sykes was appointed to it. In January, 1723-24, he was appointed to the prebend of Alton-Borealis, Salisbury, and three years after became precentor of the same cathedral. He also received the following appointments assistant preacher at St. James's, Westminster, April, 1725; dean of St. Burien, Cornwall, February, 1739; prebendary of Winchester, Oct. 15, 1740. He died Nov. 15, 1756. His published work's number sixty-three, of which we notice, *An Essay upon the Truth of the Christian Religion* (Knapton, 1725, 8vo; 2nd ed. 1775, 8vo): — *Principles and Connection of Natural and Revealed Religion* (1740, 8vo): *Credibility of Miracles and Revelation* (1742, 8vo): — *Essay on Sacrifices* (1748, 8vo): — *Scripture Doctrine of Redemption of Man by Jesus Christ* (1755, 8vo): — *Paraphrase and Notes upon the Epistle to the Hebrews* (1755, 4to). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Sykes, Oliver

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Suffield, Conn., 1778. He was converted in his twenty-second year, and in 1806 was received on trial into the New York Conference. In 1810 he became superannuated, and held that relation through most of his life. He died Feb. 11, 1853. He left property, about \$2500, to the Missionary Society, for the benefit of the China Mission. See *Minutes of, Annual Conferences*, 1853, p. 212.

Sylea

in Greek mythology, was a daughter of king Corinthus and wife of Polypemon, to whom she bore Sinis, the pine-tree bender, a notorious robber.

Syleus

in Greek mythology, was a tyrant of Aulis, who compelled all foreigners who entered his dominions to labor in his garden. Hercules killed him, together with his daughter Xenodice. Another daughter was educated by her brother Dicseus; she fell in love with Hercules, and died of grief because she could not be his. He also loved her so deeply that he was with difficulty restrained from casting himself upon her funeral pyre.

Syllabae enthronistcae

(*Συλλαβαὶ ἐνθρονιστικάι*), circular letters written by bishops recently installed to foreign bishops, to give them an account of their faith and orthodoxy, that they might receive letters of peace and communion from them. See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 2, ch. 12 § 10.

Syllabus

an abstract; a compendium containing the heads of a lecture or sermon.

Syllabus

(Gr. *συλλαβός*, a *collection, i., e. catalogue*), PAPAL, is the title given to the appendix to the encyclical letter issued by pope Pius IX, Dec. 8, 1864. It was "a list of the principal errors of the day pointed out in the consistorial allocutions, encyclical and other apostolical letters of pope Pius

IX,” and enumerating, under ten general heads or sections, eighty of these errors. These ten sections of errors are entitled,

“**I.** Pantheism, Naturalism, and Absolute Rationalism;”

“**II.** Moderate Rationalism;”

“**III.** Indifferentism, Toleration;”

“**IV.** Socialism, Communism, Secret Societies, Bible Societies, Clerico-liberal Societies;”

“**V.** Errors respecting the Church and her Rights;”

“**VI.** Errors of Civil Society, as much in themselves as considered in their relations to the Church;”

“**VII.** Errors in Natural and Christian Morals;”

“**VIII.** Errors as to Christian Marriage;”

“**IX.** Errors regarding the Civil Power of the Sovereign Pontiff;”

“**X.** Errors referring to Modern Liberalism.”

Some of the specifications under these general heads have respect to religious freedom, the separation of Church and State, the civil contract of marriage, education outside of the control of the Roman Catholic Church, the conflict between the civil law and the spiritual authority of the Church, the immunities of the clergy, the cessation of the pope’s temporal power, etc. Much excitement was created by the appearance of this bull and syllabus, especially in France; Jules Baroche, minister of public worship, forbidding the bishops to publish the syllabus and the doctrinal part of the bull. Elsewhere the civil governments did not interfere.

For literature, see Schulte, *The Power of the Romans over Princes, Countries, etc.* (1871); Fessler, *True and False Infallibility of the Popes* (Vienna, 1871; Lond. and N.Y. 1875); Gladstone, *The Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance* (1874), with replies by Newman, Manning, and others.

Syllis

in Greek mythology, was a nymph beloved by Apollo, and the mother by him of Xelippus.

Sylliturgus

(*Συλλεΐτουργος*), a Greek term to designate the assistant during the offering of the Christian sacrifice.

Sylphs

in the fantastic system of the Paracelsists, are the elemental spirits of the air, who, like the other elemental spirits, hold an intermediate place between immaterial and material beings. They eat, drink, speak, move about, beget children, and are subject to infirmities like men; but, on the other hand, they resemble spirits in being more nimble and swift in their motions, while their bodies are more diaphanous than those of the human race. They also surpass the latter in their knowledge both of the present and the future, but have no soul; and when they die, nothing is left. In form they are ruder, taller, and stronger than men; but stand nearest to them of all the elemental spirits, and as a consequence hold intercourse with human creatures. When they have children by marriage with mortals, the children have souls, and belong to the human race. Originally masculine, they have come, probably by the etherealization of poets, to be considered as feminine.

Sylvester Gozzoloni

SEE SYLVESTRANS.

Sylvester I

pope, was born in Rome about the year 270, and was the son of Rufinus and St. Justa. At thirty years of age he is said to have been ordained by bishop (pope) Marcellinus, and on Jan. 31, 314, he was chosen to succeed Melchides in the pontificate. His administration is celebrated for the Council of Niceea (q.v.), held in 325, which, however, Sylvester did not attend, on account of his infirmities; and he was represented by two priests, called Guy and Vincent, while Osius, bishop of Cordova, presided in his name. He is the author of several rules to the clergy. The account given of the donation to him of the city of Rome by Conatantine is wholly apocryphal. He died in Rome, Dec. 31, 335, and was succeeded by Marcus.

Sylvester II

one of the most learned of the mediaeval popes, originally called *Gerbert*, was born at Aurillac, in Auvergne, early in the 10th century. He was educated in the monastery of his native village, but went early to Spain, where he learned mathematics, and afterwards to Rome. He was appointed abbot of the Monastery of Bobbio, where he taught with much distinction and success. At a later period he went to Germany as preceptor of the young prince Otho, afterwards Otho II, and ultimately became secretary to the archbishop of Rheims, and director of the cathedral school, which became eminent under his care. The archbishop having been deposed, Sylvester was elected to the archbishopric; but he was afterwards set aside, the deposition of his predecessor having been declared invalid. In the year 998, however, he was appointed archbishop of Ravenna, whence he was called to the pontifical throne, April 2, 999, as the successor of Gregory V. He renounced the liberal tendencies of his earlier years, confirmed the judgment of John XV with regard to the Synod of Rheims, and established Arnulph in his archbishopric; convened a synod in 1001 at Rome, which placed the Convent of Gandersheim under the jurisdiction of the bishop of Hildesheim; and awarded title and crown to the king St. Stephen of Hungary, besides conferring on him the right to determine in ecclesiastical matters in his kingdom. While considering a plan for a crusade to the Holy Land, he died in Rome, May 12, 1003, and was succeeded by John XVIII. He was a man of rare acquirements for his age. He was an adept in mathematics and in practical mechanics and astronomy, in which departments his attainments acquired for him, among his contemporaries, the evil reputation of a magician. He is also believed to have been acquainted with Greek, and perhaps with Arabic. Of all his works, which were numerous, his letters (printed by Du Chesne in the *Historians of France*) have attracted most notice, from their bearing on the history of an obscure period. His literary remains have been published by Masson and others, more recently by Pertz, though not complete. See Richeri *Hist. Lib. 4* in Pertz, *Monum. Germ. Historica Script.* (Hanov. 1838), tom. 3; Mabillon, *Vet. Analecta* (Paris, 1723), p. 102 sq.; Hock, *Gerbert od. Papst Sylvester II u. sein Jahrhundert* (Vienna, 1837). See also Budinger on the scientific and political importance of Gerbert (Cassel, 1851); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Sylvester III

antipope, was born in Rome, May 1, 1044; and while known as John, bishop of Sabina, he was set on the pontifical throne through the influence of the consul Ptolemaeus, in place of the juvenile Benedict IX, who had been expelled for his vices. Sylvester reigned but three months, when the counts of Frascati took up arms to replace Benedict. The latter, seeing he was despised by the clergy, sold the tiara to John Gratian, whom he crowned as Gregory VI. The emperor Henry III held, in December, 1046, a council at Sutri when the three popes were all deposed, and Clement II was elected. *SEE POPE.*

Sylvestrians

is the name of an order of monks founded by Sylvester Gozzoloni, who was born in 1170 (or 1177) at Osimo, in the Papal States. He was educated at Padua and Bologna, and received a canonry at Osimo, which he renounced about 1217, in order to devote himself in solitude to a contemplative life of asceticism. Pupils and followers gathered about him, with whom he founded a monastery in 1231 on Mount Fano, in which the Benedictine rule was adopted, coupled with a vow of rigid poverty. Innocent IV confirmed the foundation (1247), and the order spread, particularly in Umbria, Tuscany, and Ancona. It was united with that of Vallambrosa in 1662, but again separated from it in 1681, and was endowed with new constitutions by Alexander VIII (1690), which provided for the celebration of matins at night, for reciprocal and also self-inflicted flagellations on every Wednesday and Friday in Advent and Lent, and for abstinence from the use of flesh, milk, and eggs on every Friday and every Church festival. A considerable number of convents, of nuns as well as monks, belonged to this order in its flourishing period; but it is now insignificant. Leo XII purposed to dissolve the order and incorporate its members with other organizations; but it has, nevertheless, been preserved to our time. An order of female Sylvestrians exists in Perugia. The direction of the order is placed in the hands of a general and a procurator-general, the former being chosen for four and the latter for three years. The habit is composed of a gown, scapulary, cowl, and mantle; its color is dark brown. The general wears violet, and is privileged to bear *the pontificalia* (q.v.). Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*

Symnrthis

in Greek mythology, was a Trinacrian nymph, goddess of the river of the like name, beloved of Faunus, to whom she bore Acis.

Symbol

(from *σύν* and *βάλλω*, *to throw together*, i.e. by comparison), an abstract or compendium, a sign or representation of something moral, by the figures or-properties of natural things. Hence symbols are of various kinds, as hieroglyphics, types, enigmas, parables, fables, etc. (q.v. severally). See Lancaster, *Dict. of Scripture Symbols*; Bicheno, *Symbolical Vocabulary*, in his *Signs of the Times*; Faber, *On the Prophecies*; Jones [W.], *Works*, vol. 4; Wemyss, *Clavis Symbolica*; Mills, *Sac. Symbology* (Edinb. 1853); Fairbairn, *Typol. of Script.*; *Brit. and For. Evan. Rev.* 1843, p. 395. **SEE SYMBOLISM.**

Symbol

(Gr. *Σύμβολον*, *sign, token*), a title anciently given to the Apostles Creed (Cyprian, *Ep.* 76; Rufinus, *De Symbolo*; Augustine, *De Fide et Symbolo*; and Hilary, *De Trin.* cap. 12). The ecclesiastical origin of the term is much disputed, but its most probable meaning was that of a contract, or bond of our faith. One reason for the name derives it from a Greek word signifying a throwing or casting together, and alleges that the apostles each contributed an article to form the Creed, putting their joint opinion or counsel in an abridged shape. The other is the opinion that this Creed was used in times of persecution as a watchword or mark whereby Christians (like soldiers in the army) were distinguished from all others.

The term *symbol*, importing an emblem or sensible representation, is also applied in the holy eucharist to the sacred elements, which there set forth the body and blood of Christ.

Symbolical Books

This title designates the public confessions of faith of the different Christian churches or denominations; in other words, the writings in which an ecclesiastical communion publishes to the world the tenets that bind together its members and distinguish it from other communions of believers or unbelievers. For the *idea* of a symbol we refer to the article **SYMBOLICS** **SEE SYMBOLICS**.

The only symbol which finds universal acceptance in the Church is the Apostles Creed. As the Church creed *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, it is distinguished from the Scriptures upon which it is based, but also, on the other hand, from the private writings and confessions of the teachers of the Church,-however greatly the latter may be esteemed. The later symbolical *books* differ from the briefer *symbolical formulas*, which alone served the purposes of the Church before the Reformation, in being more extensive and detailed, and in constituting the confessions of particular churches only (*symbola particularia*), while the great creeds (Apostles, Nicene, Athanasian) have ecumenical value. The phrase *Libri Symbolici originated* in the Lutheran Church, and was first applied to its own confessional writings when they appeared in the *Book of Concord*; but its use extended, and has long been current in all the churches and sects of Christendom.

Considerable diversity of opinion has existed with reference to the importance and value of symbolical writings. The Church of Rome regards the symbol as the immovable and unchangeable rule of faith, and therefore as the binding norm of doctrine. This does not, according to Thomas Aquinas (*Summa Theol.* 2, 2, 1, 9), detract from the supreme authority of the Scriptures, because the symbol is merely an extract from Scripture. In substance there is but one symbol; each additional formula is simply an exposition and closer determination of the original creed. Variations are to be understood as different aspects of the truth, assumed in view of the varying oppositions it has to encounter. The Church is accordingly competent to formulate a new symbol for the exposition of the truth, though not to set aside, or even to alter, the traditional creed (Thom. Aquinas, *ut sup.*).

The Church of the Reformation asserted the sole authority of Holy Scripture in matters of doctrine; and although it received the ecumenical symbols, it determined their character as being *testimonia fidei* simply, i.e. testimonies certifying the understanding of the Word of God current in the Church at a given time. The worth of confessions is accordingly made to depend on their agreement with the Scriptures, and they may be altered and improved. The author of the *Augustana* repeatedly undertook a thorough revision of his work; Luther did the same with *the Smalcald Articles*; and the evangelical estates not only approved of Melancthon's *Variata*, but in 1537 directed their theologians at the Convention of Smalcald to revise the confession. The beginnings of an obligatory support of the confession are, however, apparent at an early day. Subscription to the *Augsburg*

Confession was occasionally required during the fourth decade of the 16th century, and in 1533 the theological faculty of Wittenberg were required by statute to teach sound doctrine as contained in the ancient creeds and the *Augsburg Confession*. A growing disposition to insist on uniformity of teaching became manifest, and it was this which gave rise to the Osiandrian Controversies (q.v.). In the middle of the 16th century the various *corpora doctrinae* began to appear in 1560 the *Corpus Doctr. Philippicum*; in 1561 the *C. D. Pomeranicum*; in 1567 the *C. D. Pruthenicum*, etc. The conclusion was made in 1576 with the *Formula of Concord* (q.v.), and this names the writings to which symbolical authority is given by reason of a unanimous approval of their teachings, and is itself included among them. A rigid subscription was demanded in the countries where these writings were received by the civil government. The dispute with Calixtus (q.v.) led the Lutheran theologians to postulate a mediate inspiration, and consequently a divine authority, for the symbolical books; but the distinction between the canon of Scripture and such standards is nevertheless constantly preserved in word, if not always in fact. In reality, the symbolical books were regarded as a κανὼν τῆς πίστεως throughout the 17th century side by side with the Scriptures, inasmuch as the faith was grounded directly on the symbol rather than on the Bible.

The Reformed churches have produced no written symbol which has formal authority over them all; but they have cherished a very definite conviction of confessional unity among them, as may appear from the fact that the different Reformed confessions, and particularly the more important of them, the *Helvetica*, *Gallicana*, *Scotica*, *Belgica*, etc., are received in all such churches as embodiments of the pure type of doctrine, and from the further fact that the members of a Church holding to one of these confessions may pass beyond the territory within which such confession has authority, but cannot pass from one confession to another by joining a Church which adheres to another of the Reformed confessions. All such persons are regarded simply as members of the Reformed Church. The number of Reformed symbols was influential also in directing attention upon their substance rather than upon the formulated letter, it being conceded that with respect to the latter the confession is not infallible and incapable of further improvement. Such changes, however, are not to be needlessly undertaken, nor may individuals subject the confessional standards at will to experiments in the interests of novelty. Great care has ever been exercised to preserve the purity of the confessional symbols, in

some instances carried to the extent of requiring the subscription of the clergy and the officers of state to doctrinal standards settled by law. (Basle and Geneva even required such subscription of the body of their citizens. The Reformed Church of East Friesland alone never required subscription to its symbol.) The 17th century produced symbols in this body also, e.g. the *Canons of Dort* and the *Helvetic Consensus*, both of which go beyond even the *Formula of Concord* in scholastic rigidity. The beginning of the 18th century saw a reaction, however; Spener already ventured to doubt the necessity of symbols, since the Church *had* so long existed without them, and expressed his dissent from the doctrine of their inspiration and infallibility. A century afterwards it was conceded that obligation to, adhere to the symbol holds only with reference to essentials; and a majority of critics asserted that the unessential, not directly religious and merely theological, which deserves no place at all in a creed, was greatly in excess over that which is really essential. The conflict with rationalism caused many modifications in the views; of the churches; but subscription to the creed was generally insisted on, though the obligation thus assumed was often but lightly felt. In the present period, the reaction against rationalism has occasioned a revival of 17th-century confessionalism in many quarters; and, on the other hand, a liberal tendency requires a breaking away from the authority of symbols as being simply monuments of the faith of our fathers and evidences of former conquests, and also as being adverse to the genius of Protestantism. *SEE CONFESSION OF FAITH.*

The abstract right of the Church to require submission to its standards is evident, but it is a question which must be answered, 'May the Protestant Church' assert that right, and, if it may, then to what extent?' It is evident that the more recent symbols, as being more restrictive and separative in character than the older confessions and creeds; are of inferior authority.. It is also clear that the spirit and substance of a confession have greater importance than attaches to the form, or letter. Neither the *Augsburg Confession* nor the *Heidelberg Catechism* constitutes the Protestant Confession of Faith, and must be regarded simply as essays; towards formulating the body of Protestant doctrine, which may be tested by criticism and revised. Doctrinal purity in the concrete is, after all, a relative thing, and the Church is under the necessity of persisting in the work of grounding its teachings more solidly on the Word of God and of developing them further towards their ultimate consummation. A distinction must accordingly be admitted between heterodoxy of a more or

less serious type, which consists in departing in some points from the accepted standards of a Church, and heresy, which removes the foundations and destroys the faith itself. It is none the less certain, however, that Protestantism requires an inner unity and a durable basis of character. Every step of its progress must be in harmony with its fundamental principles, which are laid down in the confessions formulated by its founders. Those symbols attest a faith, which belongs equally to our fathers and to us. The liberty of *teaching*, moreover, needs to be guarded, lest it degenerate into license and anarchy contrary to the Word of God and the order of the Church. Protestantism certainly has the right to protect its truth against neologizing antichristianity, and also against un-Protestant Romanism in a word, against manifest perversion. The subscription to symbols required of its accredited teachers can hardly, however, be without conditions. Perhaps the utmost extent to which such requirement should be pressed is a cordial acceptance of principles upon which the confessions are based, leaving particulars to be determined by the conscience of the subscriber. In any case, the symbols are entitled to respect so far as to make them the subject of earnest and loving study, and to protect them against abuse from professed adherents.

Literature. — Early Protestant writers have no separate *locus* for symbolical books, and but few treat of them even incidentally (see Hase, *Hutterus Rediviv.* p. 115, note 1). Among later doctrinal writers, see Twisten (1826), 1, 50 sq.; Hase (3rd ed. 1842), p. 498 sq.; Martensen, p. 74 sq. Controversial writings are partially given in Hase, *ut sup.* A comprehensive monograph is Johannsen's *Wissenschaftl. u. hist. Unters. ib. d. Rechtmässigkeit d. Verpflicht. auf symb. Bücher*, etc. (Altona, 1833). See also id. *Anfänge des Symbolzwangs*, etc. (Leips. 1847); Matthes, *Vergleichende Symbolik* (ibid. 1843), p. 2 sq.; Schenkel, *Ursprüngl. Verhältn. d. Kirche zum Staat*, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1850, 2, 454 sq.; Hilingi *De Symb. Natura, Necessitate, Auctoritate, et Usu* (Erl. 1835); Bretschneider, *Unzulässigkeit — d. Symbolzwangs*, etc. (Leips. 1841); Rudelbach, *Einl. in d. Augsb. Confession*, etc. (Dresd. 1841); Sartorius, *Nothw. u. Verbindl. d. kirchl. Glaubensbekenntnisse* (Stuttg. 1845); Schleiermacher, *Eigentl. Wrth d. symb. Bücher*, in *Ref. A Im.* (Frankf. 1819), p. 335 sq.; id. *Sendschr. an v. Colln u. Schulz*, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1831, 1, 3 sq.; id. *Prakt. Theologie*, p. 622 sq.; De Wette, *Lehreinheit d. evan. Kirche*, in the *Stud. Krit.* 1831, 2, 221 sq.; Ullmann, *Altenb. kirchl. Angel.* etc., in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1840, 2; Scherrer, *Die*

Princip. u. fakt. Stellung d. schweiz. —ref Kirche, etc., in the *Verhandl. d. schweiz. Predigergesellsch. zu St. Gallen*, 1844; *Die gegenw. Krisis d. kirchl. Lebens, etc.* (Gött. 1854); *Petri, Beleucht. d. gott. Denkschrift, etc.* (Hanov. 1854); *Erklrdung der Denkschr.* (Gott. 1854); Nitzsch, *Prakt. Theol. I.*

Among editions of Lutheran symbolical writings, those of Rechenberg, *Concordia, etc.* (Lips. 1678, 8vo, and often; last ed. 1756), and of Hase, *fibri Symb. Eccl. Ev. etc.* (ibid. 1837), deserve mention. The Reformed confessions have not been gathered into a single collection, the best and most complete collection being that of Niemeyer, *Collect. Conf. in Eccl. Ref. Publicat.* (ibid. 1840), cum Append. Other collections are by Augusti (Elberfeld, 1827), German by Mess (Neuwied, 1828, 1830, 2 pts.; comp. Schweizer, *Ref. Glaubensl.* 1, 122), and Heppe, *Bekennnisschriften d.ref. Kirchen Deutschl.* (Elberfeld, 1860). The *Libri Symbolici Eccl. Romano Catholicae* were edited by Danz (Vimar. 1836) and

Streitwolf et Klener (Gott. 1837 sq.); the *Libri Symb. Eccl. Orientalis* by Kimmel (Jena, 1843; cum Append. ibid. 1850). For the symbolical books and writings of particular churches and denominations, see the respective articles. —Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Symbolics

The meaning of this term will vary with that assigned to the original word from which it is derived **σύμβολον** (from **συμβάλλειν**) has a primary reference to the fitting-together of two separate objects, e.g. the parts of a ring or of other “tessera hospitalitatis.” **Σύμβολον** (related to **σήμα**) next came to denote every mark or sign by which the connection of individuals to a whole, e.g. a corporation or association, might be indicated. Such were the badges which secured admission to a banquet, the “tessera militaria,” the flag, the password, etc. In time, whatever might be employed to illustrate abstract or supersensual ideas to the senses came to be termed a symbol, and this may be regarded the current meaning of the word today. As Christianity, like all religions, has its symbols, it is as proper to speak of *Christian symbolics* as of heathen (or ancient). A rich symbolism runs through the whole of Christian liturgies, e.g. the symbolism of the cross, etc.; but in the organism of theological study the term *symbolics* has no reference to such symbols. The reference is rather to the formulated and written *confessions* of the Church, which, more than any badge, are suited

to indicate the union of individuals in one and the same ecclesiastical organization. Of these symbols the most ancient are baptismal confessions, from which the *Symbolum Apostolicum* was developed, which forms the rallying point of all who are adherents of Christianity. Heretical tendencies afterwards compelled the Church to formulate the great creeds — the Nicene, the Niceno Constantinopolitan, and the so-called Athanasian in which the marks of orthodoxy were determined and made prominent; and, in addition to the foregoing so called *ecumenical symbols*, other minor creeds and confessions were called into being by the force of events from time to time.

The rise of Protestantism furnished a new class of symbols, which were intended to serve as marks of distinction between the old papal and the new evangelical churches. Of these the first was the *Augsburg Confession* (q.v.) of 1530, and the supplementary symbolical books of the Lutheran Church, closing with the *Book of Concord* in 1580. The Reformed churches framed distinct symbols of their own—the *Zwinglian*, the *Tetrapolitana*, etc. Of this class the *Thirty-nine Articles* of the Church of England, the *Heidelberg Catechism*, and the second *Helvetic Confession* (see the respective articles) acquired especial prominence. The Romish Church, for its part, was obliged, by the rise of Protestantism, to formulate its faith anew with a view to marking the features peculiar to its teachings, which was done in the *Professio Fidei Tridentina* and the *Catechismus Romanus* (see the corresponding articles). The accumulation of this wealth of material has operated decisively upon symbolics, so that the term has come to denote *the science, which is employed upon the doctrines that distinguish the several confessions of Christendom*. Its *method* may be historical, statistical, polemical, or irenic; but the ground upon which it operates can only be that of comparison of dogmas.

Like the history of doctrines, to which it stands related, symbolics is a modern branch of theological science, but is possessed of so much individuality as to necessitate a separate treatment. The foundation for the science was laid in the preliminary works of Walch, Semler, Planck, and others (see below, *Literature*), while its actual beginnings date to Winer and Marheineke. The former drew up tables in which he simply presented to view, side by side, the differences existing in the various confessions, while the latter sought to exhibit the internal unity of each separate confession. It is evident that the treatment of symbolics requires the use of both these methods, and will vary according as the writer occupies the

ground of one confession or another, or as he places himself *above all confessions*. It was because of this fact that Mohler's *Symbolik*, from the Roman Catholic point of view, drew forth the famous work of Baur from the Evangelical position (see below). The science speedily developed the necessity for examining its material, not simply in the letter of the symbolical books, but in the spirit of the confessions. Every detail has accordingly been made the subject of earnest study; and the ethical, social, political, and artistic bearings and differences of the various symbols have been examined. This fact gives rise to the question whether the term symbolics is adequate to the thing it is intended to represent; but all attempted substitutes have been so clumsy that they failed to win their way into favor. In Great Britain and America the subject is usually included under dogmatic theology (q.v.).

Literature. — Walch, *Introd. in Libros Symb. Eccl. Luth.* (Jen. 1732); Semler, *Apparat. ad Libros Symb. Eccles. Luth.* (Halle, 1775); Feuerlin: *Bibl. Symbolica* (Gött. 1752, 1768); Planck, *Geseh. d. Entstehung, d. Vernderungen, u. d. Bildung des prot. Lehrbegriffs* (Leips. 17911800); id. *Hist. u. vergleichende Darstellung d. verschiedene Dogm. — Systeme*, etc. (Gott. 1796; 3rd ed. 1822); Winer, *Comparative Darst. d. Lehrbegr. d. verschiedenen Kirchenparteien*, etc. (Leips. 1824, etc. 4to); Marheineke, *Symbolik* (Heidelb. 1810, etc.); id. *Inst. Symbolicæ Doctrinarum*, etc. (Berl. 1812, etc.); Marsh, *Comp. View of the Churches of England and Rome* (Lond. 1841, 8vo); Möhler, *Symbolik* (Mayence, 6th ed. 1843); Baur, *Gegensatz d. Katholicismus u. Protestantismus*, etc. (Tub. 1834).

See in connection therewith Sack, Nitzsch, etc.; Kollner, *Symballer christl. Conf.* (Hamb. 1837; 1844, 2 vols.); Guericke, *Allgem. christl. Symbol.* [Lutheran] (Leips. 1839); Rudelbach, *Reformation, Lutherthum und Union* (ibid. 1839); Gobel, *Lutherische u. ref. Kirche* (Bonn, 1837); Schneckenburger, *Lutherisch. u. ref. Lehrbegriffe* (Stuttg. 1855, posthumous); Thiersch, *Kathol. u. Protestantismus* [lectures] (Erl. 1848, 2nd ed.);

Schenkel, *Wesen d. Protestantismus* (Schaffhausen, 184652, etc.). See especially Schaff, *Creeks of Christendom* (N. Y. 1877, 3 vols. 8vo). — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v. **SEE SYMBOLICAL BOOKS.**

Symbolism

is that system which represents moral or intellectual qualities by external signs or symbols. It is characteristic of the earlier and ruder stages of development, when the mind and moral nature have not yet grown to the age, which takes direct cognizance of mental and moral qualities, or takes cognizance of them only through external signs that bear a real or a conventional resemblance to them. The Old Test. is full of symbolism; the Jewish Temple, like the Tabernacle which it superseded, though no image of the Deity was permitted in it, was itself a symbol of the soul of man, in which God abides, if it be holy and ready to receive him; and all its utensils, as well as all its services, were symbolical. *SEE TYPE*, and the various articles on the Old-Test. ceremonials and sacred objects. Symbolism was also naturally characteristic of the Church of the Middle Ages, which undertook to carry home to the eyes, minds, and hearts of the people spiritual truths through external symbols. The origin of some of these it is now difficult to discover. Many naturally suggest the correlative truth to the mind; others make the suggestion through historical or scriptural association. The following is a partial list of some of the principal symbols in use in the Christian churches, for a fuller account of which the reader is referred to Clements [Mrs.], *Handbook of Legendary and Mythological Art*. The glory, aureole, and nimbus all represent light or lightness, and are symbols of sanctity. The nimbus surrounds the head; the aureole the body; the glory unites the two. The nimbus attaches in Roman Catholic art to all saints; the aureole and glory only to the persons of the Godhead and to the Virgin Mary. The fish is an emblem of Christ. *SEE ICHTHYS*. The cross, in its various forms, is also an emblem both of Christ and his passion. *SEE CROSS; SEE CRUCIFIX; SEE LABARUM*. The lamb is a common symbol of Christ. It derives its significance from the fact that it was one of the chief sacrifices of the Jewish Temple, and from the words of John the Baptist, "Behold the lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world" (^{<A012>}John 1:29). The lamb is often represented in art bearing a cross. The lion is another symbol of Christ, who in Scripture is called "the Lion of the tribe of Judah" (^{<A015>}Revelation 5:5). The pelican, which is said to bare open her breast to feed her young with blood, is an emblem of redemption. The dove is a symbol of the Holy

Spirit (^{<A016>}Matthew 3:16) issuing from the mouth of the dying, it is an emblem of the soul. The olive-branch is an emblem of peace (^{<A018>}Genesis

8:11); the palm, of martyrdom (^{<600>}Revelation 7:9). The lily represents chastity; the lamp, piety (^{<121>}Matthew 25:1-12); fire, zeal or the sufferings of martyrdom; the flaming heart, fervent piety and spiritual love; the peacock, immortality; the crow, victory on women, it signifies the bride of Christ. The sword, axe, lance, and club indicate martyrdom; the skull and scourge, penance; the chalice, faith; the ship, the Christian Church; the anchor, faith (^{<309>}Hebrews 6:19). Each color also has a symbolic meaning in art, for which *SEE COLOR*. In Roman Catholic art, also, each apostle has his own symbol, as follows: Peter, the keys, or a fish; Andrew, the transverse cross which bears his name; James the Greater, the pilgrim's staff; John, the eagle, or the chalice with the serpent; Thomas, a builder's rule; James the Less, a club; Philip, a small cross on a staff, or crosier surmounted by a cross; Bartholomew, a knife; Matthew, a purse; Simon, a saw; Thaddeus, a halberd or lance; Matthias, a lance. The various monastic orders have also each its own symbol. See Jameson and Eastlake, *History of Our Lord as Exemplified in Works of Art* (Lond. 1864, 2 vols.); Didron, *Christian Iconography, or History of Christian Art in the Middle Ages* (ibid. 1851, ed. Bohn).

Symbolum

(Σύμβολον), a Greek term for (1) the holy eucharist; (2) a creed; (3) a bell. *SEE SYMBOL*.

Syme

in Greek mythology, was a nymph, daughter of Ialymus and Dotis. She was beloved of the sea god Glaucus, who carried her off to an island near Rhodes, on the coast of Caria, which received its name from her (Athenaeus, 7:296). By Neptune she bore Chtholnius, who colonized the island from Lindus.

Symeon The Stylite

SEE SIMEON, ST.

Symmachia

in Greek mythology, was a surname of *Venus* at Mantinea, in Arcadia.

Symmachians

The term designates the members of a sect mentioned only by Philaster (*Haer.* 63). He describes them as adherents of Patricius, who taught that the human body was not created by God, but by the devil, and that it should be abused in every possible way, suicide even being regarded as allowable. The Symmachians asserted also that every vice and fleshly lust should command the obedience of mankind, and that there is no future judgment for the race. It is more probable, however, that the Symmachians were disciples of Symmachus (q.v.) of Samaria, a Jew who became a Christian, consorted with the Ebionites, and furnished a Greek version of the Old Test. which stands before that of Theodotion in the Polyglot, but is of more recent date than the latter. Petavius (in *Notes on Epiphanius*, 2, 400) endeavors to trace their origin to yet another Symmachus; and Valesius (on Euseb. 6. 17) says that a Jewish-Christian sect originated with the Ebionite Symmachus, of whom Ambrose states, in a commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, that they descended from the Pharisees, kept the whole law, called themselves Christians, and followed Photinus in the belief that Christ was merely a man. The Manichaean Faustus (see Augustine, *Contra Faust.* 19:14), on the other hand, describes the Symmachians as Nazarenes, and Augustine adds (*Contra Cresconium*, 1, 31) that they were but few in number in his time, and that they practiced both Jewish circumcision and Christian baptism. See Fabricius [Joann. Alb.], *Philastrii de Haeresibus Liber, cum Emend. et Notis* (Hamb. 1725), p. 125. Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Symmachus

pope from A.D. 498 to 514, is noted because of his conflicts with the civil power, and his endeavors to heighten the importance of the Roman see. At the time of his election by the Roman party, the imperial party had elected the archpresbyter Laurentius, who was pledged to sign the *Henoticon* (q.v.). The determination of the election was left with Theodoric, king of the Goths, and resulted in favor of Symmachus, because he was the: first to be anointed or was supported by a majority of votes. At a synod held at Rome in 499 it was thereupon enacted that no vote should be cast for the election of a new pope before the reigning pope had actually died, and that that candidate should be regarded as elected who was supported by all or a majority of the votes of the Roman clergy. At a synod at Rome in 502 Symmachus revoked the enactment of king Odoacer which prohibited the

incumbent of the papal chair from selling *any* portion of the property of the Church, and at the same time he ordained that all interference in the affairs of the Church of Rome should be forbidden to the laity. This provision contributed greatly to the development of the papal power, and has always remained a cardinal principle in the administration of the Romish Church. The party of Laurentius, after a time, brought heavy charges against Symmachus, and Theodoric deputed bishop Peter of Altinum to investigate the case; but, as he became a partisan of Laurentius, the king convoked a new synod at Rome, the *Synodus Palmaris*, in 503. The life of Symmachus was endangered by the machinations of the Laurentines, and he submitted unconditionally to the decisions of the synod, in direct contradiction of his recently promulgated ordinance against the interference of laymen in ecclesiastical matters. He was acquitted without a trial. Bishop Ennodius of Ticinum, in his written defense of this synod, was the first to declare that God has reserved the judgment of the incumbent of the Roman see to himself, while other men must, according to his will, be judged by their fellows. At a synod held at Rome in 504, Symmachus promulgated detailed ordinances against all who should appropriate to themselves any of the possessions of the Church. It is worthy of note that the synods held under his pontificate addressed to him, by way of eminence, the title *Papa*. He appointed bishop Caesarius of Arles his vicar in Gaul. He banished the remaining Manichaeans from Rome and caused their books to be burned, but was himself branded as a Manichbean by the emperor Anastasius. Tradition attributes to him the introduction of the *Gloria in Excelsis* into the Sunday and feast-day services of the Church. He died, as is reported, July 19, 514. See Schröckh, *Christl. Kirchengesch.* 17:180, 195-211; Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* I, 2, 398-405. —Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Symmachus

a translator of the Old Test. into Greek, was born in Samaria during the latter half of the 2nd century. Originally a Jew, he became a Christian, but embraced the doctrine of the Ebionites. In spite of the high reputation enjoyed by the Alexandrian version, or Septuagint (q.v.), not only among the Hellenists outside of Palestine, but also within Palestine itself, at a later time it became an object of suspicion to the stricter Jews, owing to polemical reasons, so that, against the Christians, they denied its correctness, and set up another translation in opposition to it. The first who made a version for the use of the Jews was Aquila (q.v.); not much later

than Aquila, Theodotion (q.v.) prepared a second, and very soon afterwards another translation was made by Symmachus. From Epiphanius, *De Ponderibus et Mensuris*, c. 16 (whose accounts, however, Bleek pronounces fabulous), we learn that Symmachus was a Samaritan, Σύμμαχος τις Σαμαρείτης τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς σοφῶν. νόησας φιλαρχίαν. προσηλυτεύει καὶ περιτέμνεται δεύτερον. With Epiphanius agree Athanasius (*Synopsis*), the *Chronicon Paschale*, and Euthymius Zigabenus, in Carpzov, *Critica Sacra*, p. 567. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* 6:17; and *Demonstr. Evang.* 7:1) calls him Ἐβιωναῖος, an Ebionite, which is also the opinion of Jerome and modern critics. Fürst and Geiger call him a Jew, and a pupil of R. Meir (q.v.).

As to the time in which he lived, Epiphanius (*loc. cit.*) places him in the reign of king Severus. With this would agree the fact that Irenaeus does not name him, while he mentions Aquila and, Theodotion, and that Origen already found his translation in existence. Bleek says that from *Eusebius (loc. cit.)* we may infer, "that the translation of Symmachus was little known before the time of Origen, and that Origen had obtained it from a certain woman Juliane, to whom it had come from Symmachus himself." The passage in Eusebius runs thus: Ταῦτα δὲ ὁ Ὠριγένης μετὰ καὶ ἄλλων εἰς γὰς γραφὰς ἑρμηνεῖων τοῦ Συμμάχου, σημαίνει παρὰ Ἰουλιανῆς τινος εἰληφέναι ἦν καὶ φασὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ Συμμάχου τὰς βίβλους διαδέξασθαι.

As to the *genius* of the translation, Epiphanius tells us that he translated in opposition to the Samaritans, πρὸς διαστροφὴν τῶν παρὰ Σαμαρείταις ἑρμηνεύσας. But this supposition is in bad taste, for, in the first place, in Genesis 5, Symmachus agrees with the Samaritan against the Sept.; in the second place, we cannot see how he should have made his translation in opposition to the Samaritans, who only accept the Pentateuch; while Symmachus's version is on all the books of the Old Test.; and, in the third place, none of the other Church fathers knew anything of his opposition to the Samaritans. The probability is that his whole aim was directed towards a more elegant and finer version; for Symmachus, in his version, betrays the endeavor to satisfy the genius of the Greek language and to keep aloof from every influence of Eastern ideas and the Hebrew original. Thus he forms periods where the original has simply co-ordinate sentences, e.g. 2 Kings 1, 2, wkl wçrd, ἀπελθόντες πύθεσθε; ^{<KSD>} Job 34:29, fqçy azhw [çry ymw, αὐτοῦ δὲ ἡρεμία

διδόντος τέσ κατακρινεῖ; ^{<1904>}Psalm 9:4, **rwj a ybva bwcb**, ἀναστραφέντων τῶν ἐχθρῶν μου. Where the Hebrew circumscribes an adverbial idea by a verb, Symmachus uses an adverb, as ^{<1041>}Genesis 4:2, **tdl l āstw, καὶ πάλιν ἔτεκεν**; or he uses the adjective for the Hebrew *nomen qualitatis*, as ^{<1911>}Psalm 55:24, **hmrmw mymd yçna, μιαιφόνου καὶ δόλιοι**. He reduces the Hebrew tropes to the corresponding Greek, e.g. ^{<1015>}1 Samuel 20:25, **μ[rb μ[rk, σπερ εἰώθει**; 25:25, **wbbAta ynda mycy anAl a, μὴ πρόσχησ, ἄξιων**; **twmt twm**; in ^{<10217>}Genesis 2:17, becomes **θνητὸς ἔση**. He uses additions for the sake of elegance: thus, ^{<18213>}Job 21:13, **wTj y l waç [grbw, καὶ τάχεωσ ἄνοσοι καὶ ἀβασάνιστοι εἰς δην κατέρχονται**; ^{<2161>}Ezekiel 16:31, **ἠτα μl ql, ἐν ἀξιοπιστι συνάγουσα μισθώματα**. Hebrew proper nouns are often translated etymologically, e.g. ^{<1524>}Deuteronomy 32:49, **myrb[h rh, τὸ ὄρος τῶν διαβάσεων**; ^{<23918>}Isaiah 19:18, **μrj h ry[, πόλις ἡλίου**.

Taken all in all, Symmachus deserves the praise which has been bestowed on his translation, which was called *versio perspicua, manifesta, admirabilis; aperta*. Jerome, In ^{<3181>}Amos 3:11, speaks of Symmachus, “Non solet verborum **κακοζηλαίν**, se dintelligentie ordinem sequi;” In *Isaiah 5, 1*, “Symmachus more suo manifestius.” Eusebius, In ^{<18213>}Psalm 21:31 sq., says, **σαφέστερον ὁ Σύμμαχος**, and **σφόδρα θαυμαστῶσ ὁ Σύμμαχος**; In ^{<19110>}Psalm 46:10, **οὕτωσ ἡρμήνευσε θαυμαστῶσ ὁ Σύμμαχος**. Still we cannot characterize his style as being pure Greek or elegant; and Symmachus himself seems to have felt it, for he made a second edition of his translation, in which he corrected all such Hebraisms and harsh expressions as had crept in. Thus Jerome, In Jeremiah 32 says, “Symmachi *prima editio* et LXX et Theodotio *solos* (**μόνοι**) interpretati sunt; *secunda* quippe Symmachi vertit **διόλου**,” and In *Nahum 3* he writes, “Symmachus **ἀποτυμίας πλήρησ**, quod possumus dicere *crudelitate vel severitate plena*; in *altera* ejus editione reperi **μελοκοπίασ πλήρησ**, i.e. *sectionibus carnum et frustis per membra concisis*.” Whether his second edition embraced all the books of the Old Test. cannot be decided with certainty, since only a few fragments of the second edition on some of the books are extant.

For philological purposes, Symmachus is just as useful as the other Greek translators. Biblical criticism may also derive some advantage from the translation, of course, by exhibiting the greatest care. Thus ^{<18211>}Psalm

30:13, Symmachus reads as our text, **dwbk**, and so also the Chaldee, Jerome, Syriac, and Theodotion, against the **ydwbk** of the Sept., Vulg., and Arab.; in 66, 13, our text has **hywrl**, but Symmachus, the Sept., Syr., and Chald. seem to have read **hj wrl**.

The fragments of Symmachus's version of the Old Test. are given by Flam. Nobilis in *Vet. Test. sec. LXX Lat. Redditum*, etc. (Rome, 1587); Drusius, *Veterum Interpretum Græcorum in Totum V. T. Fragmenta Collecta*, etc. (Arnheim, 1622); Bos, *V. T. ex Version. LXX Intep. etc., nec non Fragmentis Versionum Aquilae, Symmachi et Theodotionis* (Frank. 1709); Montfaucon, *Hexaplorum Origenis quæ Supersunt*, etc. (Paris, 1713; in a later edition with notes by K. Bahrtd, Leips. and Libeck, 1769-70). The fragments on single books were edited by Trendelenburg, *Chrestomathia Hexaplaris* (Lubeck and Leips, 1794); Spohn, *Jeremias Vates e Versione Judæorum*, etc. (Lips. 1794, 1824); Segaar, *Daniel sec. LXX et Tetraplis Origenis*, etc. (Trier, 1775); Scharfenberg, *Animadversiones quibus Fragmenta Versionum V. T. Emendantur* (Lips. 1776-81), spec. 1 et 2; Schieusner, *Opuscula Critica ad Versiones Græcas V. T.* (ibid. 1812).

Literature. — Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (4th ed.), 1, 531 sq.; Carpzov, *Critica Sacra*, p. 566 sq.; Keil, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, 2, 233 sq.; Herbst, *Einleitung*, 1, 160; Kaulen, *Einleitung in die heilige Schrift* (Freiburg, 1876), p. 79; Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quæ Supersunt*, etc. (Oxonii, 1871), p. 34; Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 399 sq.; Thieme, *Disputatio de Puritate Symmachi* (Lips. 1755); Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschrift* (Breslau, 1862), 1, 39-64, and his *Nachgelassene Schriften* (Berl. 1877), 4:88 sq.; *Theologisches Universal-Lexikon*, s.v.; Heidenheim, *Vierteljahrsschrift* (1867), 3, 463 sq. **SEE GREEK VERSIONS.** (B. P.)

Symmachus, Quintus Aurelius

a prefect, pontiff, and augur of Rome in its declining age; remarkable for his eloquent appeal against the ruin threatened by the triumph of Christianity; he is the author of *Epistles* still extant. His zeal for the ancient faith of Rome exercised throughout life a marked influence upon his character. He was chosen by the senate to remonstrate with Gratian on the removal of the altar of victory (A.D. 382), from their council hall, and for curtailing the annual allowance to the Vestal Virgins. The emperor banished him from Rome, but in 384, having been appointed prefect of the

city, he urged in an epistle to Valentinianus the restoration of pagan deities. In this he was unsuccessful, but without personal loss, being appointed consul under Theodosius in 391.

Symmes, William, D.D.

a Unitarian clergyman, was born at Charlestown, Mass., in 1731, and graduated from Harvard College in 1750, where he was a tutor from 1755 to 1758. He began to preach in the North Parish in Andover, and was ordained its pastor Nov. 1, 1758, and continued in that relation until his death, May, 1807. Dr. Symmes was a good scholar, of extensive reading, and an able divine. He published, *Thanksgiving Sermon* (1768): — *Discourse on the Duty and Advantages of Singing Praises to God* (1779): — *Sermon at the General Election* (1785). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 8:35.

Symmes, Zachariah

a Congregational preacher, was born at Canterbury, England, April 5, 1599. He was educated at Cambridge, and after leaving the university was employed as tutor in several distinguished families. In 1621 he was appointed lecturer at Atholines, in London, and in September, 1625, he became rector of Dunstable. Embarrassed by his Nonconformity, he emigrated to New England, where he arrived in August, 1634. He was admitted to the fellowship of the Church in Charlestown, Mass., Dec. 6, and on the 22nd of the same month was elected and ordained teacher of the same Church, Rev. Thomas James being pastor. About a year afterwards he succeeded to the office of pastor, which he filled until his death, Feb. 4, 1671. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 1, 47.

Sympathy

(*συμπάθεια*, *fellow-feeling*) is the quality of being affected by another's affection. It was originally used, like pity and compassion, to signify our fellow-feeling with the sorrows of others, but now it is used to denote our fellow-feeling with any passion whatever. Sympathy with sorrow or suffering is compassion, with joy or prosperity is congratulation.

Symphony

(*συμφωνία*) originally signified the union of several voices in a chant, but by modern musicians it is applied to an instrumental composition, generally

used as a kind of introductory movement to anthems and other pieces. Symphonies are introduced with good effect in the interval of the voices, and are called *preludes* when played before the psalmody, *interludes* when they mark the distinction of verses, and *postludes* when introduced at the close of the psalm.

Symphorianus

a Gallic martyr at Autun in the reign of Aurelian. He was cited before the praefect Heraclius because he had refused to honor the statue of Berecynthia, and rejected the influence of appeals and scourgings. His mother supported him with her exhortations to fidelity. He was beheaded without the town walls and buried in a cell in the fields. His grave became so remarkable for cures and miracles that it compelled the reverence even of the heathen. The narrative in the *Acta Beati Symph.*, as here outlined, seems to involve something of fact. The worship of Berecynthia among the Jedui is a historical fact. Gregory of Tours mentions Symphorianus and the miracles wrought by his relics (*De Gloria Mart.* c. 52). Later tradition says that a church was, in time, built over his grave. The story cannot, however, date further back than the days of Gregory, as is evident from the chosen and even pompous language and the legendary conclusion. The death of Symphorianus is variously fixed in A.D. 180 (the reign of Aurelius), 270, or 280 (Aurelian). He is commemorated on Aug. 22. See the *Acta SS.* s.v. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Symphorosa

the Christian widow of a martyred tribune. Hadrian had built a temple at Tibur (Tivoli), and was about to dedicate it with religious ceremonies when he learned that Symphorosa was a zealous Christian. He caused her, with her seven sons, to be summoned, and sought by persuasion to induce her to offer sacrifices. On her refusal, the emperor threatened her, and had her carried to the Temple of Hercules at Tivoli, where she was beaten with fists, hung up by the hair, and afterwards taken down and drowned. Her brother Eugene, a councilor of Tivoli, recovered the body and buried it in the suburbs. On the following day her sons were brought before the same temple and impaled in various modes, after which their bodies were thrown into a deep pit, which subsequently became known as the pit *ad septem biothanatos*. The persecution then rested for a year and a half, during which period the remains of the martyrs were interred on the Via Tiburtina

and honored as they deserved. The natalities of Symphorosa and her sons are observed on July 18 (see Ruinart, *Acta Primorum Martyrum*, p. 18). The legend exists in manuscript form among the writings falsely ascribed to Julius Africanus, and may have originated in the third century, though the contents do not harmonize well with the known ordinary conduct of Hadrian. Ruinart supposes the probable period of the occurrence to have been A.D. 120. See also the *Acta SS.* sub July 18. —Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*

Symposia

(*συμπόσια*, *banquets*) is a word occasionally used by ecclesiastical writers to describe the ancient agape (q.v.). These *symposia* were held at the graves of the martyrs; and the festival was designed to be, not only a memorial of the deceased, but, according to Origen, “an odor of a sweet smell in the sight of God;” for the poor and needy, the widows and orphans, met together, and were refreshed by the charity of the rich.

Sympson, Cuthbert

a layman and a deacon of the Congregational Church at Islington, of which Ruft (or Rough) was pastor. He was arrested Dec. 13, 1557, and tortured, being racked three times to make him divulge the members of the Protestant Church of which he was deacon. He was eventually burned at Smithfield, March 28, 1558. See Punchard, *Hist. of Congregationalism*, 2, 326, 347.

Synagogue

(*συναγωγή*; other equivalent terms are *προσευχή* or *προσευκτήριον*, i.e. *chapel*; Heb. *d[aw] I aeor assembly of God*; Aramaic *atçnk yb*, *atçnk*), in the Jewish place of worship in post-Biblical and modern times. However obscure the origin of these establishments, they eventually became so important and characteristic as to furnish a designation of the Jewish Church itself in later literature.

It may be well to note at the outset the points of contact between the history and ritual of the synagogues of the Jews, and the facts to which the inquiries of the Biblical student are principally directed. 1. They meet us as the great characteristic institution of the later phase of Judaism. More even than the Temple and its services, in the time of which the New Test. treats,

they at once represented and determined the religious life of the people. 2. We cannot separate them from the most intimate connection with our Lord's life and ministry. In them he worshipped in his youth and in his manhood. Whatever we can learn of the ritual which then prevailed tells us of a worship which he recognized and sanctioned; which for that reason, if for no other, though, like the statelier services of the Temple, it was destined to pass away, is worthy of our respect and honor. They were the scenes, too, of no small portion of his work. In them were wrought some of his mightiest works of healing (^{<0129>}Matthew 12:9; Mark 23; ^{<0231>}Luke 13:11). In them were spoken some of the most glorious of his recorded words (4:16; ^{<0169>}John 6:59); many more, beyond all reckoning, which are not recorded (^{<0023>}Matthew 4:23; 13:54; ^{<0583>}John 18:20, etc.). 3. There are the questions, leading us back to a remoter past. In what did the worship of the synagogue originate? What type was it intended to reproduce? What customs, alike in nature, if not in name, served as the starting-point for it? 4. The synagogue, with all that belonged to it, was connected with the future, as well as with the past. It was the order with which the first Christian believers were most familiar, from which they were most likely to take the outlines, or even the details, of the worship, organization, and government of their own society. Widely divergent as the two words and the things they represented afterwards became, the ecclesia had its starting-point in the synagogue.

I. Name and its Signification. — The word συναγωγή, which literally signifies a *gathering*, is not unknown in classical Greek (Thucyd. 2, 18; Plato, *Republ.* 526 D), but became prominent in that of the Hellenists. It appears in the Sept. as the translation of not less than twenty-one Hebrew words in which the idea of a gathering is implied (Tromm, *Concordant.* s.v.). But, although the word is there used to denote *any kind of gathering, heap, mass, or assemblage*, such as *a gathering of fruits* (for the Heb. *āsa, āysa*, ^{<0236>}Exodus 23:16; 34:22), *of water* (*μωqm, hwqm*, Genesis 1, 9; ^{<0813>}Leviticus 11:36), *a heap of stones* (*l g*, ^{<0887>}Job 8:17), *a band of singers* (*l wj m*, ^{<0304>}Jeremiah 31:4, 13), *a mass or multitude of people or soldiers* (*hpsa, l yj*, ^{<0302>}Isaiah 24:22; ^{<0370>}Ezekiel 37:10), *a tribe or family* (*tyb*, ^{<0121>}1 Kings 12:21), etc., yet its predominant usage in this version is to denote *an appointed meeting of people either for civil or religious purposes*, thus being synonymous with ἐκκλησία. This is evident from the fact that the Sept. uses συναγωγή 130 times for the

Hebrew **hd[** and twenty-five times for **l hq**; which in seventy instances is rendered in the same version by **ἐκκλησία**. The synonymous usage in the Sept. of these two expressions is also seen in ^{<1154>}Proverbs 5:14, where **ἐκκλησία** and **συναγωγή** stand in juxtaposition for the Hebrew **l hq** and **hd[**. In the books of the Apocrypha, the word, as in those of the Old Test., retains its general meaning, and is not used specifically for any recognized place of worship. For this the received phrase seems to be **τόπος προσευχῆς** (1 Macc. 3, 46; 3 Macc. 7:20). In the New Test., however, we find **συναγωγή**, like **ἐκκλησία**, used metonymically, more especially for *an appointed and recognized Jewish place of worship* (^{<1023>}Matthew 4:23; 6:2, 5, 9:35, etc.). Sometimes the word is applied to the tribunal which was connected with or sat in the synagogue in the narrower sense (^{<1017>}Matthew 10:17; 23:34; ^{<1139>}Mark 13:9; ^{<1212>}Luke 21:12; 12:11). Within the limits of the Jewish Church it perhaps kept its ground as denoting the *place*, of meeting of the Christian brethren (James 2, 2). It seems to have been claimed by some of the pseudo-Judaizing, half-Gnostic sects of the 'Asiatic churches for their meetings (Revelation 2, 9). It was not altogether obsolete, as applied to Christian meetings, in the time of Ignatius (*Fp. ad Trall. c.v; ad Polyc. c. 3*). Even in Clement of Alexandria the two words appear united as they had done in the Sept. (**ἐπὶ τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐκκλησίας**, *Strom. 6:633*). Afterwards, when the chasm between Judaism and Christianity became wider, Christian writers were fond of dwelling on the meanings of the two words which practically represented them, and showing how far the synagogue was excelled by the ecclesia (August. *Enarr. in Psalm 80*; Trench, *Synonyms of N.T.* § 1). The cognate word, however, **σύναξις**, was formed or adopted in its place, and applied to the highest act of worship and communion for which Christians met (Suicer, *Thesaur. s.v.*).

More definite than the Greek term synagogue is the ancient Hebrew name, *beth tephillah* (**hLpṗḗtyB****ε****τόπος προσευχῆς**, or simply **προσευχῆ**) = *house of prayer* (^{<4163>}Acts 16:13, for which the Syriac rightly has **atwl x hyb**; Josephus, *Life*, 54), which is now obsolete, or *beth hak-keneseth* (**tsḗkḥityB**) = *house of assembly*, which has superseded it. This definite local signification of the term synagogue among the Jews has necessitated the use of another expression for the members constituting the assembly, which is **atçynk** or **rwbx**, to express our secondary sense of the word **ἐκκλησία**.

II. History of the Origin and Development of the Synagogue.

1. According to tradition, the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob instituted the prayers three times a day (*Berakoth*, 26 b), and had places of worship (comp. the Chaldee paraphrases of Onkelos, Jonathan ben-Uzziel, and the Jerusalem Targum on ^{<1242>}Genesis 24:62, 63; 25:27). We are informed that there were synagogues, in the time of the pious king Hezekiah (*Sanhedrin*, 94 b); that the great house (לדג תב) was a stupendous synagogue; that the many houses of Jerusalem (מל צמרי תב) which Nebuchadnezzar burned (^{<1259>}2 Kings 25:9) were the celebrated 480 synagogues that existed in Jerusalem (Jerusalem *Megillah*, 3, 1), and that in Babylon the synagogue was to be seen in which Daniel used to pray (*Erubin*, 21 a). We have the testimony of Benjamin of Tudela, the celebrated traveler of the Middle Ages, that he himself saw the synagogues built by Moses, David, Obadiah; Nahum, and Ezra (*Itinerary*, 1, 90, 91, 92, 106, 153, ed. Ascher [London, 1840]). It is in harmony with this tradition that James declares "Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath day" (Acts 15.: 21; comp. Philo, 2. 167, 630; Josephus, *Apion*, 2, 18; *Baba Kama*, 82 a; Jerusalem *Megillah*, 4,1). But these are simply traditions, which love to invest everything with the halo of the remotest antiquity.

2. In the Old Test. itself we find no trace of meetings for worship in synagogues. On the one hand, it is probable that if new moons and Sabbaths were observed at all, they must have been attended by some celebration apart from, as well as at, the tabernacle or the Temple (^{<1315>}1 Samuel 20:5; ^{<1323>}2 Kings 4:23). On the other, so far as we find traces of such local worship, it seems to have fallen too readily into a fetich religion, sacrifices to ephods and teraphim (^{<1327>}Judges 8:27; 17:5) in groves and on high-places, offering nothing but a contrast to the "reasonable service," the prayers, psalms, instruction in the law, of the later synagogue. The special mission of the priests and Levites under Jehoshaphat (^{<1417>}2 Chronicles 12:7-9) shows that there was no regular provision for reading the "book of the law of the Lord" to the people, and makes it probable that even the rule which prescribed that it should be read once every seven years at the Feast of Tabernacles had fallen into disuse (^{<1510>}Deuteronomy 31:10). With the rise of the prophetic order we trace a more distinct though still a partial approximation. Wherever there was a company of such prophets, there must have been a life analogous in many of its features to that of the later

Essenes and Therapeutse, to that of the *coenobia* and monasteries of Christendom. In the abnormal state of the polity of Israel under Samuel, they appear to have aimed at purifying the worship of the high-places from idolatrous associations, and met on fixed days for sacrifice and psalmody (^{<092>}1 Samuel 9:12; 10:5). The scene in ^{<092>}1 Samuel 19:20-24 indicates that the meetings were open to any worshippers who might choose to come, as well as to “the sons of the prophet,” the brothers of the order themselves. The only pre-exilian instance which seems to indicate, that the devout in Israel were in the habit of resorting to pious leaders for blessings and instruction on stated occasions is to be found in ^{<102>}2 Kings 4:23, where the Shunammite’s husband asks, “Wherefore wilt thou go to him (Elisha) today? It is neither new moon nor Sabbath.” Yet ^{<1218>}2 Kings 22:8, etc.; ^{<1314>}2 Chronicles 34:14, etc., testify undoubtedly against the existence of places of worship under the monarchy. The date of Psalm 24 is too uncertain for us to draw any inference as to the nature of the “synagogues of God” (I *ayde* *ym*, meeting-places of God), which the invaders are represented as destroying (ver. 8). It ‘may have belonged to the time of the Assyrian or Chaldaean invasion (Vitringa, *De Synag.* p. 396-405). It has been referred to that of the Maccabees (De Wette, *Psalmen*, ad loc.), or to an intermediate period when Jerusalem was taken and the land laid waste by the army of Bagoses, under Artaxerxes II (Ewald, *Poet. Biich.* 2, 358). The, “assembly of the elders,” in Psalm 107, 32, leaves us in like uncertainty.

3. During the Exile, in the abeyance of the Temple worship, the meetings of devout Jews probably became more systematic (Vitringa, *De Synag.* p. 413-429; Jost, *Judenthum*, 1, 168; Bornitius, *De Synagog.* in Ugolino, *Thesaur.* 21), and must have helped forward the change which appears so conspicuously at the time of the Return. The repeated mention of gatherings of the elders of Israel, sitting before the prophet Ezekiel and hearing his word (^{<2101>}Ezekiel 8:1; 14:1; 20:1; 33:31), implies the transfer to the-land of the Captivity of the custom that had originated in the schools of the prophets. One remarkable passage may possibly contain a more distinct reference to them. Those who still remained in Jerusalem taunted the prophet and his companions with their exile, as outcasts from the blessings of the sanctuary. “Get ye far from the Lord; unto us is this land; given in a possession.” The prophet’s answer is that it was not so. Jehovah was as truly with them in their “little sanctuary” as he had *been* in the Temple at Jerusalem. His presence, not the outward glory, was itself the sanctuary

(11, 15, 16). The whole history of Ezra presupposes the habit of solemn, probably of periodic, meetings (^{<1815>}Ezra 8:15, ^{<1816>}Nehemiah 8:2; 9:1; ^{<3075>}Zechariah 7:5). To that period, accordingly, we may attribute the revival, if not the institution, of synagogues, or at least of the systematic meetings on fasts for devotion and instruction (^{<3089>}Zechariah 8:19). Religious meetings were also held on Sabbaths and fasts to instruct the exiles in the divine law, and *to* admonish them to obey the divine precepts (^{<1510>}Ezra 10:1-9; ^{<1681>}Nehemiah 8:1, 3; 9:1-3; 13:1-3). These meetings, held near the Temple and in other localities, were the origin of the synagogue, and the place in which *the* people assembled was denominated **tsnkh tyb**, *the house of assembly*; hence, also, the synagogue in the Temple, itself. The elders of this synagogue handed the law to the high-priest (Mishna, *Yoma*, 7:1; *Sotah*, 7:7, 8), aided in the sacrifices (*Tamid*, 5, 5), took charge of the palms used at the Feast of Tabernacles (*Sukkah*, 4:4), accompanied the pilgrims who brought their first-fruits (*Tosiphta Bikkurim*, 2), officiated as judges (*Makkloth*, 3, 12), and superintended the infantschools (*Sabbath*, 1, 3). Assuming Ewald's theory as to the date and occasion of Psalm 124, there must, at some subsequent period, have been a great destruction of the buildings, and a consequent suspension of the services. It is, at any rate, striking that they are not in any way prominent in the Maccabean history, either as objects of attack or rallying-points of defense, unless we are to see in the gathering of the persecuted Jews at Maspha (Mizpal), as at a "place where they prayed aforesaid in Israel" (1 Macc. 3, 46), not only a reminiscence of its old glory as a holy place, but the continuance of a more recent custom. When that struggle was over, there appears to have been a freer development of what may be called the synagogue parochial system among the Jews of Palestine and other countries. The influence of John Hyrcanus, the growing power of the Pharisees, the authority of the Scribes, the example, probably, of the Jews of the "dispersion" (Vitranga, *De Synag.* p. 426), would all tend in the same direction. Well-nigh every town or village had its one or more synagogues. Where the Jews were not in sufficient numbers to be able to erect and fill a building, there was the **προσευχή**, or place of prayer, sometimes open, sometimes covered *in*, commonly by a running stream or on the sea-shore, in which devout Jews and proselytes met to worship, and, perhaps, to read (^{<4163>}Acts 16:13; Josephus, *Ant.* 14:10, 23; Juvenal, *Sat.* 3, 296). Sometimes the term **προσευχή** (= **hLpætyB**) was applied even to an actual synagogue (Josephus, *Life*, § 54). Eventually we find the Jews

possessing synagogues in the different cities of Syria, Asia Minor, Greece, Egypt, and wherever they resided. We hear of the apostles frequenting the synagogues in Damascus, Antioch, Iconium, Thessalonica, Berea, Athens, Corinth, Ephesus, etc. (^{<402>}Acts 9:2, 20; 13:14; 14:1; 17:1, 10:17; 18:4, 19; 19:8). There were numerous synagogues in Palestine: in Nazareth (^{<415>}Matthew 13:54, ^{<402>}Mark 6:2; ^{<404>}Luke 4:16), Capernaum (Matthew. 12:9; ^{<402>}Mark 1:21; ^{<405>}Luke 7:5; ^{<406>}John 6:59), etc.; and in Jerusalem alone there were 480 (Jerusalem *Megillah*,. 3, 1; Jerusalem *Kethuboth*, 13) to accommodate the Jews from foreign lands *who* visited the Temple. There were synagogues of the Libertines, Cyrenians, Alexandrians, Cilicians, and of the Asiatics (^{<408>}Acts 6:9; comp. *Tosiphta Megillah*, 2; Babylon *Megillah*, 26 a). When it is remembered that more than 2,500,000 Jews came together to the metropolis from all countries§ to celebrate the Passover (Josephus, *Ant.* 6:9, 3; *Pesachim*, 64 a), this number of synagogues in Jerusalem. will not appear at all exaggerated. An idea may be formed of the large number of Jews at the time of Christ, when it is borne in mind that in Egypt alone, from the Mediterranean to the border of Ethiopia, there resided nearly a million of Jews (Philo, *Against Flaccus*, 2, 523), and that in Syria, especially in the metropolis, Antioch, the Jews constituted a large portion of the population (Gratz [2nd ed.] 3, 282).

III. Site, Structure, Internal Arrangement, Use, and Sanctity of the Synagogue. —

1. Taking the Temple as the prototype, and following the traditional explanation of the passages in ^{<402>}Proverbs 1:21 and ^{<409>}Ezra 9:9, which were taken to mean that the voice of prayer is to be raised on heights (*arqt çarb*), and that the sanctuary was therefore erected on a summit (*ta µmwrl kyhl a tyb*), the Jewish canons decreed that synagogues are to be built upon the most elevated ground in the neighborhood, and that no house is to be allowed to overtop them (*Tosiphta Megillah*, 3; Maimonides, *lad Ha-Chezaka Hilchoth Tephila*, 11:2). So essential was this law deemed, and so strictly was it observed in Persia, even after the destruction of the Temple, that Rab (A.D. 165-247) prophesied a speedy ruin of those cities in which houses were permitted to tower above the synagogue, while rabbi Ashi declared that the protection of Sora was owing to the elevated site of its synagogues (*Sabbath*, 11 a). Lieut. Kitchener, however, states (*Quar. Statement* of the "Pal. Explor. Fund," July, 1878, p. 123 sq.) that the ruins of the fourteen specimens of ancient synagogues extant in

Palestine (all in Galilee) do not correspond to these Talamudical requirements as to location, nor yet to those below as to position; for they are frequently in rather a low site, and face the south if possible. Failing of a commanding site, a tall pole rose from the roof to render it conspicuous (Leyrer, in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*).

Picture for Synagogue 1

The riverside outside the city was also deemed a suitable spot for building the synagogue, because, being removed from the noise of the city, the people could worship God without distraction, and, at the same time, have the use of pure water for immersions and other religious exercises (^{<4463>}Acts 16:13; Josephus, *Ant.* 14:10, 23; Juvenal, *Sat.* 3, 12, etc.; see also the Chaldee versions on ^{<1242>}Genesis 24:62). *SEE PROSEUOHA.*

The building was commonly erected at the cost of the district, whether by a church-rate levied for the purpose, or by free gifts, must remain uncertain (Vitrina, *De Synagog.* p. 229). Sometimes it was built by a rich Jew, or even, as in ^{<4175>}Luke 7:5; by a friendly proselyte. In the later stages of Eastern Judaism it was often erected, like the mosques of Mohammedans, in the tombs of famous rabbins or holy men.

Picture for Synagogue

2. The size of a synagogue, like that of a church or chapel, varied with the population. We have no reason for believing that there were any fixed laws of proportion for its dimensions, like those, which are traced in the tabernacle and the Temple. The building itself was generally in the form of a theatre; the door was usually on: the west, so that, on entering, the worshippers might at once face the front, which was turned towards Jerusalem, since the law is that "all the worshippers in Israel are to have their faces turned to that part of the world where Jerusalem, the Temple, and the Holy of Holies are" (*Berakoth*, 30 a). This law, which is deduced from ^{<1183>}1 Kings 8:29; ^{<4912>}Psalms 28:2, and the allegorical interpretation of Song of Songs 4:4, also obtained among the early Christians (Origen, *Hom. 5. 1 Nurn.* in *Opp.* 2, 284) and the Mohammedans (Koran, c. 2). *SEE KEBLAH.* Hence all the windows are said to have been generally in the eastern wall, so that the worshippers might look towards the holy city, in accordance with ^{<2760>}Daniel 6:10.

Like the Temple, the synagogue was frequently without a roof, as may be seen from the following remark of Epiphanius: “There were anciently places of prayer without the city, both among the Jews and the Samaritans; there was a place of prayer at Sichem, now called Neapolis, without the city in the fields, in the form of a theater, open to the air, and without covering, built by the Samaritans, who in all things imitated the Jews” (*Contr. Hceres.* lib. 3, Haer. 80). It was this, coupled with the fact that the Jews had no images, which gave rise to the satirical remark of Juvenal —

“Nil prseter nubes et cceli nume adorant.” (Sat. 14:98.)

In some places there were temporary *summer* and *winter* synagogues; they were pulled down and re-erected at the beginning of each season, so that the style of building might be according to the period of the year (*Baba Bathra*, 3 b).

3. In the internal arrangement of the synagogue we trace an obvious analogy, *mutatis mutandis*, to the type of the tabernacle. At the wall opposite the entrance, or at the Jerusalem end, stood *the wooden chest* or *ark* (חֲבֻטָּה) containing the scrolls of the law. It stood on a raised base with several steps (לְסֻבָּה = *subsellium*, אֶרְבֵּי, Jerusalem *Megillah*, 3, 1), which the priests mounted when they pronounced the benediction (חֲבֻטָּה Numbers 6:24-26) upon the congregation. Hence the phrase חֲבֻטָּה הִיא, which was retained after the destruction of the Temple to describe the act of giving the benediction to the people by the priests (*Raosh Ha-Shandh*, 31 b; *Sabbath*, 118 b). It is necessary to bear in mind that the ancient name for this ark is חֲבֻטָּה (comp. Mishna, *Berakoth*, 5, 3, 4; *Taanith*, 2, 1, 2; *Megillah*, 4:4, etc.), the name afterwards given to it (חֲבֻטָּה) being reserved for the ark-of-the-covenant table, which was wanting in the second Temple. There was a canopy (חֲבֻטָּה) spread over the ark, under which were kept the vestments used during the service (*Jerusalem Megillah*, 3). In some places the ark or chest had two compartments, the upper one containing the scrolls of the law, and the lower the synagogical garments of the officers of the community. The ark was not fastened to the wall, but was free so that it might easily be taken outside the door of the synagogue in case a death occurred in the place of worship, in order that the priests should be able to attend the service; or be removed into the streets when fasts and lays of humiliation were kept

(Mishna, *Taanith*, 2, 1). **SEE FAST**. In later times, however, a recess was made in the wall, and the ark was kept there. This recess was called the *Sanctuary* (I *kyhevdaq*). The same thought was sometimes developed still further in the name of *Kophereth*, or Mercy-seat, given to the lid or door of the chest, and in the veil which hung before it (Vitranga, p. 181). On certain occasions the ark was removed from the recess and placed on the rostrum (*hmyBæ βήμα*) in the middle of the synagogue (*Tosiphta Megillah*, 3; Mainsonides, *lad Ha-Chezaka Hilchoth Lulab*, 7:23). **SEE TABERNACLES, FEAST OF**. Within the ark, as above stated, were the rolls of the sacred books. The rollers round which they were wound were often elaborately decorated, the cases for them embroidered or enameled, according to their material. Such cases were customary offerings from the rich when they brought their infant children on the first anniversary of their birthday to be blessed by the rabbi of the synagogue.

Picture for Synagogue 3

In front of the ark was the desk of the leader of the divine worship; and as the place of the ark was amphitheatral, the desk was sometimes lower and sometimes higher than the level of the room. Hence the interchangeable phrases “*he who descends before the ark*” (*hbyth ynpl drwyh*) and “*he who ascends before the ark*” (*hbyth ynpl rbw[h]*) used to designate the leader of divine worship in the synagogue (Mishna, *Taanith*, 2, 2; *Berakoth*, 5, 4; *Rosh Ha-Shanah*, 4:7; *Meaillah*, 4:3, 5, 7, etc.).

The next important piece of furniture was the rostrum or platform (/ [*e I DijnæhmyBæ βήμα, ays†WB*), capable of containing several persons (~~1088~~ Nehemiah 8:4; 9:4; Josephus, *Ait.* 4:8,12). On this platform the lessons from the law and the prophets were read, discourses delivered, etc. (Mishna, *Sotah*, 8:8; *Babylon Sukkah*, 51b; *Megillah*, 26 b). 8. EHAPHTARAH. There were no arrangements made at first for laying down the law while reading, and the one upon whom it devolved to read a portion of the pericope had to hold the roll in his hand till the second one came up to read, and relieved him of it. Afterwards, however, there was a reading-desk (*ˆygyI bæ*) = *ἀναλογεῖον*) on this platform, and the roll of the law was laid down during pauses, or when *the methurgeman* (*ˆmgrwtm* = *bürterpreter*) was reciting in the vernacular of the country the portion read (*Yoma*, 68 b; *Megillah*, 26 b; *Jerusalem Megillah*, 3). The reading-desk

was covered with a cloth (*asrP*) which varied in costliness according to the circumstances of the congregation (*Megillah*, 26 b). When the edifice was large this platform was generally in the center, as was the case in the synagogue at Alexandria (*Sukkah*, 51 b).

There were also arm chairs (*yr*;*t/arn*;*t*;*t* = καθέδραι, *r*;*el*;*aj* = κλιντήρες), or seats of honor (*prwtokathedraiai*), for the elders of the synagogue, the doctors of the law, etc. (*Matthew* 23:2, 6; *Mark* 12:39; *Luke*, 43; *Sukkah*, 51 b; *Maimonides*, *Ill choth Tephila*, 10, 4), to which the wealthy and honored worshipper was invited (*James* 2:2, 3). They were placed in front of the ark containing the law, or at the Jerusalem end, in the uppermost part of the synagogue, and these distinguished persons 'sat' with their faces to the people, while the congregation stood facing both these honorable ones and the ark (*Tosiphta Megillah*, 3). In the synagogue at Alexandria there were seventy-one golden chairs, according to the number of the members of the Great Sanhedrim (*Sukkah*, 51 b). **SEE SANHEDRIM**. In the synagogue of Bagdad "the ascent to the holy ark was composed of ten marble steps, on the upper-most of which were the stalls set apart for the prince of the Captivity and the other princes of the house of David" (*Benjamin of Tudela, Itinerary*, 1, 105, ed. Ascher, Lond. 1840).

There was, moreover, a perpetual light (*dymt ryn*), which was evidently in imitation of the Temple light (*Exodus* 28:20). This sacred light was religiously fed by the people, and in case of any special mercy vouchsafed to an individual, or of threatening danger, a certain quantity of oil was vowed for the perpetual lamp. This light was the symbol of the human soul (*Proverbs*. 20:27), of the divine law (*Proverbs* 6:23), and of the manifestation of God (*Ezekiel* 43:2). It must, however, be remarked that though the perpetual lamp forms an essential part of the synagogical furniture to the present day, and has obtained among the Indians, Greeks, Romans, and other nations of antiquity (*Rosenmüller, Mogenland*, 2, 156), yet there is no mention made of it in the Talmud. Other lamps, brought by devout worshippers, were lighted at the beginning of the Sabbath, i.e. on Friday evening (*Vitringa*, p. 198).

As part of the fittings, we have also to note

- (1) another chest for the *Haphtaroth*, or rolls of the prophets;

- (2) Alms-boxes at or near the door, after the pattern of those at the Temple, one for the poor of Jerusalem, the other for local charities;
- (3) Notice-boards, on which, were written the names of offenders who had been “put out of the synagogue;”
- (4) A chest for trumpets *and* other musical instruments, used at the New-Years, Sabbaths, and other festivals (Vitringa, Leyrer, *loc. cit.*).

The congregation was divided, men on one side, women on the other, a low partition, five or six feet high, running between them (Philo, *De Vit. Contempl.* 2, 476). The arrangements of modern synagogues, for many centuries, have made the separation more complete by placing the women in low side-galleries, screened off by lattice-work (Leo of Modena, in Picart, *Cerem. Relig.* 1).

4. Besides meetings for worship, the synagogues, or, snore properly, the rooms connected with them, were also used as courts of justice for the local Sanhedrim (*Targum Jonathan* on ^{<012>}Amos 5:12,15; Jerusalem *Sanhedrin*, 1, 1; Jerusalem *Baba Metsia*, 2, 8; Babylon *Kethuboth*, 5 a; *Sabbath*, 150 a) and in it the beadle of the synagogue administered the forty stripes save one to those who were sentenced to be beaten (Mishna, *Makkoth*, 3, 12; comp. ^{<017>}Matthew 10:17; 23:34). Travelers, too, found an asylum in the synagogue; meals were eaten in it (*Pesachim*, 101; *Bereshith Rabba*, 100. 45), and children were instructed therein (*Kiddushin*, 30 a; *Baba Bathra*, 21 a; *Taanith*, 24 b; *Berakoth*, 17 a; *Yebamoth*, 65 b). This, however, did not detract from its sanctity; for the synagogue once used for the divine worship was only allowed to be sold on certain conditions (Mishna, *Megillah*, 3, 1, 2). When the building was finished, it was set apart, as the Temple had been, by a special prayer of dedication. From that time it had a consecrated character. The common acts of life, such as reckoning up accounts, were forbidden in it. No one was to pass through it as a short cut. Even if it ceased to be used, the building was not to be applied to any base purpose — might not be turned, e.g., into a bath, a laundry, or a tannery. A scraper stood outside the door that men might rid themselves, before they entered, of anything that would be defiling (Leyrer, *loc. cit.*, and Vitringa).

IV. The Officers and Government of the Synagogogue. The synagogues of the respective towns were governed by the elders (μνηστῆρες] πρεσβύτεροι, ^{<013>}Luke 7:3), who constituted the local Sanhedrim, consisting either of the

twenty-three senators or the three senators assisted by four principal members of the congregation (*fegillah*, 27; Josephus, *Ant.* 4:8,14; *War*, 2, 20, 5; ^{<417B>}Acts 7:5; 21:8), as this depended upon the, size and population of the place. **SEE SANHEDRIM**. Hence these authorized administrators of the law were alternately denominated *shepherds* (~~μυστῆρι~~ = ποιμένες, Jerusalem *Peah*, 8; Babylon *Chagigah*, 60; *Sabbath*, 17 a; ^{<417B>}Acts 20:28; Eph. 4:11), *the rulers of the synagogue*, and *the chiefs* (τσηκηιναο = ἀρχισυνάγωγοι, ἄρχοντες, ^{<417B>}Matthew 9:18, 23; ^{<417C>}Mark 5:22; ^{<417D>}Luke 8:41; ^{<417E>}Acts 13:15) and *overseers* (μνημμμ = προεστῶτες, Mishna, *Tamid*, 5, 1).

The president of the Sanhedrim was *ex officio* the head or chief of the synagogue, and was therefore, κατ' ἐξοχήν, *the ruler of the synagogue* (Mishna, *Yoma*, 7:1; *Sofah*, 7:7), while the other members of this body, according to their various gifts, discharged the different functions in the synagogue (^{<517F>}1 Timothy 5:17), as will be seen from the following classification. **SEE HIGH-PRIEST**.

1. The Ruler of the Synagogue (τσηκηιναο = ἀρχισυνάγωγος) and his two Associates. — Though the supreme official, like the two other members of the local court, had to be duly examined by delegates from the Great Sanhedrim, who certified that he possessed all the necessary qualifications for his office (Maimonides, *lad Ha-Chezaka Hilchoth Sanhedrin*, 2, 8), yet his election entirely depended upon the suffrages of the members of the synagogue. The Talmud distinctly declares that “no ruler (σνεβῆ=ποιμήν) is appointed over a congregation, unless the congregation is consulted” (*Berakoth*, 55 a). But, once elected, the ruler was the third in order of precedence in the Temple synagogue i.e. first came the high-priest, then the chief of the priests (ᾠς), and then the ruler of the synagogue (Mishna, *Yoma*, 7:1; *Sotah*, 7:7), while in the provincial synagogues the respective rulers were supreme, and had the principal voice in the decision and distribution of the other offices. His two judicial colleagues aided him in the administration of the law. **SEE ARCH-SYNAGOGUES**.

2. The Three Amoners (ηηηδχααββ = διακόνοι; ^{<500D>}Philippians 1:1; ^{<517B>}1 Timothy 3:8,12; 4:6). The office of aflmoner was both very responsible and difficult; as the poor-taxes were of a double nature; and in periodically collecting and distributing the alms the almoner had to exercise

great discretion from whom to demand them and to whom to give them. There were, first, *the alms of the dish* (yWj mT), consisting of articles of food which had to be collected by the officials daily, and distributed every evening, and to which every one had to contribute who resided thirty days in one place; and there were, secondly, *the alms of the box* (hpWq), consisting of money which was collected every Friday, was distributed weekly, and to which every one had to contribute who resided, ninety days in one place. Two authorized persons had to collect the former and three the latter. They were obliged to keep together, and were not allowed, to put into their pockets any money thus received, but were to throw it into the poor-box. The almoners had the power of exempting from these poor rates such people as they believed to be unable to pay, and to enforce the tax on such as pretended not to be in a position to contribute. They had also the power to refuse alms to any whom they deemed unworthy of them. All the three almoners had to be present at the distribution of the alms. The greatest care was taken by the rulers of the synagogue and the congregation that those elected to this office should be “men of honesty, wisdom, justice, and have the confidence of the people” (*Baba Bathra*, 8; *Aboda Sara*, 18; *Taanith*, 24; Maimonides, *lad Ha-Chezaka Hilchoth Mathenath Anyim*, 9). Brothers were ineligible to this office; the almoners (hqdx yakg ^ysnrp) were not allowed to be near relations, and had to be elected by the unanimous voice of the people (*Jerusalem Peah*, 8).

3. The Legate of the Congregation, or the Leader of Divine Worship (rWBxəjyl æ = ἄγγελος ἐκκλησίας, ἀπόστολος). — To give unity and harmony to the worship, as well as to enable the congregation to take part in the responses, it was absolutely necessary to have one who should lead the worship. Hence, as soon as the legal number required for public worship had assembled (^ynm), the ruler of the synagogue (snrp = ποιμήν), or, in his absence, the elders (myhqz = πρεσβύτεροι), delegated one of the congregation to go up before the ark to conduct divine service. The function of the apostle of the ecclesia (rWBx jyl ç) was not permanently vested in any single individual ordained for this purpose, but was alternately conferred upon any lay member who was supposed to possess the qualifications necessary for offering up prayer in the name of the congregation. This is evident from the reiterated declarations both in the Mishna and the Talmud. Thus we are told that any one who is not under thirteen years of age, and whose garments are not in rags, may

officiate before the ark (Mishna, *Megillah*, 4:6); that “if one is before the ark = ministers for the congregation], and makes a mistake [in the prayer], another one is to minister in his stead, and he is not to decline it on such an occasion” (Mishna, *Berakoth*, 5, 3). “The sages have transmitted that he who is asked to conduct public worship is to delay a little at first, saying that he is unworthy of it; and if he does not delay, he is like unto a dish wherein is no salt; and if he delays more than is necessary, he is like unto a dish which the salt has spoiled. How is he to do it? The first time he is asked, he is to decline; the second time, he is to stir; and the third time, he is to move his legs and ascend before the ark” (*Berakoth*, 34 b). Even on the most solemn occasions, when the whole congregation fasted and assemble with the president and vice-president of the Siedrim for national humiliation and prayer, no stated minister is spoken of; but it is said that one of the aged men present is to deliver a penitential address, and another is to offer up the solemn prayers (Mishna, *Taanith*, 2, 1-4). **SEE FAST**. On ordinary occasions, however, the rabbins, who were the rulers of the synagogue, asked their disciples to act as officiating ministers before the ark (*Berakoth*, 34 a). But since the sages declared that “if the legate of the congregation (ῥωβχ τυλ ζ = ἄγγελος ἐκκλησίας, ἀπόστολος) commits a mistake while officiating, it is a bad omen for the congregation who delegated him, because a man’s deputy is like the man himself” (Mishna, *Berakoth*, 5, 5); and, moreover, since it was felt that he who conducts public worship should both be able to sympathize with the wants of the people and possess all the moral qualifications befitting so holy a mission, it was afterwards ordained that “even if an elder (ῆqz = πρεσβύτερος) or sage is present in the congregation, he is not to be asked to officiate before the ark; but that man is to be delegated who is apt to officiate, who has children, whose family are free from vice, who has a proper beard, whose garments are decent, who is acceptable to the people, who has a good and amiable voice, who and understands how to read the law, the prophets, and the Hagiographa, who is versed in the homiletic, legal, and traditional exegesis, and who knows all the benedictions of the service” (Mishna., *Taanith*, 2, 2; Gemara, *ibid.* 16 a, b; Maimonides, *fad Ha-Chezaka Hilchoth Tephila*, 8:11, 12; comp. Timothy 3:1-7; ~~3001~~Titus 1:1-9). As the legate of the people, the most sacred portions of the liturgy (e.g. wnn [, synhk tkrb, hçwdq, çydq), which could only be offered up in the presence of the legal number, were assigned to him (*Berakoth*, 21 b, and Rashi, *ad loc.*), and he was not only the mouthpiece of those who were

present in the congregation on the most solemn feasts, as on the Great Day of Atonement and New Year, but he was the surrogate of those who, by illness or otherwise, were prevented from attending the place of worship (*Rosh Ha-Shanah*, 35; Maimonides, *lad Ha-Chezaka Hilchoth Tephila*, 8:10).

4. The Interpreter, or Maethurgeman (מִגְדָּלֵי, מגדלי). — After the Babylonian captivity, when the Hebrew language was rapidly disappearing from among the common people, it became the custom to have an interpreter at the reading-desk (חֲמֵיב) by the side of those who were alternately called up to read the several sections of the lessons from the law and the prophets. *SEE HAPHTARAH*. This *methurgeman* had to interpret into Chaldee or into any other vernacular of the country a verse at a time when the lesson from the law was read, as the reader was obliged to pause as soon as he finished the reading of a verse in Hebrew, and was not allowed to begin the next verse till the *methurgeman* had translated it; while in the lesson from the prophets three verses were read and interpreted at a time (Mishna, *Megillah*, 4:4). The reader and the interpreter had to read in the same tone of voice, and the one was not allowed to be louder than the other (*Berakoth*, 45 a). The interpreter was not allowed to look at the law while interpreting, lest it should be thought that the paraphrase was written down. The office of interpreter, like that of conducting public worship, was not permanently vested in any single individual. Any one of the congregation who was capable of interpreting was asked to do so. Even a minor, i.e. one under thirteen years of age, or one whose garments were in such a ragged condition that he was disqualified for reading the lesson from the law, or a blind man, could be asked to go up to the reading-desk and explain the lesson (Mishna, *Megillah*, 4:5; Maimonides, *lad Ha-Chezaka Hilchoth Tephila*, 12:10-14).

5. The Chazzan, or Attendant on the Synagogue (חַזָּן, חזן = ὑπηρέτης), was the lowest servant, and was more like the sexton or the beadle in our churches. He had the care of the furniture, to open the doors, to clean the synagogue, to light the lamps, to get the building ready for service, to summon the people to worship, to call out (דַּוְמָי) the names of such persons as were selected by the ruler of the synagogue to come up to the platform to read a section from the law and the prophets, to hand the law to ordinary readers, or to the ruler of the synagogue when it had to be given to the high-priest, in which case the ἀρχισυνάγωγος took the law

from the *chazan*, gave it to the chief priest, who handed it to the high-priest (Mishna, *Yoma*, 8:1; *Sotah*, 7:7); he had to take it back after reading (^{<QHT>}Luke 4:17-20), etc. Nothing, therefore, can be more clear than the position which this menial servant occupied in the synagogue in the time of Christ and a few centuries after. The Talmud distinctly declares that the *chazan* is the beadle or the sexton of the congregation, and not the legate or the angel of the church (רַב־בַּיִת לְיָדוֹת הַקְּדוֹשִׁים לְפָנֵי הַקָּהָל ; comp. *Tosiphta Yoma*, 68 b; and Mishna, *Berakoth*, 7:1, for the meaning of צַמְצָם). The notion that his office resembled that “of the Christian deacon,” as well as the assertion that, “like the *legatus* and the *elders*, he was appointed by the imposition of hands,” has evidently arisen from a confusion of the *chazan* in the days of Christ with the *chazan* five centuries after Christ. Besides, not only was this menial servant not appointed by the imposition of hands, but the *legatus* himself, as we have seen, had no laying-on of hands. It was about A.D. 520, when the knowledge of the Hebrew language disappeared from among the people at large, that alterations had to be introduced into the synagogical service which involved a change in the office of the *chazan*. As the ancient practice of asking any member to step before the ark and conduct the divine service could not be continued, it was determined that the *chazan*, who was generally also the schoolmaster of the infant school, should be the regular reader of the liturgy, which he had to recite with intonation (*Masecheth Sopherim*, 10:7; 11:4; 14:9,14; Gratz, *Gesch. der Juden*, 5, 26). 6. *The Ten Batlanin, or Men of Leisure* (יְבָנֵי בַיִת). No place was denominated a town, and hence no synagogue would legally be built in it, which had not ten independent men who could be permanently in the synagogue to constitute the legal congregation whenever [required (Mishna, *Megillah*, 1, 3; Maimonides, *lad Bachezaka Hilchoth Tephila*, 11:1). These men of leisure were either independent of business because they had private means, or were stipendiaries of the congregation, if the place had not ten men who could entirely devote themselves to this purpose (Rashi, *On Megillah*, 5 a). They; had to be men of piety and integrity (*Baba Bathra*, 28 a; Jerusalem *Megillah*, 1, 4). By some (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. in* ^{<QHT>}*Matthew* 4:23, and, in part, Vitranga, p. 532) they have been identified with the above officials, with the addition of the alms-collectors. Rhenferd, however (Ugolino, *Thesaur.* vol. 21), sees in them simply a body of men, permanently on duty, making up a congregation (ten being the minimum number), so that there might be no delay in beginning the service at the proper hours, and that no

single worshipper might go away disappointed. The latter hypothesis is supported by the fact that there was a like body of men, the *Stationarii* or *Viri Stationis* of Jewish archaeologists, appointed to act as permanent representatives of the congregation in the services of the Temple (Jost, *Gesch. des Judenth.* 1, 168-172). It is of course possible that in many cases the same persons may have united both characters, and been, e.g., at once *otiosi* and alms-collectors. In the Middle Ages these ten *Batlanin* consisted of those who discharged the public duties of the synagogue, and were identical with the rulers of the synagogue described above. Thus Benjamin of Tudela tells us that the ten presidents of the ten colleges at Bagdad were called the *Batlanin*, *the leisure men*, because their occupation consisted in the discharge of public business. During every day of the week they, dispensed justice to all the Jewish inhabitants of the country, except on Monday, which was set aside for assemblies under the presidency of R. Samuel, master of the college denominated *Gaon Jacob*, who on that day dispensed justice to every applicant, and who was assisted therein by the said ten *Batlanin*, presidents of the colleges (*Itinerary*, 1, 101, ed. Ascher, Lond. 1840). This seems to favor the opinion of Herzfeld that the ten *Batlanin* are the same as the ten judges or rulers of the synagogue mentioned in *Aboth*, 3, 10, according to the reading of Bartenora (*Haorayoth*, 3 b, etc.; comp. *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, 1, 392).

V. *Worship.* —

1. *Its Time.* — As the Bible prescribes no special hour for worship, but simply records that the Psalmist prayed three times a day (Psalm Iv, 18), and that: Daniel followed the same example (^{דניאל} Daniel 7:11), the men of the Great Synagogue decreed that the worship of the synagogue should correspond to that of the Temple. To this end they ordained that every Israelite is to offer either public or private worship to his Creator at stated hours three times a day (a) in the morning (**tyrj ç**) at the third hour = 9 A.M., being the time when the daily morning sacrifice was offered; (b) in the afternoon or evening (**hj nm**) at the ninth hour and a half = 3:30 P.M., when the daily evening sacrifice was offered; and (c) in the evening (**byr [m]**), or from the time that the pieces and the fat of the sacrifices, whose blood was sprinkled before sunset, began to be burned till this process of burning, was finished. As this process of burning, however, sometimes lasted nearly all night, the third prayer could be offered at any time between dark and dawn (Mishna, *Berakoth*, 4:1; Gemara, *ibid.* 26 b;

Pesachim, 58 a; Jerusalem *Berakioth*, 4:1; Josephus, *Ant.* 14:4, 3). It is this fixed time of worship which accounts for the disciples assembling together at the third hour of the day (i.e. 9 A.M.) for morning prayer (**tyrj ç**) on the Day of Pentecost (**400** Acts 2:1-15), and for Peter and John's going up to the Temple at the ninth hour (i.e. 3 P.M.) for (**byr [m]**) evening prayer (**400** Acts 3:1), as well as for Cornelius's prayer at the same hour (10:30). The statement in **400** Acts 10:9, that Peter went up upon the house-top to pray about the sixth hour (=12 M.), has led some of our best expositors to believe that the hour mentioned in **400** Acts 3:11 and 10:30 is the time when *the third* prayer was offered. The two passages, however, and the two different hours refer to one and the same prayer, as may be seen from the following canon: "We have already stated that the time for the evening prayer (**hj nm**) was fixed according to that of the daily evening sacrifice, and since this daily evening sacrifice was offered at the ninth hour and a half (=3.30 P.M.), the time of prayer was also fixed for the ninth hour and a half (=3.30 P.M.), and this was called the *Lesser Minchah* (**hj nm hnfq**). But as the daily evening sacrifice was offered on the fourteenth of Nisan (**j sp br []**) at the sixth hour and a half (=12.30 P.M.), when this day happened to be on a Friday (**tbç br []**), *SEE PASSOVER*, it was enacted that he who offers his evening prayer after the sixth hour and a half (=12.30 P.M.) discharges his duty properly. Hence, as soon as this hour arrives, the time of obligation has come, and it is called the *Great Minchah*: (**hl wdg hj nm**; Maimonides, *lad HaChezaka Hilchoth Tephila*, 3, 2; *Berakoth*, 26 b). This mistake is all the more to be regretted, since the accuracy in such minute-matters on the part of the sacred writers-shows how great is the trustworthiness of their records, and how closely and strictly the apostles conformed to the Jewish practices. The prayers three times a day were not absolutely required to be offered in public worship in the synagogue every day. The times of public worship were (a) Monday and Thursday, which were the two market-days in the week, when the villagers brought their produce into the neighboring town and their matters of dispute before the local Sanhedrim, which held its court in the synagogue (Jerusalem *Megillaah*, 5, 1, *Baba Kama*, 32 a), and on which the pious Jews fasted (**400** Mark 2:18; **400** Luke 5:33; 18:12; **400** Acts 10:30); (b) the weekly Sabbath; and (c) feasts and fasts. But though not obligatory, yet it was deemed specially acceptable if the prayers were offered even privately in the synagogue, since it was inferred from

^{<31816>}Malachi 3:16 that the Shechinah is present where two or three are gathered together.

2. The Legal Congregation. — Though it was the duty of every Israelite to pray privately three times a day, yet, as we have already seen, it was only on stated occasions that the people: assembled for public worship in the legally constituted congregation, and recited those portions of the liturgy which could not be uttered in private devotion. *Ten* men, at least, who had passed the thirteenth year of their age (**hwxm rb**) were required to constitute a legitimate congregation (**^ynm**) for the performance of public worship. This number, which evidently owes its origin to the completeness of the ten digits, is deduced from the expression **hd[**, in ^{<04107>}Numbers 14:27, where it is said “how long shall I bear with this (**hd[**) congregation?” referring to the spies. As Joshua and Caleb are to be deducted from the twelve, hence the appellation congregation remains for the ten, and this number is therefore regarded as forming the legal quorum (Mishna, *Sanhedrim*, 1, 6; Maimonides, *lad Haa-Chezaka* ‘*Hilchoth Tephila*, 11:1). “The *Shema* (**[mç**) must not be solemnly recited, nor must one go before the ark to conduct public worship, nor must the priests raise their hands to pronounce the benediction, nor must the lessons from the law or the prophets be read... unless there are ten persons present” (Mishna, *Megillah*, 4:3).

3. Ritual. — The most important features in the institutions of the synagogue are the *liturgy*, the reading of the law and the prophets, and the homilies. To know the exact words of the prayers which our Savior and his apostles recited when they frequented the synagogue is to us of the utmost interest. That the Jews in the time of Christ had a liturgical service is certain; but it is equally certain that the present liturgy of the synagogue embodies a large admixture of prayers, which were compiled after the destruction of the second Temple. Though the poetic genius of the psalmists had vanished and the Temple music was, hushed, yet numerous fervent and devout spirits were still unquenched in Israel. These earnest spirits made themselves audible in the synagogue in most devout and touching prayers, embodying the new anxieties, the novel modes of persecution and oppression which the Jews had to endure from the children of Christianity the religion newly born and brought up in the lap of Judaism who deemed it their sacred duty to heap unparalleled sufferings upon their elder brothers. These prayers, formed after the model of the Psalms, not

only ask the God of Israel to pity the sufferers, to give them patience to endure, and in his own time to confound their enemies and free them from all their troubles, but embody the teachings of the sages and the sentiments propounded by the Haggadists in the Sabbatic homilies. Hence, in describing the ritual of the synagogue, it is most essential to separate the later element from the earlier portions. As it is beyond the limits of this article to trace the rise, progress, and development of all the component parts of the liturgy in its present order, we shall simply detail those portions which are, undoubtedly, the ancient nucleus, which, beyond a question, were used by our Savior and his disciples, and around which the new pieces- were grouped in the course of time.

(1.) *The Hymnal Group* (**twoymzayq** **WSP**). — Just as the Temple building was the prototype for the synagogue edifice, so the Temple service was the model for the ritual of the synagogue. Hence, just as the Temple service consisted of the priests reciting the ten commandments, pronouncing the benediction upon the people (^{<0163>}Numbers 6:24-27), the offering of the daily morning and evening sacrifice, the Levites chanting Psalm 115, 116; ^{<3168>}1 Chronicles 16:8-22 (**Wd/h**) during the morning sacrifice, and Psalm 116; ^{<3163>}1 Chronicles 16:23-36 (**Wryv**) during the evening sacrifice, so the ritual of the synagogue consisted of the same benediction, the chanting of the sacrificial psalms-as the sacrifices themselves could not be offered except in the Temple — and sundry additions made by Ezra and the men of the Great Synagogue. It is for this reason that the ritual began with the Temple psalms. These were followed by the group consisting of Psalm 100 — [19, 34, 91, 135, 136, 33, 92], 93, 145-150 — those enclosed in brackets being: omitted on the Sabbath — ^{<3390>}1 Chronicles 29:10-13; ^{<4016>}Nehemiah 9:6-12; ^{<1214>}Exodus 14:30-15, 18, and sundry sentences not found in the Bible, denominated the order of the *Hymnal Sentences or musical periods*. The use of this hymnal group as part of both the Temple and the synagogue service is of great antiquity, as is attested by the *Seder Olam*, 14 and *Masecheth Sopherim*; see also *Sabbath*, 118 b, where we are told that **wdwh** was ordained by David, and **wryc** by the *Sopherim*, or scribes.

(2.) *The Shema, or Keriath Shema* (**[miv]tajr** **22c**). This celebrated part of the service was preceded by two benedictions, respectively denominated “the Creator of Light” (**rwa rxwy**) and “Great Love” (**hbr hbha**), and

followed by one called “*Truth*” (**tma**, now expanded into **byxyw tma**). The two introductory benedictions were as follows:

(a.) “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who createst light and formest darkness, who makest peace and createst all things! He in mercy causes the light to shine upon the earth and the inhabitants thereof, and in goodness renews every day the work of creation. Blessed art thou, the Creator of light!”

(b.) “With great love hast thou loved us, O Lord our God; thou hast shown us great and abundant mercy, O our Father and King, for the sake of our forefathers who trusted in thee! Thou who didst teach them the love of life, have mercy upon us, and teach us also to praise and to acknowledge thy unity in love. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who in love hast chosen thy people!” (Mishna, *Tamid*, 5, 1; *Berakoth*, 11 b). Thereupon the ten commandments were recited, which, however, ceased at a very early period, because the Sadducees declared that this was done to show that this was the most essential portion of the revealed law (Mishna, *Tamid*, 5, 1, with *Berakoth*, 14 b). Then came the *Shema* proper, consisting of ~~<BIB>~~Deuteronomy 6:4-9; 11:13-21; ~~<BIB>~~Numbers 15:37-41; which was concluded with benediction

(c.), entitled “*True and Established*” (**byxyw tma**), as follows: “It is true and firmly established that thou art the Lord our God and the God of our forefathers; there is no God besides thee. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the redeemer of Israel!” (Mishna, *Berakoth*, 1, 4; Gemara, *ibid.* 13 a; Mishna, *Tamid*, 5, 1. Gemara, *ibid.* 32 b). There is evidently an allusion to the reading of the *Shema* in the reply which our Savior gave to the lawyer who asked him, “Master, what must I do to inherit eternal life?” when the lawyer forthwith recited the first sentence of the *Shema* (~~<BIB>~~Luke 10:26).
SEE SHEMA.

(3.) The third portion which constituted the ancient liturgy embraces the “*Eighteen*”. *Benedictions* (**hnwmç hrç [**), called, **κατ' ἐξοχήν**, the *Prayer* (**hl pt**). They are as follows:

a. (wrb) “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, the God of our fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; great, omnipotent, fearful, and most high God, who bountifully showest mercy, who art the possessor of all things, who rememberest the pious deeds of our fathers, and sendest the Redeemer to

their children's children, for his mercy's sake is love, O our King, Defender, Savior, and Shield! Blessed art thou, O Lord, the shield of Abraham!"

b. (rwbq hta) "Thou art powerful, O Lord, world without end; thou bringest the dead to life in great compassion, thou holdest up the falling, healest the sick, loosest the chained, and showest thy faithfulness to those that sleep in the dust. Who is like unto thee, Lord of might, and who resembles thee (a Sovereign killing and bringing to life again, and causing salvation to flourish)? Arid thou art sure to raise the dead. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who raisest the dead!"

c. (çwdq hta) "Thou art holy, and thy name is holy, and' the holy ones praise thee every day continually. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the holy God!"

d. (ˆnwj hta) "Thou mercifully bestowest knowledge upon men and teachest the mortal prudence. Mercifully bestow upon us, from thyself, knowledge, wisdom, and understanding. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who mercifully bestowest knowledge!"

e. (wnbyçh) "Our Father, lead us back to thy law; bring us very near, O our King, to thy service, and cause us to return in sincere penitence into thy presence! Blessed art thou, O Lord, who delightest in repentance!"

f. (j l s) "Our Father, forgive us, for we have sinned; our King, pardon us, for we have transgressed; for thou art forgiving and pardoning. Blessed art thou, O Lord, merciful and plenteous in forgiveness!"

g. (har) "Look at our misery, contend our cause, and deliver us speedily, for thy name's sake, for thou art a mighty deliverer, blessed art thou, O Lord, the deliverer of Israel!"

h. (wnapr) "Heal us, O Lord, and we shall be healed; save us, and we shall be saved; for thou art our boast. Grant us a perfect cure for all our wounds; for thou, O Lord our King, art a faithful and merciful Physician. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who healest the sick of thy people Israel!"

i. (wnyl [wrb) "Bless to us, O Lord our God, for good this year, and all its kinds of produce; send thy blessing upon the face of the earth; satisfy us with thy goodness, and bless this year as the years bygone. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who'blessest the seasons!"

j. ([qt) “Cause the great trumpet to proclaim our liberty; raise the standard for the gathering of our captives, and bring us together from the four corners of the earth. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who gatherest together the dispersed of Israel!”

k. (hbyçh) “Reinstate our judges as of old, and our councillors as of yore; remove from us sorrow and sighing; and do thou alone, O Lord, reign over us in mercy and love, and judge us in righteousness and justice. Blessed art thou, O Lord the King, who lovest righteousness and justice!”

l. (µynyçl ml w) “Let the apostates have no hope, and let those who perpetrate wickedness speedily perish; let them all be suddenly cut off; let the proud speedily be uprooted, broken, crushed, and humbled speedily in our days. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who breakest down the enemy and humblest the proud!”

m. (µyqydxh l [) “On the righteous, on the pious, on the elders of thy people, the house of Israel, on the remnant of the scribes, on the pious: proselytes, and on us, bestow, O Lord our God, thy mercy; give ample: reward to all who trust in thy name in sincerity, make our portion with them forever, and let us not be ashamed, for we trust in thee! Blessed art thou, O Lord, the support and refuge of the righteous!”

n. (µyl çwryl w) “To Jerusalem thy city in mercy return, and dwell in it according to thy promise; make it speedily in our day an everlasting building, and soon establish therein the throne of David. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who buildest Jerusalem!” (ta j mx) “The branch of David, thy servant, speedily cause to flourish, and exalt his horn with thy help, for we look to thy help all day.” Blessed art thou O Lord, who causest to flourish the horn of David!”

o. ([mç wnl wq) “Hear our voice, O Lord our God; have pity and compassion on us, and receive with mercy and acceptance our prayers, for thou art a God hearing prayer and supplications. Our King, do not send us empty away from thy presence, for thou hearest the prayers of thy people Israel in mercy! Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hearest prayer!”

p. (hxr) “Be favorable, O Lord our God, to thy people Israel, and to their prayer; restore the worship to thy sanctuary, receive lovingly the burnt-sacrifice of Israel and their prayer, and let the service of Israel thy people

be always well-pleasing to thee. May our eyes see thee return to Zion in love. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who restorest thy Shechinah to Zion!”

q. (μydwmm) “We thankfully confess before thee that thou art-the Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, world without end, and that thou art the shepherd of our life and the rock of our salvation from generation to generation; we render thanks unto thee and celebrate thy praises. Blessed art thou, O Lord, whose name is goodness, and whom it becomes to praise!”

r. (μwl ̇ μẏç) “Bestow peace, happiness, blessing, grace, mercy, and compassion upon us and upon the whole of Israel, thy people. Our Father, bless us all unitedly with the light of thy countenance, for in the light of thy countenance didst thou give to us, O Lord bur God, the law of life, loving-kindness, justice, blessing, compassion, life, and peace. May it please thee to bless thy people Israel at all times, and in every moment, with peace. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who blessest thy people Israel with peace!”

These eighteen (really nineteen) benedictions are mentioned in the Mishna, *Rosh Hashanah*, 4; *Berakoth*, 4:3; *Tosiptta Berakoth*, 3; Jerusalem *Berakoth*, 2; *Meillah*, 17 a. We are distinctly told that they were ordained by the one hundred and twenty elders of the Great Synagogue (*Megillah*, 17 b; *Berakoth*, 33 a; *Siphre* on ^(683D)Deuteronomy 33:2), and we know that the representatives of the people (dm[m yçna) recited them in the Temple every day (*Sabbath*, 24 b), that the priests pronounced three of them upon the people every morning in the *Hall of Squares* (tyzgh tkçl) in the Temple-court, and that the high-priest prayed the sixteenth (hxr) and the seventeenth (μydwmm) sections of this litany on the Great Day of Atonement (*Yoma*, 68 b). There can therefore be no doubt that our Savior and his apostles joined in these prayers when they resorted to the synagogue, and that when the apostles went on the top of the house to pray at the stated hour (^(401B)Acts 1:13; 10:9) these benedictions formed part of their devotions. It must, however, be remarked that the first three and the last three benedictions are the oldest; that benedictions *d.* to *m.* were compiled during the Maccabean struggles and the Roman ascendancy in Palestine; and benediction *n.* was most probably compiled after the destruction of the second Temple.

But though these three groups (viz. the hymnal group, the *Shema*, and the eighteen benedictions) constituted the liturgy of the Jews when engaged in public or private devotion during the period of the second Temple, yet there were other prayers which could only be recited at public worship when the legal number (γnm) were properly assembled.

4. *The order of the public worship in the synagogue was as follows:*

(1.) *Morning Service.* — The congregation having washed their hands outside the synagogue, and being properly assembled, delegated one of their number to go before the ark and conduct public worship. This *legate of the congregation* ($\rho w B x e$), who, like the rest of the congregation, was arrayed in his fringed garment, and with the phylacteries on his head and left arm, *SEE FRINGE; SEE PHYLACTERY*, began with reciting the *Kadish* ($\nu y d e \phi$), the people responding to certain parts, as follows: “Exalted and hallowed be his great name in the world which he created according to his will; let his kingdom come in your lifetime and in the lifetime of the whole house of Israel very speedily. [Legate and congregation] Amen. Blessed be his great name, world without end. [Legate alone] Blessed and praised, celebrated and exalted, extolled and adorned, magnified and worshipped, be thy holy name blessed be he far above all benedictions, hymns, thanks, praises, and consolations which have been uttered in the world. [Legate and congregation] Amen. [Legate alone] May the prayers and supplications of all Israel be graciously received before their Father in heaven. [Legate and congregation] Amen. [Legate alone] May perfect peace descend from heaven, and life upon us and all Israel. [Legate and congregation] Amen. [Legate alone] May he who makes peace in his heaven confer peace upon us and all Israel. [Legate and congregation] Amen.” The similarity between this very ancient *Kadish* and the Lord’s Prayer needs hardly to be pointed out. After this the legate recited in a loud voice the first sentence of the *Shema*, the rest being recited quietly by him and the congregation. Then followed the eighteen benedictions, for the third of which the *Kedushah* ($h \phi w d q$) was substituted in public worship. It is as follows: “Hallowed be thy name on earth as it is hallowed in heaven above, as it is written by the prophet, and one calls to the other and says [Congregation], Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God of Sebaoth; the whole earth is filled with his glory! [Legate] Those who are opposite them respond: [Congregation] Blessed be the glory of the Eternal, each one in his station. [Legate] And in thy Holy

Word it is written, thus saying: [Congregation] The Lord shall reign forever, thy God, O Zion, from generation to generation. Halleluiah! [Legate] From generation to generation we will disclose thy greatness, and forever and ever celebrate thy holiness; and thy praise shall not cease in our mouth, world without end, for thou, O Lord, art a great and holy King. Blessed art thou, holy God and King!" On Monday, Thursday, Sabbath, feasts and fasts, lessons from the law and prophets were read, and (with the exception of Monday and Thursday) discourses delivered by the rabbins. The service concluded with the priests pronouncing the benediction (^{<0034>}Numbers 6:24-27).

(2.) *The Afternoon and Evening Prayer.* — Some of the psalms in the hymnal group were omitted, otherwise the service was similar to that of the morning. The public worship of the feasts and fasts is described in the articles on the respective festivals, and in the article HAPHTARAH *SEE HAPHTARAH*. The other prayers which precede and follow the three ancient groups in the present liturgy of the synagogue are not described in this article because they are of later origin. *SEE LITURGY*.

VI. *Judicial Authority.* —

1. As the officers of the synagogue were also the administrators of justice, the authority which each assembly possessed extended to both civil and religious questions. The rabbi's, or the heads of the synagogue, as it is to the present day, were both the teachers of religion and the judges of their communities. Hence the tribunals were held in the synagogue (^{<0211>}Luke 12:11; 21:12), and the *chazzan*, or beadle, who attended to the divine service had also to administer the stripes to offenders (^{<0317>}Luke 4:17-20; comp. Mishna, *Makkoth*, 3, 12; and ^{<0007>}Matthew 10:17; 23:34; ^{<1139>}Mark 13:9; ^{<4219>}Acts 22:19; 26:11). The rabbins who had *diplomas* from the Sanhedrim, and, after the Sanhedrim ceased, from the *Gaonim* of the respective colleges at Sora and Pumbeditha (q.v.), and who were chosen by the different congregations to be their spiritual heads with the consent of the assembly, selected such of the members as were best qualified to aid them in the administration of the communal affairs. These constituted a local self-governing and independent college; they issued all the legal instruments, such as marriage contracts, letters of divorce, bills of exchange, business contracts, receipts, etc. They had the power of inflicting corporal punishment on any offender, or to put him out of the synagogues (=excommunicate) altogether (^{<0185>}Matthew 18:15-17; ^{<1122>}John

9:22; 12:42; 16:2). The punishment of excommunication, however, was very seldom resorted to, as may be seen from the fact that though Christ and his apostles opposed and contradicted the heads of the synagogue, yet they were not put out of the synagogue. In some cases they exercised the right even outside the limits of Palestine, of seizing the persons of the accused and sending them in chains to take their trial before the Supreme Council at Jerusalem (~~400C~~ Acts 1:2; 22:5).

2. It is not quite so easy, however, to define the nature of the tribunal and the precise limits of its jurisdiction. In two of the passages referred to (~~4007~~ Matthew 10:17; ~~4139~~ Mark 13:9) they are carefully distinguished *from* the **συνέδρια**, or councils, yet both appear as instruments by which the spirit- of religious persecution might fasten on its victims. The explanation commonly given that the council sat in the synagogue, and was thus identified with it, is hardly satisfactory (Leyrer, in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop* s.v. "Synedrien"). It seems more probable that the council was the larger tribunal of twenty-three, which sat in every city, **SEE COUNCIL**, identical with that of the seven, with two Levites: as assessors to each, which Josephus describes as acting in the smaller provincial towns (*Ant.* 4:8,14; *War.* 2, 20, 5); and that under the term synagogue we are to understand a smaller court, probably that of the ten judges mentioned in the Talmud C. (Gem. Hieros. *Sanhedr.* loc. cit.), consisting either of the elders, the chazzan, and the legate, or otherwise (as Herzfeld conjectures, 1, 392) of the ten Batlanin, or *otiosi* (see above, IV, 6).

VII. *Relations of the Jewish Synagogue to the Christian Church.* — It is hardly possible to overestimate the influence of the system thus developed. To it we may ascribe the tenacity with which, after the Maccabean struggle, the Jews adhered to the religion of their fathers, and never again relapsed into idolatry. The people were now in no danger of forgetting the law, and the external ordinances that hedged it round. If pilgrimages were still made to Jerusalem at the great feasts, the habitual religion of the Jews in, and yet more out of, Palestine was connected much more intimately with the synagogue than with the Temple. Its simple, edifying devotion, in which mind and heart could alike enter, attracted the heathen proselytes who might have been repelled by the bloody sacrifices of the Temple, or would certainly have been driven from it unless they could make up their minds to submit to circumcision (~~4218~~ Acts 21:28). **SEE PROSELYTE.** Here, too, as in the cognate order of the scribes, there was an influence tending

to diminish and ultimately almost to destroy the authority of the hereditary priesthood. The services of the synagogue required no sons of Aaron; gave them nothing more than a complimentary precedence.

SEE PRIEST; SEE SCRIBE. The way was silently prepared for a new and higher order, which should rise in “the fullness of time” out of the decay and abolition of both the priesthood and the Temple. In another way, too, the synagogues everywhere prepared the way for that order. Not “Moses” only, but “the prophets” were read in them every Sabbath day; and thus the Messianic hopes of Israel, the expectation of a kingdom of heaven, were universally diffused.

1. It will be seen at once how closely the *organization* of the synagogue was reproduced in that of the Ecclesia. Here also there was the single presbyter bishop, **SEE BISHOP**, in small towns, a council of presbyters under one head in large cities. The *legatus* of the synagogue appears in the ἄγγελος (^{<4011>}Revelation 1:20; 2:1), perhaps also in the ἀπόστολος, of the Christian Church. To the elders as such is given the name of Shepherds (^{<4011>}Ephesians 4:11; ^{<4011>}1 Peter 5:1). They are known also as ἡγούμενοι (^{<8107>}Hebrews 13:7). Even the transfer to the Christian proselytes of the once distinctively sacerdotal name of ἱερεύς, foreign as it was to the feelings of the Christians of the apostolic age, was not without its parallel in the history, of the synagogue; Sceva, the exorcist Jew of Ephesus, was probably a “chief priest” in this sense (Acts 19, 14). In the edicts of the later Roman emperors, the terms ἀρχιερεύς and ἱερεύς are repeatedly applied to the rulers of synagogues (Cod. Theodos. *De Jud.*, quoted by Vitringa, *De Decem Otiosis*, in Ugolino, *Thes.* 21). Possibly, however, this may have been, in part, owing to the presence of the scattered priests, after the destruction of the Temple, as the rabbins or elders of what was now left to them as their only sanctuary. To them, at any rate, a certain precedence was given in the synagogue services. They were invited first to read the lessons for the day. The benediction of ^{<4012>}Numbers 6:22 was reserved for them alone.

2. In the *magisterial functions* of the synagogue also, we may trace the outline of a Christian institution. The ἐκκλησία, either by itself or by appointed delegates, was to act as a court of arbitration in all disputes among its members. The elders of the Church were not, however, to descend to the trivial disputes of daily life (τὰ βιωτικά). For these any men of common sense and fairness, however destitute of official honor and

position (οἱ ἐξουθενημένοι), would be enough (<400>1 Corinthians 6:1-8). For the elders, as for those of the synagogue, were reserved the graver offences against religion and morals. In such cases they had power to excommunicate, to “put out of” the Ecclesia, which had taken the place of the synagogue, sometimes by their own authority, sometimes with the consent of the whole society (<400>1 Corinthians 5:4). It is worth mentioning that Hammond and other commentators have seen a reference to these judicial functions in <400>James 2:2-4. The special sin of those who fawned upon the rich was, on this view, that they were “*judges* of evil thoughts,” carrying respect of persons into their administration of justice. The interpretation, however, though ingenious, is hardly sufficiently supported.

3. The *ritual* of the synagogue was to a large extent the reproduction (here also, as with the fabric, with many inevitable changes) of the statelier liturgy of the Temple. It will be enough, in this place, to notice in what way the ritual, no less than the organization, was connected with the facts of the New Test, history, and with the life and order of the Christian Church. Here too, we meet with multiplied coincidences. It would hardly be an exaggeration to say that the worship of the Church was identical with that of the synagogue, modified

- (a) by the new truths,
- (b) by the new institution of the supper of the Lord,
- (c) by the spiritual *charismata*.

(1.) From the synagogue came the use of fixed forms of prayer. To that the first disciples had been accustomed from their youth. They had asked their Master to give them a distinctive one, and he had complied with their request (<200>Luke 11:1), as the Baptist had done before for his disciples, as every rabbi did for his. The forms might be, and were, abused. The Pharisee might in synagogues, or, when the synagogues were closed, in the open street, recite aloud the devotions appointed for hours of prayer, might gabble through the *Shema* (“Hear, O Israel,” etc., from <400>Deuteronomy 6:4), his *Kadish*, his *Shemneh Esreh*, the eighteen *Berakoth*, or blessings, with the “vain repetition” which has reappeared in Christian worship. But for the disciples this was, as yet, the true pattern of devotion, and their Master sanctioned it. To their minds there would seem nothing inconsistent with true heart-worship in the recurrence of a fixed order (κατὰ τάξιν, <440>1 Corinthians 14:40), of the same prayers, hymns, doxologies, such as all liturgical study leads us to think of as existing in the

apostolic age. If the gifts of utterance which characterized the first period of that age led for a time to greater freedom, to unpremeditated prayer if that was in its turn succeeded by the renewed predominance of a formal fixed order, the alternation and the struggle which have reappeared in so many periods of the history of the Church were not without their parallel in that of Judaism. There also was a protest against the rigidity of an unbending form. Eliezer of Lydda, a contemporary of the second Gamaliel (cir. A.D. 80-115), taught that the legate of the synagogue should discard even the *Shemoneh Esreh*, the eighteen fixed prayers and benedictions of the daily and Sabbath services, and should pray as his heart prompted him. The offense against the formalism into which Judaism stiffened was apparently too great to be forgiven. He was excommunicated (not, indeed, avowedly on this ground), and died at Caesarea (Jost, *Gesch. des Judenth.* 2. 36,45).

(2.) The large admixture of a didactic element in Christian worship, that by which it was distinguished from all Gentile forms of adoration, was derived from the older order. "Moses" was read in the synagogues every Sabbath day" (^{<4151>}Acts 15:21), the whole law being read consecutively, so as to be completed, according to one cycle, in three years, according to that which ultimately prevailed and determined the existing divisions of the Hebrew text (Leyrer, *loc. cit.*), 2 the fifty-two weeks of a single year. *SEE BIBLE*. The writings of the prophets were read as second lessons in a corresponding order. They were followed by the *Lerash*, the **λόγος παρακλήσεως** (^{<41315>}Acts 13:15), the exposition, the sermon of the synagogue. The first Christian synagogues, we must believe, followed this order with but little deviation. It remained for them before long to add "the other Scriptures" which they had learned to recognize as more precious even than the law itself, the "prophetic word" of the New Test., which, not less truly than that of the Old, came, in epistle or in narrative, from: the same Spirit. *SEE SCRIPTURE*.

(3.) To the ritual of the synagogue we may probably trace a practice, which has sometimes been a stumbling-block to the student of Christian antiquity, the subject-matter of fierce debate among Christian controversialists. Whatever account may be given of it, it is certain that Prayers for the Dead appear in the Church's worship as soon as we have any trace of it after the immediate records of the apostolic age. It has been well described by a writer whom no one can suspect of Romish tendencies as an "immemorial practice." Though "Scripture is silent, yet antiquity plainly speaks." The

prayers “have found a place in every early liturgy of the world.” (Ellicott, *Destiny of the Creature*, serm. 6). How, indeed, we may ask, could it have been otherwise? The strong feeling shown in the time of the Maccabees, that it was not “superfluous and vain” to pray for the dead (2 Macc. 12, 44), was sure, under the influence of the dominant Pharisaic scribes, to show itself in the devotions of the synagogue. So far as we trace back these devotions, we may say that there also the practice is “immemorial,” as old, at least, as the traditions of the Rabbinic fathers (Buxtorf, *De Synagog.* p. 709, 710; M’Caul, *Old Paths*, ch. 38). The writer already quoted sees a probable reference to them in ⁵⁰¹⁸2 Timothy 1:18 (Ellicott, *Past. Epistles*, ad loc.). But it is by no means certain that Onesiphorus was at that time dead. *SEE DEAD, PRAYERS FOR THE.*

(4.) The conformity extends, also, to the times of prayer. In the hours of service this was obviously the case. The third, sixth, and ninth hours were, in the times of the New Test. (⁴⁴⁰¹Acts 3:1; 10:3, 9), and had been, probably, for some time before (¹⁸⁵⁷Psalms 55:17; ²¹⁶⁰Daniel 6:10), the fixed times of devotion, known then, and still known, respectively as the *Shacharith*, the *Minchah*, and the *Arabith*; they had not only the prestige of an authoritative tradition, but were connected respectively with: the names of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to whom, as to the first originators, their institution was ascribed (Buxtorf; *De Synagog.* p.280). The same hours, it is well known, were recognized, in the Church of the second, probably also in that of the first century (Clem. *A Strom.* loc. cit.; Tertull. *De Orat.* c. 25). The sacred days belonging to the two systems seem, at first, to present a contrast rather than a resemblance; but here, too, there is a symmetry which points to an original connection. The solemn days of the synagogue were the second, the fifth, and the seventh; the last, or Sabbath, being the conclusion of the whole. In whatever way the change was brought about, the transfer of the sanctity of the Sabbath to the Lord’s day involved a corresponding change in the order of the week, and the first; the fourth, and the sixth became to the Christian society what the other days had been to the Jewish.

The following suggestion as to the mode in which this transfer was effected involves, it is believed, fewer arbitrary assumptions than any other, *SEE SABBATH*, and connects itself with another interesting custom, common to the Church and the synagogue. It was a Jewish custom to end the Sabbath with a feast, in which they did honor to it as to a parting king. The feast was held in the synagogue. A cup of wine, over which a special blessing

had been spoken, was handed rounds (Jost, *Gesch. des Judenth.* 1, 180). It is obvious that, so long as the apostles and their followers continued to use the Jewish mode of reckoning — so long, i.e., as they fraternized with their brethren of the stock of Abraham this would coincide in point of time with their **δεῖπνον** on the *first* day of the week. A supper on what we should call Sunday evening would have been to them on, the *second*. By degrees, **SEE LORDS SUPPER** the time became later, passed on to midnight, to the early dawn of the next day. So the Lord's sipper ceased to be a supper really. So, as the Church rose out of Judaism, the supper *gave* its holiness to the coming, instead of *deriving* it from the parting day. The day came to be **κυριακή**, because it began with the **δεῖπνον κυριακόν**. Gradually the Sabbath ceased as such to be observed at all. The practice of observing both, as in the Church of Rome up to the fifth century, gives us a trace of the transition period. **SEE SUNDAY**.

(5.) From the synagogue, lastly, came many less conspicuous practices, which meet us in the liturgical life of the first three centuries. Ablution, entire or partial, before entering the place of meeting (^{<S102>}Hebrews 10:22; ^{<B101>}John 13:1-15; Tertull. *De Orat.* 100. 11); standing and not kneeling, as the attitude of prayer (^{<D181>}Luke 18:11; Tertull. *ibid.* 100. 23); the arms stretched out (Tertull. *ibid.* c. 13); the face turned towards the Keblah of the east (Clem. Al. *Strom.* loc. cit.); the responsive Amen of the congregation to the prayers and benedictions of the elders (^{<B416>}1 Corinthians 14:16). In one strange exception at custom of the Church of Alexandria we trace the wilder type of Jewish, of Oriental devotion. There, in the closing responsive chorus of the prayer, the worshippers not only stretched out their necks and lifted up their hands, but leaped with wild gestures (**τούς τε πόδας ἐπεγείρομεν**), as if they would fain rise with their prayers to heaven itself (Clem. — *Ad. Strom.* 7,40). This, too, reproduced a custom of the synagogue. — Three times did the whole body of worshippers leap up simultaneously as they repeated the greater *sanctus* hymn of Isaiah 6 (Vitringa, p. 1100 sq.; Buxtorf, ch. 10).

VIII. Literature. — *Jerusalem Megillah*, c. 3; Maimonides, *lad Ha-Chezakailchoth Tephila*; Vitringa, *. De Syngoga Vetere* (Weissenfels, 1726); Zulz, *Diegottesdienstlichen Vortrdge der Juden* (Berlin, 1832), p. 366 sq.; id. *Die Ritus des synagogalen Gottesdienstes* (*ibid.* 1859); Edelmann, *Higajon Leb* (Kinigsb. 1845); Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volces Israel* (Nordhausen, 1855-1857), 1, 24-30, 127, 391-394; 2, 129-134, 183-

223; Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums* (Leipsic, 1857-58), 1, 38 sq., 168 sq., 262 sq.; Duschak, *Illustrirte Monatsschrift ü für die gesammten Interessen des Judenthums* (Lond. 1865), 1, 83 sq., 174 sq., 409 sq. See also Burmann, *Exercitt. Acad.* 2, 3 sq.; Reland, *Anti. Sacr.* 1, 10; Carpzov-Appar. p. 307 sq.; Hartmann, *Verbind. des A.T. mit d. Neuen*, p. 225 sq.; Brown, *Antiquities of the Jews*, 1, 590 sq.; Allen, *Modern Judaism*, ch. 19; the monographs of Bornitz, *De Vet. Synagogis* (Vitemb. 1650); Leovardic, *De Synagoga et Ecclesia* (s. 1. et an.); Rhenferd, *De Otiosis Synagogce* (Franec. 1686); id. *Archisynagogus Otiosus* (ibid. 1688); Tentzel, *De Proseuchis Samar.* (Vitemb. 1682); and the dissertations cited by Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* col. 1811. **SEE WORSHIP.**

Synagogue, The Great

(post-Biblical Hebrew, **hl wdGhi tsnKj**) Aramaic, **atbr atçnk**; late Greek and Latin, **συναγωγή μεγάλη**, *Synagoga Magna*), *the Great Assembly*, or *the Great Synod*, according to Jewish tradition, denotes the council first appointed after the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity to reorganize the religious life, institutions, and literature of the people. Our information on the subject is chiefly from Rabbinical sources.

I. Name and its Signification. — Though the verb. **snK**; *to gather, to assemble*, occurs in the Old Test. (^{<1046>}Esther 4:16; ^{<1321>}1 Chronicles 22:2; ^{<1721>}Ezekiel 22:21; 39:828; ^{<1472>}Psalms 147:2), yet the noun **tsnKa**, *assembly, synagogue*, does not occur in Biblical Hebrew. In the Hebrew Scriptures the terms **hlj qj l hq**; and **hpwsa**; are used for *congregation, assembly*, **SEE ECCLESIASTES**, and there can be but little doubt that the non-Biblical **tsnKj** is designedly employed to distinguish this assembly from all other gatherings. **SEE SYNAGOGUE.** This is also the reason why the article is prefixed to the adjective alone, and not also to the noun viz. **tsnKjhl wdGhi**, *the Great Synagogue-inasmuch* as this singles it out from the other *synagogues*, provincial or local, both great and small, which obtained at the same time, and which were designed for different objects. When Ewald asserts that “in the Mishnic language the substantive and the adjective *never* have the article together (*Lehrbuch*, § 293 a, note), we need only refer to *Sabbath*, 17:4; *Yoma*, 4:3; *Taanith*, 3, 7; *Kethuboth*, 6:7; *Nedarim*, 3, 11; *Nazir*, 8:1; *Baba Bathra*, 4:3; and to innumerable other passages, in refutation of this assertion. According to the most ancient tradition, this assembly or synagogue was styled *great* because of the great

work it effected in restoring the divine law to its former greatness, and because of the great authority and reputation which it enjoyed (Jerusalem *Megillah*, 3, 7; Babylon *Megillah*, 13 b; *Yoma*, 69 b; *Erubin*, 13 b; *Zebachim*, 102; *Sanhedrin*, 14 a). The enactments of the Great Synagogue are often quoted in the name of **hl wdgh tsnk yvbi**, *the men of the Great Assembly*, or those who successively constituted its members during the long period of its existence. The abbreviated forms of these two names to be met with in Jewish literature are **h8k = tsnk hl wdgh** and **h8 8ka, gh8ka = hl wdgh tsnk yçna**. Sometimes this assembly is also designated the 120 elders (**µynqz µyrç[w ham**, *Megillah*, 17 b, 18 b).

II. Origin, Date, and Development of the Great Synagogue. — It is supposed by many that Ezra was the founder of the Great Synagogue, and that he, in fact, was its president. Gratz, however, has adduced the following arguments to prove that Nehemiah originated it after the death of Ezra 1. The very name of Ezra is not even mentioned in the Biblical register of the representatives (Nehemiah 9; Ezra 5), and it is inconceivable to suppose that the originator would have been omitted; and, 2. Nehemiah, as is well known, went twice from Shushan to Jerusalem to restore order viz. in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes's reign (B.C. 446), and considerably after the thirty-second year of his reign (B.C. cir. 410). On his second arrival he found Jerusalem in a most deplorable condition: the chiefs of the families had formed alliances with Sanballat the Horonite and Tobiah the Ammonite, enemies of the Jews; the Sabbath was desecrated, and the law of God in of the sanctuary were disregarded (⁴³¹⁶Nehemiah 13:6-31). Now the convention of the Great Synagogue was held expressly for the removal of these very evils; and since the representatives distinctly bound themselves by a most solemn oath to abstain from mixed marriages, to keep the Sabbath holy, and to attend sacredly to the sanctuary and its requirements, there can be no doubt that the synod was convened by Nehemiah *after his second visit* to Jerusalem to devise means in order to meet these perplexing points, and that because these evils disturbed the order of the community, therefore they were made the principal and express objects of the first synod. It is the position of ch. 10 recording the convention of the Great Synagogue which has caused this error. But it is well known that the book of Nehemiah is not put together in chronological order. Gratz has shown a position of the different chapters in accordance with the above view (Frankel, *Monatsschrift*, 6:62). **SEE EZRA**. It is

obvious, however, that Nehemiah acted in perfect concert with Ezra, and hence there is no substantial error in attributing the Great Synagogue to the latter.

As to *its date*, the convention of this Great Synagogue was most probably one of Nehemiah's last acts, and it must have taken place after the death of Artaxerxes, else Nehemiah could not have remained in Jerusalem, since even the second permission to visit that city was granted to him on condition that he should return to Shushan. It could not therefore have taken place before B.C. 424. The Great Synagogue was most probably held a few years after the above date of Nehemiah's second visit. Ezra was doubtless then dead, and this is the reason why his name does not occur in the register of the representatives. The whole period of the Great Synagogue embraces about 104 years (B.C. 404-300), or from the latter days of Nehemiah to the death of Simon the Just (q.v.), who was the last link of the chain constituting the synod (*Aboth*, 1, 2). It then passed into the Sanhedrim, when the whole of its constitution was changed. *SEE SANHEDRIM.*

The existence of the Great Synagogue, which is attested by the unanimous voice of Jewish tradition, was first questioned by Richard Simon (*Hist. Crit. du Vieux Test.* lib. 1, cap. 8). Jacob Alting, with more boldness, rejected it altogether as one of the inventions of tradition ("Synagoga magna enim nec uno tempore nec uno loco vixit, eoque synagoga non fuit, rerum commentum n est traditionariorum, qui nullum alioquin nexum *παραδόσεως* reperire potuerunt," *Opp.* 5, 382). He was followed by — Rau (*Diatribes de Synag. Magna* [Ultraj. 1726], p. 66, etc.) and Aurivillius (*De Synag. vulgo dicta Magna* [ed. J. D. Michaelis, Götting. 1790]). De Wette (*Einleitung in das A.T.* § 14) contemptuously dismisses it as "a tradition which vanishes as soon as the passages are looked at whereon it is based, and as not even being a subject for refutation." Those who condescend to argue the matter reject this tradition because it is not mentioned in the Apocrypha, Josephus, Philo, or the *Seder Olam*, and because the earliest record of it is in the tract of the Mishna entitled *A both*, which belongs to the 1st or 2nd century of our era, but probably represents an earlier age. But surely this argument from the silence of a few writers cannot set aside the express and positive testimony of the Mishna, the Talmud, and the earliest Jewish works. In like manner, the book of Ecclesiasticus, in its catalogue of Jewish heroes (ch. 1), does not mention Ezra: Josephus never alludes to the tribunal of twenty-three members, and

the earliest patristic literature of the Jews does not breathe a syllable about the Maccabean heroes. Would it be fair to conclude from this silence that Ezra, the tribunal, and the Maccabees are a myth? In confirmation of the records in the Talmudic literature about the Great Synagogue, the following circumstantial evidence is to be adduced: The errors of the Samaritans became rampant after the death of Nehemiah, while of the high-priests between Eliashib and Onias I some were insignificant men and others were reprobates. Judaism, moreover, has no record whatever of any distinguished persons during this period. We should therefore have expected the religion of the people to be at the lowest ebb. But instead of declining, we find Judaism-rapidly rising. No trace is to be found in the whole of this period of the disturbances, misconceptions, and errors, which prevailed in the time of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Zerubbabel. The law and the precepts were pre-eminently revered. The ancient collection of Ben-Sirach's sayings, which reflects the spirit of the people in the pre-Simonic age, breathes a fervent enthusiasm for the inspired law (comp. *Ecclus.* 2, 16; 7:29; 9:15 10:19; 15:1; 19:17; 21:11; 23:27, and especially ch. 24). Who, then, has kindled and sustained such an enthusiasm and religious spirit, if not an assembly similar to that convened by Nehemiah?" (Gratz, in Frankel's *Monatsschrift*, 16, 63, etc.).

III. Number of Members and their Classification. — We are told that Nehemiah organized the Great Synagogue (comp. Nehemiah 10,1-10 with *Midrash Ruth*, c. 3; Jerusalem *Shebiith*, 5, 1), and that it consisted of 120 members (Jerusalem *Berakoth*, 2, 4; Jerusalem *Megillah*, 1; Babylon *Megillah*, 17 b). In looking at the register of the Great Assembly recorded in Nehemiah (10, 18), it will be seen: that-a Only sixteen out of the twenty-four *chiefs of the priests* (^{<1340>}1 Chronicles 24:7-18) are enumerated, and that for the eight that are wanting four private persons are given, viz. Zidkijah, Daniel, Baruch, and Meshullam. b. Of the six or seven *chief Levites-viz.* Jeshua, Bani, Kadmiel, Hodijah, Sherebiah, Hashabniah who returned with Zerubbabel and Ezra (^{<1694>}Nehemiah 9:4, 5; ^{<1510>}Ezra 5:18,19, 24), Bani is omitted, and twelve private individuals are mentioned who were undoubtedly the *doctors of the law* (^{μννϋbm}; ^{<1607>}Nehemiah 8:7; 9:3). c. Of the forty-five *chiefs of the people* (^{γϕαρ} [h]) only half are known as heads of families, and the rest are again distinguished private individuals. Here the families of David and Joab (comp. ^{<1692>}Ezra 8:2, 9) are missing. d. Of the *representatives of the cities* there are only two mentioned — viz. Anathoth and Nebowhich plainly shows that others are omitted, since these

two places did not at all distinguish themselves to be thus singled out. Now, in looking at the peculiar position in which they are placed among the heads of the people in the register of the exiles, it will be seen that the family of Hariph (Joseh) stand first; then follow the names of thirteen cities (viz. Gibeon, Bethlehem, Netophah, Anathoth, Beth-azmaveth, Kirjath-jearim, Chephirah, Beeroth, Ramah; Gaba, Michmas, Beth-el, and Ai); Nebo concludes the catalogue of the cities, and the family of Magbish follows upon it (^{<15218>}Ezra 2:18-30; ^{<16724>}Nehemiah 7:24-33), which exactly corresponds with the order in the register of the Great Synagogue; Hariph begins, then come cities, i.e. Anathoth; Nebai comes last, and then again Magbish (^{<16109>}Nehemiah 10:19, 20). It has been supposed, therefore, that the above-named cities are to be inserted between Hariph and Anathoth. If we add to these fifteen cities the other five specified in the register (viz. Lod, Hadid, Ono, Jericho, and Tekoa — 7, 36, 37), which were represented by this synod, we have in all twenty cities. Under this view, eight divisions of the priests are wanting—the family of Bani is missing from the Levites, seven families of the heads of the people have disappeared and thirteen of the representatives of the cities have dropped out. Now, if we supply those which seem to have been dropped, and add them up with the private individuals mentioned in the register, we obtain the following representatives in the Great Synagogue: twenty-eight priests, consisting of the twenty-four divisions and the four private individuals; nineteen Levites, being the seven families and the twelve private persons; fifty Israelites, twenty-nine being chiefs of the people and twenty-one private persons—making in all ninety-seven, with Nehemiah ninety-eight, while the remaining twenty-two are the deputations of the cities. We may thus obtain the 120 members of the Great Synagogue mentioned by the unanimous voice of tradition. It will also be seen from the above that these 120 members represented five classes, viz.

1. *The chiefs of the priestly divisions* (ba tyb yçar);
2. *The chiefs of the Levitical families* (μϣϣϣ h yçar);
3. *The heads of the Israelite families* (μ[h yçar);
4. *Representatives of cities, or the elders.* (μϣϣϣ; πρεσβύτεροι);
5. *The doctors of the law* (μϣϣϣμ μϣϣϣϣ; γραμματεῖς), from all grades.

This number, however, if thus made up, was most probably restricted to the time of Nehemiah, as there can be no doubt that the assemblies which

were, afterwards held consisted of a smaller number, since, at the time when the Great Synagogue is held to have passed over into the Great Sanhedrim, the representatives consisted of seventy, which became the fixed rule for the Sanhedrim (q.v.).

IV. *The Work of the Great Synagogue.* — At its first organization under Nehemiah, if the above be its true origin, the representatives bound themselves by a most solemn oath ($h[wb\dot{c}bw\ hl\ ab]$) to carry out the following six decisions, which were deemed most essential for the stability of the newly reconstructed State:

1. Not to intermarry with heathens;
2. To keep the Sabbath holy;
3. To observe the sabbatical year;
4. Every one to pay annually a third of a shekel to the Temple;
5. To supply wood for the altar;
6. Regularly to pay the priestly dues (¹⁶¹⁰⁸Nehemiah 10:28-39).

The foundation for the reorganization and reconstruction- of the State and the Temple-service being thus laid at the first meeting of this synod, the obtaining of the necessary materials for the successful rearing-up of the superstructure and the completion of the edifice demanded that the synod should occasionally reassemble to devise and adopt such measures as should secure the accomplishment of the plan and the permanent maintenance of the sanctuary. To this end the members of the Great Synagogue are believed to have collected the canonical Scriptures. This was called forth by the effects of the first decision, which involved the expulsion of Manasseh, son of the high-priest Joiada, by Nehemiah and the synod for refusing compliance with that decision i.e. to be separated from his heathen wife, the daughter of Sanballat (13:23-29). In consequence of this his father-in-law, Sanballat, obtained permission to build an opposition temple on Mount Gerizim, in which Manasseh became high-priest, and whither he was followed by many of the Jews who sympathized with him. This proceeding, however, compelled them to deny the prophets, because their repeated declarations about the sanctity of Jerusalem did not favor the erection of a temple out of the ancient metropolis. To erect a wall of partition between the Jews and these apostates, and to show to the people which of the ancient prophetic books were sacred, the *Sopherim* and the men of the Great Synagogue compiled the canon of the prophets. As the early prophets and the great prophets i.e. Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel —

like the Pentateuch, were already regarded, as sacred, it only remained for the Great Synagogue to complete *the prophetic* canon by inserting into it the twelve minor prophets, which this synod accordingly did, as may be seen from *Baba Bathra*, 15; *Aboth di Rabbi Nathan*, c. 1; 2 Macc. 12:13. Although some of these authorities are no longer clear about the books inserted into the canon, yet they all testify to the fact that the members of the Great Synagogue were engaged in collecting the canonical books of the prophets. The Hagiographa were not as yet made up, as is evident from the fact that the younger Sirach did not even know the expression ⲙⲓⲃⲁⲗⲉⲕⲁ but used the general term τὰ ἅλλα to denote them (*Preface to Ecclus.*), and that in Alexandria additions were made to the book of Esther, and other books were inserted in what we now call the Hagiographa, as well as from the circumstance that the canonicity of some of the Hagiographa continued to be a point of difference between the schools of Shammai and Hillel, which could not have been the case if the canon of the Hagiographa had been definitely made up. They also compiled the ritual for private and public worship, *SEE SYNAGOGUE*; and, finally, they introduced schools for the study of the divine law (ⲃⲓⲧⲓⲃⲁ), and defined the precepts of Holy Writ. The whole of this is indicated in the epitome of the three grand maxims transmitted to us in the laconic style of the Mishna: "The prophets transmitted the divine law to the men of the Great Synagogue, who propounded the three maxims be cautious in judging, get many disciples, and make a hedge about the law" (*Aboth*, 1, 1). The other work of the men of the Greek synagogue which has come down to us in the name of the *Sopherim* is given in the article *SCRIBE* *SEE SCRIBE* .

V. Literature. — Wassermann, in Jost's *Israelitische Annalen* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1840), 2, 163 sq.; Sachs, in Frankel's *Zeitschrift für die religiösen Interessen des Judenthums* (Berlin, 1845), 2, 301 sq.; Krochmal, *More Neboche Ha-Seman* (Leopoli, 1851), p. 52 sq., 102 sq., 166 sq.; Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (Nordhausen, 1855-57), 1, 22 sq., 380 sq.; 2, 53, 244 sq., 264 sq.; Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums*, 1, 35 sq., 95 sq., 270 sq.; Low, *Ben Chananja* (Segedin, 1858), 1, 102 sq., 193 sq., 292 sq., 338 sq.; and especially the elaborate essay of Gratz, in Frankel's *Monatschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* (Leipsic, 1857), 6:31 sq., 61 sq.; also Furst, *Gesch. des Kanons*, p. 22, note. *SEE CANON SYNAGOGUE AND CHURCH*. The Jewish Church is, in the catacombs, represented as a woman of majestic presence in flowing robes; but in medieval examples, as on the doorway at

Rochester Cathedral, with her eyes bandaged, the tables of the law falling from one hand, and a broken staff in the other (^{<2456>}Jeremiah 5:16, 17). The Church is crowned and sceptred, and holds a church and a cross.

Synallaxis

in Greek mythology, was one of the Ionids, nymphs skilled in medicine, living on the Cytherus, a river of Elis.

Synapte

(*συναπτή*) is a Greek term for the Greek Collect in the Liturgy of St. Mark, resembling the *ectene* in that of St. James and of St. Chrysostom. It is used, also, to designate the Holy Communion.

Synaxarium

(*συναξάριον*) is a term for an abridged form of the Greek menology (record of months), an account of the festival being celebrated.

Synaxis

(*σύναξις*), an Eastern term signifying, respectively,

1. A collect or short prayer;
2. The holy eucharist, or the Christian sacrifice;
3. An assembly for worship; and,
4. The joint commemoration of saints.

Syncellus

(from *συγκέλλω*, *to join*) was an ancient officer attached to the patriarchs or prelates of the Oriental Church as witnesses to their conversation and conduct. Others acted as clerks and stewards. It eventually became a mere title of honor.

Syncellus, Georgius

a Byzantine author and an ecclesiastical dignitary of Constantinople, who lived at the close of the 8th and the beginning of the 9th century after Christ. He has left a *Chronography*, or chronological record of events, extending from the creation to the accession of the emperor Diocletian. He

began with Adam, and intended to bring down his compilation to his own time, but death anticipated the completion of his task.

I. Name. — He is called *Georgius Abbas* and *Georgius Monachus*, and has sometimes been erroneously identified with *Georgius Hamartolus*, whose works remain still, for the most part, unpublished. The designation of *Syncellus*, which has been given to the chronographer as a distinctive appellation, is no personal name, but a title of dignity. It is derived from his ecclesiastical office in the hierarchy of the metropolitan Church of the Eastern Empire. The syncellus was originally the companion, room-mate, occupant of the same cell with the *patriarch-cohabita for, cellaneus, concellaneus*. He was to be the constant witness of the purity of the patriarch's life and the propriety of his conduct and conversation, on the same principle as that which requires members of the Jesuit Order to be always accompanied by one of the fraternity. Sometimes one syncellus was appointed, sometimes two, and sometimes more. Frequently the designation was bestowed as an honorary and honorable title. At times the office was employed as a mode of placing spies around the patriarch. The popes of Rome had their syncelli down to the time of Gregory the Great, at least, as has been proved by Ducanige, who has discussed the subject with his usual exuberant learning (*Gloss. Med. et Infim. Latin. s.v.*). They were attached, also, to other prelates. The relation was naturally one of great intimacy and confidence, and consequently became one of influence and high distinction. Hence the syncellus seems frequently to have acted as coadjutor to the patriarch, and to have been for a long time regarded as in the legitimate line of succession to the patriarchate. The practice, however, of elevating the syncellus to the patriarchal throne on the death of the metropolitan appears to have never been habitual, and to have been abandoned before the end of the 9th century (*Zonaras, XVI, 13:25; Gretser et Goar, Comm. in Codin. p. 105*). The emperor Romanus Lecapenus made his youngest son, Theophylact, syncellus, evidently with a view to the succession to the highest place in the hierarchy (*Zonaras, XVI, 18*). The special functions of the office seem to have been gradually abandoned, but the name and dignity were still retained when Codinus prepared his *Court-roll of the Imperial Officials* (see *Goar, Praef. ad Syncellum, 2, 56*).

II. Life. — George the Chronographer was syncellus to the patriarch Tarasius, who died in 806. He may have been one of those imposed on that

eminent functionary by the emperor Nicephorus as a spy. We know nothing of him except from his name and his title, and from his commemoration by his friend and continuator Theophanes. The testimony of Theophanes amounts to very little. It is simply that George, the abbot and syncellus, was a distinguished and very learned man who faithfully and laboriously chronicled the events of the world from Adam, and diligently recorded their chronological succession; that life failed him when he had brought his chronicle down only to the accession of Diocletian; that on the approach of death, he requested and urged his friend Theophanes to complete his design, and that Theophanes reluctantly undertook and executed this commission. Of George the Chronographer nothing more is reported. After this brief apparition on the stage of history he vanishes into thick darkness, leaving his unfinished work behind him.

III. Works. — The only work of George Syncellus which we possess, or know to have been written by him, is his *Chronography*, or *Universal Chronicles*, which comes down, as has been said, to the reign of Diocletian. Had life and health been spared, he would probably, like his continuator, Theophanes, and like the general tribe of mediaeval chroniclers, have been fuller, more original, and more instructive in the treatment of contemporaneous events. These events were, in all likelihood, well known to him, from his social and official position, and from the diligent studies, which obtained for him the reputation of extraordinary knowledge (*πολυμαθέστατος*). As he died when he had proceeded no further than the accession of Diocletian, nothing can be expected from him but fidelity of compilation and discernment in the selection and use of authorities. Faithfulness and industry may be readily conceded to him. Discretion and sagacity are scarcely among his characteristics. He is exceedingly curt, harsh, dry, jejune, and often confused. His temperament, his vocation, and his times inclined him to credulity and superstition. He introduces his multitudinous extracts in a crude and undigested form, and accepts without hesitation whatever he finds in his texts. Yet his work has a very high value, and largely from this total absence of critical discrimination. It is the most extensive of the Greek chronicles that have come down to us, with the exception of the Sicilian, Alexandrine, or Paschal chronicle. The latter and the chronicle of Eusebius are the only two important chronological treatises that preceded lit which have been preserved. Eusebius was sadly mutilated and fragmentary, and was in part restored by the aid of Syncellus. Scaliger, the restorer of Eusebius,

contemplated the abandonment of his undertaking when he despaired of obtaining the assistance of Syncellus, which he deemed indispensable. The restoration was, indeed, impracticable without such aid, till the discovery of the complete work, in recent years, in an Armenian MS., which was published at Milan, in 1818, by Mai and Zohrab. The *Chronography* of Syncellus has thus rendered important service. It has other sources of interest. It is throughout a compilation, but a compilation which usually retains the *ipsissima verba* of the authors from whom it borrows, and which records its obligations. Thus have been preserved remnants, more or less extensive, of many writers who would otherwise have perished utterly. The citations from Eusebius have already been referred to. We owe, besides, to Syncellus nearly all that survives of Julius Africanus, most of the fragments of Manetho, and much of the little that is left of Berosus, who strangely illustrates the Book of Genesis, and corroborates the remarkable discoveries of the late George Smith. Among the shattered remnants imbedded in the chronicle of Syncellus like broken columns, ruined architraves, dismembered friezes, and mutilated statues in medieval walls and fortalices may be found passages from books of various kinds, including many from partially or wholly lost Apocrypha. There are extracts from the Life of Adam, the Book of Enoch, the History of Judith, Hermes, Zosimus the philosopher, etc. Some of these excerpts are very curious, and perpetuate the memory of remarkable superstitions and of quaint legends of the antique world, It would be misplaced labor to investigate here the chronological accuracy of Syncellus, or to comment upon his chronological statements. The service has been rendered laboriously, if not altogether satisfactorily, by the Dominican Goar, who added a *Canon Chronographicus* to the *editio princeps* of the work. The history of the MS used by Goar is curious. It was preserved in the library of the patriarch at Constantinople. It reappeared in the Royal Library of France. A notice, in Greek, appended to the MS states that it was purchased at Corinth, for four pieces of gold (χρυσισινοῦς), by John Abrami (or Abrams), in the month of November, 1507, or mundane year 7016 (of the sera of Constantinople). It was probably one of the many waifs from the Ottoman capture of Constantinople. For some time it was believed to have been lost from the Royal Library. It reached Scaliger's hands. It was, in time, restored to the royal repository, where it still remains, if it did not perish in the fires of the Commune. The supposed date of this MS is 1021. It is somewhat mutilated, and one leaf is lost; but it is the most complete MS. of this author. Dindorf regards as of much higher mark another Parisian

MS, which he also employed in his recension of the text for the Bonn series of the *Byzantine Historians*. This has lost many leaves in the middle, and, like Coleridge's *Christabel*, has neither beginning nor end.

IV. Literature — Georg. Syncelli *Chronographia*, Ed. J. Goar (Par. 1652). This edition is accompanied with copious emendations and annotations, with an instructive preface, and with a full chronographical canon. *Georg. Syncellus et Nicephorus C. P. ex recensione Guilelmi Dindorfii* (Bonnsae, 1829, 2, vols. 8vo). Dindorf republishes the *apparatus literarius* of Goar, and adds a reprint of Bedovii *Dissertatio de Georgii Syncelli Chronographia*. (G. F. H.)

Syncretism

(συγκρητισμός, *union*). This term is employed in Church history to designate the movement to promote union among the various evangelical parties of Germany in the 17th century. The word occurs in Plutarch (2, 490 B; ed. Reiske, 7:910) perhaps the only instance among the writers of antiquity—and is there illustrated by the idea that the Cretans, though frequently at war among themselves, were accustomed to unite their powers against the attacks of any foreign foe (καὶ τοῦτο ἦν ὁ καλούμενος ὑπ' αὐτῶν συγκρητισμός). Erasmus adopted the word into the *Adagia* (chil. 1, cent. 1, No. 11, p. 24), and defined it to signify the union of parties who have need of each other or who desire to make head against a common foe, though they may not be influenced to form such union because they are one at heart. Both the word and the idea came into common use soon afterwards. Zwingli, for example, in a letter to Caolampadius of the year 1525, recommends such a syncretism (*Opp.* ed. Schuler et Schulthess, 7:390); Bucer employs the term frequently in connection with his efforts towards union after the publication of the Augsburg Confession (*Opp.* 8:577), as does also Melancthon with reference to the same business (*Corp. Ref.* 2, 485 sq.; 1, 917; *Opp. Mel.* ed. Vitemb. 4:813). The apostate Staphylus (q.v.) charges the Reformers with being simply Babel-builders, and in setting forth his proofs represents the Lutherans as being *Syncretizantes* (*Calov. Syncret. Hist.* 1, 2). Zach. Ursinus (q.v.) also employs the term in an unfavorable sense (*Opp. Ursini* [Neustadt, 1589], 2, 305 on ²⁰⁰⁶ Isaiah 9:6). Syncretism is thus shown to have been a current term with all persons of humanistic culture in the 16th century, and to have been employed, according to circumstances, with a favorable or unfavorable meaning to designate an alliance of dissenting

parties in despite of all dissent. The twofold use of syncretism as a term of commendation or censure continued throughout the 17th century, but with a gradual predominance of the latter idea, arising from the increased importance which came to be attached to every variation of doctrinal beliefs. In 1603 the Romish theologian Windeck wrote against the Protestants a *Prognosticon Futuri Status Ecclesiae*, in which he advised the Romanists to cultivate greater harmony, in the words “Si saperent Catholici, et ipsis cara esset reipublicae Christianae salus, syncretismum colerent.” The Heidelberg theologian David Pareus (q.v.) responded in his *Irenicum, sive de Unione Evangel. Concilianda*, with an appeal to both wings of the Protestant Church for an alliance against their common foe; but Leonhard Hutter rejected the idea of such an alliance as preposterous (Ἐξέτασις Ἐλεγκτική, etc. [Wittenb. 1614]), and a Jesuit, Adam Contzen, followed in a polemic of eight hundred and sixty-one pages, entitled *De Pace Germaniae Libri II* (Mayence, 1616, 8vo), whose principal purpose was a demonstration of the impossibility of any union between the Lutheran and Reformed parties of the Protestant Church. The tendency, scarcely interrupted by the raging of the Thirty Years War, of Lutheran and Romanist zealots to magnify existing differences of opinion and intensify their influence drew forth the protest of Calixtus (q.v.). He stigmatized it as shameful, and urged the making of distinctions between doctrines of greater and inferior importance; and, while he wished the further development of doctrinal matters to be relegated to the schools he also urged that a practical sympathy and fellowship be cultivated between the churches. This brought on him a storm of obloquy. The Wittenberg faculty issued two opinions, warning against such “syncretismus diversarum religionum,” and deprecating the Sandomir Consensus (q.v.); and in the same year (1645) a Jesuit, Veit Erbermann wrote a work entitled Ἐιρηνικόν *Catholicum*, etc., that deserves notice as being the probable source of a new interpretation of the word syncretism, by which it came to denote, not, as aforetime, the practical association of religionists holding divergent views upon some questions, but an intermixing of the religions themselves. The new rendering of the word furnished the opponents of Calixtus with additional weapons, of which they were not slow to avail themselves. See Dannhauer, *Mysterium Syncretismi*, etc. (Strasb. 1648), where the idea of syncretism is made to include every form of hurtful association or intermixture, e.g. of Eve with the serpent, of the chemical or mechanical intermixture of heterogeneous elements in nature, etc. With Calovius (q.v.) begins emphatically the use of the term syncretism as

denoting an improper and unallowable approximation of Lutheran and Reformed Christians towards each other. This view underlies the phrase *Syncretistic Controversies* (q.v.) as used in ecclesiastical history. The more benevolent meaning was gradually laid aside, and even Calixtus was constrained to refuse his consent to the application of the term to his position. The perversion has retained its hold upon the popular usage until now, and, has doubtless contributed towards the unauthorized assumption of a derivation of syncretism from *συγκεράννυμι*. —Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Syncretistic Controversies

The title applies in ordinary practice to such disputes only as originated in connection with efforts made in the second half of the 17th century to promote union and fellowship between the Protestant churches of Germany. These disputes raged less between Reformed and Lutheran theologians than between the strict and the liberal wing of the Lutheran Church itself. The progress of controversy, moreover, generally resulted in the interweaving of extraneous and foreign matters with the direct question at issue; and in this way the syncretistic controversies became also disputes with reference to the degree of freedom to be allowed theological schools and theological science, the disputants being known as *Gnesiolutherani* and *Moderatiores*. The term *syncretism* (q.v.) is not broad enough to cover all these several disputes, but is in practice so employed by all parties. Everything prior to the transactions of the year 1645 must be regarded as preliminary to the syncretistic controversies proper. From that date we may distinguish three periods to the death of Calovius and the practical end of the dispute.

1. *From the Colloquy of Thorn to the Death of George Calixtus* (1645-56). — Calovius had succeeded in preventing the selection of Calixtus as the delegate of Dantzic to the Colloquy of Thorn; and when the latter was appointed to serve for Königsberg instead, Calovius caused him to be deprived of all opportunity to co-operate with the Lutheran delegates. Calixtus thereupon associated and counseled with the Reformed theologians, and thereby gave opportunity for his opponents to fasten on him the charge of an unwarrantable combining of diverse religions a charge persistently urged, though he publicly and in writing rejected the Reformed Confession of Thorn. The next measure was a union of all the Saxon theologians, led by Weller, the superintendent of Brunswick, in a censure

of the University of Helmstadt, which favored Calixtus, on the alleged ground that it had made innovations in doctrine and had departed from the generally received *Consensus Formula et Catechesis Rudiorum*. To this Calixtus responded with a denial under date of Feb. 26, 1647; but with no other result than that of increasing the eagerness with which every peculiarity in the teaching of Helmstadt was scanned for the discovery of error. In Prussia, the appointment of the Calixtines Chr. Dreier and Johann Latermann to the faculty of Königsberg excited similar disputes, which called forth numerous volumes in defense of either side; and Calovius, who had been superseded by Dreier, continued to fan the flame from a distance, even after Myslenta, its originator, had died (in 1653).

The increasing prominence of the electors palatine and Brandenburg was in this period regarded with anxiety by the electoral court of Saxony, and the representatives of the latter, in the Peace Congress of Westphalia, had standing instructions, accordingly, to prevent, if possible, the concession of rights to the Reformed churches equal to those enjoyed by the Lutheran; but the endeavor failed altogether. The class of Lutheran theologians 'which approved the action of the congress in this regard was accordingly not in favor in electoral Saxony; and as early as Jan. 21, 1648, the theologians of Wittenberg and Leipsic were commanded to investigate the errors of the Helmstadt theologians, and state them "article by article." In the following year the elector addressed to the dukes of Brunswick a paper in which he rehearsed all the objections of his theologians against Calixtus and Helmstadt, and requested that the latter, as disturbers of the Church and State, should be forbidden to write against the Saxon divines. In November, 1650, Calovius, the redoubtable defender of Lutheran orthodoxy, was called to the faculty of Wittenberg. An immense quantity of controversial writings preceded and followed this event. The dukes of Brunswick refused to accede to the request to silence their theologians, and caused a defense of their position to be written by Horneius, and a reply to the elector by Calixtus himself; and they also rejected the proposition to convene a diet of theologians, as tending rather to increase than diminish the troubles of the Church. They proposed instead a convention of "political councilors who love peace and are acquainted with affairs; but this was rejected by Saxony. On Jan. 9, 1654, twenty-four accredited representatives of evangelical powers united in a renewed proposition to submit the questions in dispute to a body of peacefully inclined theologians and statesmen for discussion; but the elector of

Saxony, acting under the advice of, his theologians, would not entertain the project. The Saxons now pursued the plan of dismissing the party of Helmstadt from the Lutheran Church more zealously than before, and in the course of their labors produced a work which was expected to serve as the confession of faith of all who would continue in the purified Church—the *Consensus Repetitus Fidei vere Lutherance*. To secure the largest possible number of supporters, a mass of writings in harmony with its teachings was issued; but it became speedily apparent that but few were ready to adopt the new confession, and this fact, coupled with the death of George Calixtus in the spring of 1656, caused a cessation of the strife.

Five years of almost total quiet ensued, interrupted only by slight agitations in Brandenburg, where the Lutheran preacher Samuel Pomarius (q.v.) was suspended for preaching against the Reformed and the syncretists. This period was followed, however, by *Renewed Conflicts* (1661-69). — The immediate occasion of strife was found in the measures taken by the landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, William VI, to secure a religious constitution for his land which should be sufficiently broad and generous to comprehend both Lutherans and Reformed under its operation. His endeavors culminated in a convention, which met at Cassel consisting of two members of the (Reformed) University of Marburg and two theologians belonging to the (Lutheran) faculty of Rinteln. A declaration was drawn up which recognized existing divergences of opinion between the parties, but at the same-time showed an agreement between them on all essential matters, and on the ground of such consent urged the exercise of brotherly love and the recognition of both parties as belonging to one Church, sharing in a common faith and looking towards a common heaven. The appearance of this declaration roused the Wittenbergers to action. They issued a circular asking the support of all good Lutherans against the Cassel colloquy, and induced the faculties of Jena and Leipsic to unite with them in admonishing the theologians of Rinteln concerning the lapse of which they had been guilty. A fusilade of papers in Latin and German, aimed at both the learned world and the public, was now kept up until after the death of William VI, in 1666, when the zeal of Rinteln became much cooler in consequence of benefits conferred, on the Reformed at the expense of the Lutheran party.

The renewal of the dispute in Hesse soon, reacted upon Brandenburg, whose duke was brother-in-law to the landgrave, and thoroughly in sympathy with his plans. The government issued a manifesto deprecating

the custom of discussing points of controversy in the pulpit and before mixed audiences, and soon afterwards (Aug. 21, 1663) a colloquy was summoned to Berlin for the purpose of “inaugurating a state of fraternal unity.” The Lutherans, however, proved unyielding, the poet Paul Gerhardt (q.v.) in particular being fixed in his opposition to any compromise, and the colloquy ended without result. Various orders now followed in quick succession, by which preachers were forbidden to apply opprobrious names to their opponents in the pulpit, and also to attribute to them doctrines inferred from their principles, but not avowed by them. The Lutherans refused to sign a pledge of obedience to these edicts, this being in their eyes tantamount to a formal abandonment of their position. The government eventually compelled them to yield, though many chose deposition from office and exile rather than submission.

A new phase of the dispute began in 1664 with the publication of a great collection of *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, which included a multitude of judgments against Calixtus and the syncretists, and also the *Consensus Repetitus Fidei vere Lutherance*. The exclusion of the syncretists was now less aimed at than the rallying of all strict Lutherans about the *Consensus* as a new confession of faith. The terms of the *Consensus*, however, implicitly condemned Calixtus and his adherents as non-Lutheran and heretical; and the new movement accordingly drew out the son of Calixtus, Frederick Ulric, who from this time made it the object of his life to resist the persistent attacks of Calovius on his father’s character and work. Both were extremists, and could not substantiate all the assertions they put forth; but the party of Calovius triumphed over Calixtus for a time through the efforts of a new combatant whom they had gained to their support—the youthful Strauch, professor of history and assessor in theology at Wittenberg. The University of Helmstadt, on the other hand, enlisted the services of Herman Conring (q.v.), a scholar and statesman of European fame, and he succeeded in so presenting to view the danger to the peace of the Church and to the liberty of teaching which grew out of the attempt to force the *Consensus* upon the Church as a confession of faith, that universities and princes were alarmed, and a period of quiet was secured, 1669.

3. Final Conflict. — Calovius reopened the war in 1675 with accustomed energy; and, although the temper of the time was changing, and disgust with the interminable quarrel began to be manifested, he was able, by 1679, to compel the entire University of Jena to disavow all sympathy with

syncretism. This, however, proved to be his last victory. His aged patron, the elector Johann Georg II of Saxony, died in the following year, and the new ruler was not so fond of controversy as the old one had been. In 1682 the *Historia-Syncr.*, which Calovius had made a storehouse of the details of his life-long contest, and published anonymously to evade the law forbidding such publications, was bought up and prevented from circulating among the people by the government. He died of apoplexy Feb. 21, 1686. No considerable features in connection with the syncretistic controversy appear after the death of Calovius. Lutherans and members of the Reformed Church in Germany neither desired nor sought fraternity with each other during more than another century. When the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes occurred, in 1685, only the Reformed population in Germany welcomed the fugitive Protestants from France. The end of the controversy—a peaceful separation between theology and religion, the regulation of the boundaries intervening between Church and school, between confession and science, between that which is and that which is not, obligatory upon all Christians was not attained. Calovius held pure doctrine to be the one thing needful, and regarded that as fixed and settled, so that every soul is required to simply accept it as the truth. Calixtus did not believe the acceptance of doctrine to be, upon the whole, the essential thing in Christianity, nor that all doctrine has equal importance; and he held that the points of belief which a Christian absolutely *must* receive are but few. He was thus able to overlook minor differences and desire fraternity among all Protestant Christians.

The literature of the controversy is vast. See especially Calovius, *Hist. Syncr.*; Walch, *Streitigkeiten d. luth. Kirche*, pt. 1 and 4; Tholuck, *Akad. Leben d. 17ten Jahrh.* (1854), pt. 2; id. *Lebenszeugen d. luth. Kirche* (Berl. 1859); id. *Kirchl. Leben d. 17ten Jahrh.* (ibid. 1861) Gass, *Gesch. d. prot. Dogmatik* (ibid. 1857), vol. 2; and the works mentioned s.v. “Calixtus, George.” — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*

Syncretists

(*συγκρητιστάι*, *unionists*), persons; who advocate a system of union and harmony which was attempted to be introduced into the Lutheran Church in the 17th century. It originated with Calixtus, professor of divinity at Helmstadt, who, in examining the doctrines professed by the different bodies of Christians, discovered that, notwithstanding there were many things to be reprobated, there was so much important truth held by them in

common that they ought to banish their animosities, and live together as disciples of one common Master. His object was to, heal the divisions and terminate the contests, which prevailed. Like most men of a pacific spirit, he became the butt of all parties. He was accused of Calvinism, Roman Catholicism, Arianism, Socinianism, Judaism, and even Atheism. His bitterest opponent was Buscher, a Hanoverian clergyman, who published a book against him entitled *Crypto-Papismus Novae Theologic Helmstadiensis*. The subject was taken up by the Conference held at Thorn in the year 1645, to which Calixtus had been sent by the elector of Brandenburg; and the whole force of the Saxon clergy was turned against him, as an apostate from the strict and pure principles of Lutheranism. This great man continued, however, with consummate ability, to defend his views and repel the attacks of his enemies till his death, in 1656. But this event did not put a stop to the controversy. It continued to rage with greater or less violence till near the close of the century, by which time most of those who took part in it had died. To such a length was the opposition to Calixtus at one time carried that, in a dramatic piece at Wittenberg, he was represented as a fiend with horns and claws. Those who sided with him were called *Calixtines* or *Syncretists*. **SEE SYNCRETISM.**

Syndics

(*σύνδικοι*), or DEFENSORES, were officers whose duty it was to watch over the rights of the poor and of the Church, to act as superintendents of the *Copiate* (q.v.), and to see that all clerks attended the celebration of morning and evening service in the church. See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 3, ch. 2.

Synecdemi

(*συνεκδημοι*, *fellow pilyriuss*), a name given by the Paulicians in the 9th century to their teachers, because they were all equal in rank, and were distinguished from laymen by no rights, prerogatives, or insignia.

Synedrians

(from *σύνεδρος*, *a sitting together*), a name given by the Novatians to orthodox Christians, because they charitably decreed in their synods to receive apostates and such as went to the Capitol to sacrifice into their communion again upon their sincere repentance.

Synergism

(*συνεργέω*, *to work-together*) is the doctrine that the human will co-operates with divine grace in the work of conversion, as it was advanced by Erasmus in his controversy with Luther, and afterwards represented by Melancthon and his school. Luther taught that sin had absolutely ruined man, making of his reason a ravenous beast and of his will a slave, so that it is impossible for him to contribute in any way towards his conversion; and in the first edition of his *Loci Communes* Melancthon's teaching is in entire harmony with Luther's view. Such a view necessarily resulted in the doctrine of predestination, and both Luther and Melancthon traced everything back to God as the first cause, the sin of Judas no less than the conversion of Paul. It was, however, an unnatural view for Melancthon to hold, and he receded from it into the dualistic idea that human liberty must be recognized as a factor in conversion by the side of the divine necessity. In the third edition of the *Loci* sin is derived from the will of the devil and of man, instead of that of God; not everything, consequently, is to be ascribed to the divine causality, and there is a realm of contingencies by the side of the realm of necessity which is founded on the freedom of the human will. A certain measure of volitional freedom to perform outward works of obedience to the divine law remains to man even after the Fall; but he cannot, without the aid of the Holy Spirit, quantitatively and qualitatively fulfill that law, and accordingly in every good action three causes work together (*συνεργοῦσι*) the Word of God, the Holy Spirit, and the human will, which does not resist the Word of God, and is at times described directly as *facultas sese applicandi ad gratiam*. The doctrine of predestination fell, of course, so soon as man came to be regarded as other than a volitionless statue. This synergistic theory of Melancthon's was admitted into the Leipsic Interim (q.v.) in the words "God does not operate on man as on a block, but draws him in such a way that his will co-operates." It was also advocated in a polemical address by Johann Pfeffinger, professor and pastor at Leipsic (1555), against whom Amsdorff (q.v.) contended, in 1558, that "it is presumptuous to hold that man could, in the exercise of his natural powers, prepare and fit himself to receive grace." Pfeffinger had said, however, that the Holy Spirit must first arouse the will, after which the latter is required to do its part in conversion. From this personal stage the question was lifted into the schools by Flacius (q.v.). He denied all participation of the will in the work of conversion, because it is dead to all good, wanting in all powers for good, and inclined to evil

constantly. Tod, therefore, is the sole agent in conversion, and man is not only passive, but also unwilling. To the defense of such postulates Flacius devoted two days in a disputation at Jena, which latter university now became the center of strict Lutheranism as against Wittenberg, where the spirit of Melancthon ruled. The next measure of this Lutheran champion was the publication of the *Weimar Book of Confutations*, which committed the duke of Saxony to the defense of orthodoxy, and served, at the same time, to refute all the errors of the time. It likewise occasioned the overthrow of Strigel (q.v.), who had been forced to aid in making a first draft of the book, but was unwilling to admit into it any of the improvements suggested by Flacius, and wrote against it in the form in which it was given to the world. He was seized and imprisoned on Easterday, 1559, but was soon afterwards liberated in deference to the censure with which public opinion everywhere visited that act of violence; and a colloquy was ordered to be held at Weimar in August, 1560, with a view to settling the dispute. On this occasion Flacius inconsiderately asserted that original sin is not an accident, but part of the substance of man, and obstinately refused to retract the statement. The favor of the court now began to wane, and in exactly the same degree did the Flacianist divines rage against all who refused to sustain their opinions. Punishment naturally followed, and reached its culmination in the dismissal from office of Flacius and his clique, Dec. 10, 1561. Strigel, on the other hand, was induced to draw up a *Declaration* of his views, and was thereupon reinstated, which event was followed by an explanatory *Super declaration* from the hand of superintendent Stossel, designed to conciliate the opposite party (*Cothurnus Stoesselii*, in Salig, 3, 891). Strigel, however, refused to accept the interpretation of his views given by Stossel, and took refuge from the machinations of false brethren in Leipsic. The Lutherans who rejected Stossel's compromise were banished, to the number of forty. The accession of John William to the throne of ducal Saxony (1567) restored the Flacianists, Flacius himself excepted, to power; a futile colloquy was held for the purpose of giving peace to the Church at Altenburg, Oct. 21, 1568; and the duke was eventually constrained to order the forming of the *Corpus Doctrinae Thuringicum* (Jena, 1571) with a view to the protection of assailed orthodoxy. The *Formula of Concord* gave the finishing stroke to the conflict, and settled it substantially in harmony with the Flacian view. See Salig, *Hist. d. Augsbg. Conf.* 1, 648; Walch, *Religionsstreitigkeiten innerhalb d. luth. Kirche*, 1, 60; 4:86; Planck, *Gesch. d. prot. Lehrbegriffs*, 4, 553; Schlüsselberg, *Catalogi*

Haeret. 5; Galle, *Melancthon*, p. 326; Thomasius, *Bekennniss d. luth. Kirche*, etc., p. 119; Dillinger, *Reformation*, 3, 437; Schmid, in *Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol.* 1849, p. 13; Preger, *Mf. Flacius Illyricus*, etc., 2, 104-227. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Synesius

bishop of Ptolemais, was first a pagan, then a Christian, and always a rhetorician. He lived at the close of the 4th and the beginning of the 5th century of our era. He was a late representative of the rhetorical declaimers of the Hellenic schools, and of the Neo-Platonic philosophers. He was also a pagan and a Christian poet, an elegant gentleman of leisure, and a bishop of the African Church. Contrasts were combined and reconciled in the man and in his career. He lived in an age of transitions; and he is, in his writings and in his fortunes, typical of the age in which he lived. The biography and the literary remains of Synesius are much more interesting and instructive for the light which they shed upon the social, intellectual, and religious condition of provincial life in the Roman empire during the first period of its manifest dissolution than for any influence exercised by him on the literature, the philosophy, the paganism, or the Christianity of his times, or on the sentiments, convictions, or character of subsequent generations. — He was designated by Casaubon “the sweetest of philosophers and the delight of the pious muses” (“suavissimus philosophus et piarum delictum musarum,” *Pref. Ep. Greg. Nyssen.*); yet few authors have excited so much admiration and been so seldom read. Few have been so often quoted by the few who were acquainted with him, and been so inaccessible for many generations, even to professed scholars. The attractions of Synesius are so special in their character that they address themselves to a very limited class of students. The period which he illustrates is so obscure, so disheartening, and so little considered, that only the frequenters of the by ways of history are likely to turn their regards to it. More than two centuries intervened between two editions of his works. After this long interval, three complete editions have been published within the last twenty years. One is only a Latin version, another is a French translation, and the third is no more than a reprint of the Greek text and Latin rendering from the edition of 1640, with some slight corrections. The writings of Synesius, in prose or verse, inspired by pagan or by Christian influences, are much less notable for literary charm, for vigorous thought, or for philosophical reflection than as a presentation of the feelings; the aspirations, the

struggles, the difficulties, the hazards, the gratifications, the annoyances, the occupations, and the associations of a cultivated country gentleman, *de provincia*, under the reign of Arcadius and Honorius, when all parts of the empire were falling to pieces. They, accordingly, interpret the times for us, and require to be interpreted by them.

I. *Character and Circumstances of the Age.* — The life of Synesius was cast in a stormy period; and the storms were not limited to his own province, but swept over the whole empire. It was the age of general dissolution, political, social, intellectual, and religious; an age of usurpations and civil discords; of crimes in the palace and treacheries in the State; of barbarian invasions; of permanent dismemberments; of strife between pagans and Christians; of controversies, heresies, and schisms in the Christian Church; of social depravation and decay; of universal disintegration, and of rapid material decline. The date of the birth of Synesius is undetermined. If he was born in 370, it occurred only seven years after the death of the pagan emperor and the failure of his attempt to restore paganism. When Synesius died, if he died in 431 Genseric and his Vandals had seized a large part of Africa; Britain, Gaul, and Spain had been cut off from the Roman dominion. During his lifetime usurper had sprung up after usurper; Asia Minor and Greece and Italy had been ravaged by the Goths; Constantinople had been threatened and Rome thrice captured by them, and Alaric had led his wild hosts from the Alps to Scylla and Charybdis. While Synesius was still a child in the cradle, Firmus had revolted in Egypt, and the insurrection had been revived after the lapse of a few years, to be crushed out in the Gildonic war. Strangely enough, to none of these portentous events is any distinct allusion made in the remains of this author, except to the Gothic insurrection in Phrygia. There is a possible reference to the Gildonic war (*Catastasis*, 2, 1). In the early oration delivered before the emperor Arcadius there is a clear exposition of the fearful perils from the Northern hordes impending over the empire (*De Regno*, c. 21-24). Was his mind so engrossed by literary labors, by philosophical speculations, and by troubles nearer home that the great calamities of the time occurred without attracting his attention? Or was his pen arrested by despair, even in his candid communications to his friends? Yet the invasions and the mutilations of the empire in the gloomy chasm between the birth and the death of Synesius were not the most grievous calamities of those years. Even more grievous was the social condition, which invited the invasions, and rendered resistance impracticable. There

was no cohesion or concert between the provinces; no devotion to emperor or empire; nothing but division, isolation, misery everywhere as a consequence, in part at least, of imperial rule and imperial administration. The organization of the government was impotent for defense, or for that vigorous attack which is often the best means of defense. It was ingeniously devised for inflicting needless and paralyzing restraint, and for extorting revenue from penury and wide-spread distress. Lands were left uncultivated and almost without inhabitants. Wide tracts relapsed into forest or marsh. The people were ground by taxes and the ruinous modes of collecting them. Movement and enterprise were prevented in order to facilitate fiscal arrangements. Bridges were broken down by time and neglect. Roads were left without repair, and became impassable. Communication was rendered difficult. Commerce, manufactures, and industry of all kinds were harassed and impeded in many ways. In numerous extensive regions banditti lurked in the woods, infested the highways, and ransacked villages. So great was the wretchedness which had driven these outcasts into nefarious courses that a presbyter nearly contemporary with Synesius undertook their exculpation. One book of the *Theodosian Code*, whose compilation falls within this age, is occupied with defining and enforcing the liabilities to municipal and other public burdens, and with regulating and restricting the exemptions from them, which were often arbitrarily and capriciously accorded. The hard struggle for bare life engrossed nearly all thoughts; and irregular, treacherous, and violent proceedings became familiar, while unrestrained license was common whenever opportunities of indulgence presented themselves. The general demoralization and the social disintegration were aggravated by divisions in the Christian Church, which weakened the authority of the new religion, and by the great contention between Christianity, often sadly corrupted, and the expiring paganism, which was cognizant of its disease, but not of its approaching dissolution. All the bonds of government, law, morals, and religion were fearfully enfeebled. Full and indisputable information in regard to these sorrowful generations is contained in the *De Civitate Dei* of Augustine and the *De Gubernatione Dei* of Saivian of Marseilles. Yet, despite all interruptions and apprehensions, philosophy and literature continued to be cultivated. Philosophy lost itself in NeoPlatonic fantasies and Oriental mysticism. Literature was, in large part, made up of pedantic epistles and rhetorical affectations. It was the era of Libanius, Themistius, and Symmachus. No severer censure of it need be sought than is contained in the productions of Synesius. It was, however, also the era of the great

Christian orators and fathers, who contended earnestly against vice in high places, oppression and wrong wherever they were found, and the manifold distresses of the people; Ambrose, Basil, Augustine, John Chrysostom, Jerome, and the two Gregories illustrated the Christian Church in that age, and attracted the admiration of pagans as well as of the followers of their own creed. To none of them does Synesius make any reference. These, then, were the varied, and in many respects alarming, aspects of the years which measured the career of Synesius, and by them its anomalies are rendered intelligible.

II. Life. — Synesius was probably born about the year 370. Some authorities say in 375. His birthplace was Cyrene, the capital of Cyrenaica, the tract which stretches along the African coast westward from Egypt. Cyrene was a Dorian colony of the mythical ages; and Synesius claimed for himself the most illustrious Laconian descent. In his denunciation of Andronicus, he contrasts the splendor of his own lineage with the mean extraction of the imperial governor. "I default of other merit," says he, "I descend from Eurysthenes from ancestors whose names, from Eurysthenes, who led the Dorians into Laconia, down to my father, are inscribed in the public registers" (*Epist.* 57; comp. *Catastasis*, 2, 5). This deduces his line from the royal house of Sparta, though he has blundered in his statement of the ancient legend. His family was opulent (*Epistl.* 133). He had a city house, and country estates in which he took unceasing delight. Nevertheless, he diligently sought exemption from civic and fiscal burdens. His love of letters and philosophy must have been manifested early, for his tastes were already decided and, much accomplishment attained when he proceeded to Alexandria (394) to attend the Neo-Platonic and other courses in that tumultuous city. Here he became acquainted with the beautiful, brilliant, and unfortunate Hypatia. He enrolled himself among her disciples. He secured her esteem and regard, and always retained the warmest admiration for her. Seven of his letters are addressed to her. On returning from Egypt, he went to Athens, to complete his education at that old center of learning and refinement, whence had issued, in the preceding generation, the emperor Julian and many of his distinguished contemporaries, pagan and Christian. He was utterly disenchanted by his visit, and made no long stay (*Epist.* 54, 135). After deserting Athens, he paid a second visit to Alexandria, as is shown by a graphic and humorous letter (*ibid.* 4), describing the hazards of shipwreck to which he was exposed on his return. (Druon, p. 587-589, discusses the calculations of

Petavius and Tillemont, and assigns this voyage to 397.) Soon after his return, he was sent by his fellow-citizens to Constantinople, to present their petitions and a golden crown to the young emperor Areadius (*De Regno*, c. 2). He was a youthful ambassador. He appears to have discharged his mission with ability, acceptance, and some degree of success. The emperor was still under tutelage. Everything was in confusion. The court was distracted by bitter rivalries. Alaric had recently ravaged Greece and threatened Athens. During his stay the insurrection of the Goths in Phrygia occurred. It was no wonder that he experienced frequent inattention and disheartening procrastinations, and that he was at times reduced almost to destitution and despair. He had the honor of delivering a public harangue before the emperor. He gained influential friends, established a reputation for literary talent, and acquired elegant correspondents, who would display and eulogize his epistles at Constantinople, while he would pay the same compliment to theirs at Cyrenie. One thing he accomplished for himself—immunity from public dues. An earthquake hastened and excused his departure from the capital of the Eastern-Empire. On reaching home he found his country desolated by barbarian war, an affliction's from which it had seldom been entirely free for five centuries. The nomads from the edges of the Libyan desert were making frightful irruptions, plundering, destroying, murdering, and meeting with little and only ineffectual resistance (*Epist.* 104, 113, 124). The governor and officials were more studious of pillaging than of repelling other pillagers. Synesius, calling to mind his Laconian descent and the example of Leonidas, and having apparently had some military training himself in his youth, roused his neighbors to action, and led them against the spoilers. This war with the nomads, which was renewed from time to time, is mentioned in many of his letters, and forms the subject of a special tract. These productions exhibit the weakness and wretchedness of the province — the neglect, imbecility, cowardice, and rapacity of the imperial authorities, and the disgust of Synesius at the conduct of both the people and the officials. After the war was over, or, rather, in the intervals of partial or local repose, he enjoyed an elegant and learned retreat in his country residences, finding occupation in study, literary production, and rural pursuits, and relaxation in hunting, many sports, and an active correspondence. Two years and more after the close of his embassy he revisited Alexandria. It was during this visit that he married. He received his wife from the hands of the patriarch; and to her and to his children he remained always tenderly attached. His marriage was his first visible contact with Christianity. It was, perhaps, decisive. It is no

violent presumption to suppose that his wife was Christian, as he received her from the Christian bishop of Alexandria (*Epist.* 105). “The unbelieving husband *may have been* sanctified by the believing wife;” or the wife may have been chosen with a prevenient disposition to believe. There is no evidence, no intimation of this. The *Dion* was written about this time. It is pagan. The treatise *On Dreams* was composed after his marriage. It is mystical and Neo-Platonic, and accords with Christianity as little as Cicero’s dialogue *De Divinatione*. After an abode at Alexandria of more than two years, and the birth of a son, he came back to Cyrene, which was shortly afterwards besieged by the barbarians. During the succeeding years he must have inclined more and more to Christianity, but without renouncing his philosophical dogmas. The date of his conversion cannot be ascertained. He must have been reputed a Christian, or “almost a Christian,” when elected bishop of Ptolemais (409,410). The episcopate was a very different function then from what it has been in serener and more settled periods. The bishop was the guide, the advocate, the protector, the support, and often the judge of the Christian flock. His civil attributes were of the utmost importance to the daily life of his [People. Character was of more immediate concern to them than doctrine. Synesius had gained and deserved the esteem and confidence of his countrymen. The metropolitan Church of Ptolemais demanded him for its bishop. He was unwilling to incur the solemn responsibilities of the position. He declined, he protested, he urged objections which might be deemed insuperable. He could not put away the wife to whom he was devoted; he was unwilling to forego the pleasures of the chase, the other recreations of the country, and the literary and philosophical ease, which had been the charm of his life. He had neither relish nor aptitude, he thought, for the multifarious and exacting business, which would devolve upon him. He could not surrender the NeoPlatonic convictions, which he had approved, expounded, and still believed; yet he recognized that they were at variance with Christian doctrine. In an elaborate letter to his brother he presents earnestly the grounds of his hesitation and reluctance. He begs him to lay his views before the patriarch Theophilus, whose decision he agrees to receive as the decree of God (*Epist.* 105). The patriarch must have recommended his acceptance of the sacred honor, notwithstanding his *Nolo episcopari*. He was consecrated at Alexandria by Theophilus. Seven months afterwards, being still in that city, he declared that “he would have preferred many deaths to the episcopate” (*Epist.* 95). Did he separate from his wife? Druon thinks that he did. It has been more frequently supposed that the separation

was not required of him. Did he yield his convictions in regard to the pre-existence of souls, the non-resurrection of the body, and the incompatibility of Christian doctrine with revealed truth? M. Druon again confidently concludes that he did. Other inquirers, ancient and modern, believe, with more probability, that he continued to entertain them, for some time at least, after his elevation. He may have acted on the convenient principle of Sesevola and Varro, which he avowed in the letter to his brother, that many things in religion are allegorical, which it is expedient to inculcate upon the vulgar, who are unable to receive truth in its purity. At any rate, he discharged with energy, resolution, integrity, and skill the administrative and other external offices of the episcopate. He boldly assailed the tyranny and rapacity of the governor of the province, and succeeded in relieving the provincials of his rule. His denunciation of Andronicus survives. Another incident of his episcopal aptitudes is preserved. He effected an amicable and satisfactory settlement between two of his suffragans for the possession of a dismantled fortress on the border of their respective dioceses. There was ample occasion for the display of his sagacity and fortitude. The ravages of the nomads were renewed. The Ausurians besieged Ptolemais. The resistance of the inhabitants was sustained by the courage of their bishop, who continued zealous in seeking protection for the province, and has transmitted to our days the record of its woes. How much longer he guided his diocese we do not know. The date usually assigned for his death (430, 431) is founded on a dubious conjecture. In this date M. Druon does not concur. He considers a letter to Hypatia, written from a sick-bed, and ascribed to 413, to be his latest epistolary or other production (Epist. 16) (Druon, p. 551); and believes that he escaped, by an earlier death, the affliction of knowing the tragic fate of "his teacher, mother, sister, friend." It would be strange, had he known it, that no mention of her murder occurs in letter or other treatise. A fantastic legend, two centuries after his death, attributed to him a miracle for the proof of the resurrection. The greatest of all miracles, in his case, was that, being, or having been, a Neo-Platonist, he became a bishop of the Christian Church without the full renunciation of his views; that, being a provincial of an African province, he acquired eminence in diplomacy, in philosophy, and in poetry; that, living amid the turbulences, vices, and meannesses of the 5th century, he maintained the reputation of an innocent, sincere, and gallant man.

III. Works. —The works of Synesius, usually brief for the *Dion* is one of the longest — are numerous and varied. They are of great interest. We may concede to Synesius grace of expression; we may admit the exuberance of his fancy and the propriety of his reflections; we may enjoy the freshness and simplicity of many of his letters, and the unalloyed purity of his sentiments; tout these merits may easily be exaggerated, and do not constitute his chief claim to enduring consideration. It is the striking portraiture of the manifold phases of an unhappy period, when civilization was sinking under a mortal agony that gives a value to his remains far transcending their literary and philosophical excellences. These excellences were, indeed, counterbalanced by very grave defects. The style of Synesius is too often characterized by affectations, strained fancies, and a conscious craving for display. His philosophy is without, originality. Yet even his philosophy merits attention, as illustrating the fine gradations by which pagan speculation melted into the semblance of Christianity without divesting itself of its pagan phrase and spirit.

The works of Synesius which survive (for his juvenile poem, the *Cynegetica*, or, *On Hunting*, has been lost) are, an *Address to Paeonius*, with the *Gift of an Astrolabe*, invented or improved by himself, in which he encouraged his friend to prosecute the study of astronomy an *Oration on Government*, delivered at Constantinople before the emperor Arcadius; it is somewhat commonplace, but is remarkable for the boldness and freedom of its utterance and for its sound sense. *Dion*, which is so called in honor of Dion Chrysostom, his exemplar in style and habit of thought. This treats of the training of a philosopher, or, rather, of what had been the aim and the result of his own education in philosophy. It is, in some sort, a semi-pagan anticipation of the *Religio Medici* of Sir Thomas Browne. The treatise is at times transcendental, but abounds in high fancies and generous aspirations. The *Encomium on Baldness* is a rhetorical extravaganza, a counterpart and reply to Dion Chrysostom's *Eulogy of Hair*. The speculation *On Dreams* is simply a specimen of superstition and Neo-Platonic mysticism. It was honored or loaded with a commentary by Nicephorus Gregoras. The *Catastasis*, or *Catastases* for the production consists of two distinct parts—is chiefly a mournful recitation of the miseries of Cyrenaica, induced by chronic misgovernment and oppression, and by the reiterated invasions of the nomads. It is, perhaps, the strongest testimony to the weakness, impoverishment, and disorganization of the provinces of the empire that he ascribes the calamities which he specially deplores to only one thousand

Ausurians, and says that they were defeated and scattered by forty imperial troopers, Unnigardae. The second *Catastasis* is a eulogy of Anysius, the leader of these Unnigardae, and the military chief of the province. These *Catastases* resemble the overwrought declamations of the professional rhetoricians. In the same strain, also, is the declamation *Against Andronicus*. A fable, entitled *The Egyptian, or On Providence*, is a regret for the deposition and a laud for the restoration of his friend and correspondent Aurelian, the praetorian praefect. A couple of brief *Homilies* are entitled to no special notice.

The most important and the most interesting of the remains of Synesius are his *Letters*, 157 or 159 in number, according as the *Denunciation of Andronicus* is excluded from or is included in the series of *Epistles*, and ten *Hymns*. The letters are of diverse style, and on the most dissimilar occasions. Some are formal letters of civility; others are written to be paraded by his correspondents among their acquaintances. These are strained, rhapsodical, and ostentatious, and are more notable for literary filigree than for their contents. Other Letters are friendly communications or earnest expositions. They are simple, fresh, natural, earnest, and modern in their cast. His correspondence with his brother is direct and affectionate, and is rendered attractive by the revelation of his disposition, feelings, and circumstances. The family and serious letters make a favorable contrast to the redundant epistolography of Libanius and Symmachus, and afford in an equal degree pleasure and instruction.

There is much variance of opinion in regard to both the character and the dates of the *Hymns* of Synesius. Druon has endeavored to fix their chronology, but hardly secures confidence in his conclusions. The first two were, almost certainly, the earliest. They are thoroughly Neo-Platonic, and probably pagan. The rest may be Christian, with a diminishing Neo-Platonic complexion. The only one entirely free from this philosophical characteristic is the short one numbered the tenth. Druon assigns seven of the hymns to the years preceding his conversion. This conclusion is not apt to win assent. The third hymn is Neo-Platonic, but it is as Christian as the ninth. The later Neo-Platonism apes so closely and so habitually the language and sentiments of Christianity, and the Christianity of Alexandria is often so deeply imbued with Neo-Platonism, that exact discrimination between pagan and Christian utterances is not always possible. The convictions of men were then in a transition stage in everything, and paganism and Christianity frequently lapsed into each other. There is a

passage in the third hymn (ver. 210-230), which may be simply Neo-Platonic, but it bears a striking resemblance, in thought and expression, to parts of the Athanasian Creed. As the conversion of Synesius cannot be fixed to any certain date, and as he avowed his inability to renounce his philosophic opinions when chosen bishop, all the hymns may have been composed under Christian influences, and all but the last may retain Neo-Platonic tendencies, without being thereby rendered pagan. But these questions cannot be discussed here. The hymns of Synesius exhibit no eminent poetic merit. Their attraction lies in their philosophy, in their ease of expression and facility of versification. It was a strange adaptation of Anacreontic meter to fit it to philosophical and theological songs. Yet it may well be asked what meaning should be attached to the claim of Synesius, in the opening of the seventh hymn, to have been the first to tune his lyre in honor of Jesus.

IV. Literature. — *Synesii Opern*, ed. Turnebi (ed. princep., Paris, 1553, fol.); *id.* ed. Morell. (ibid. 1612, fol.; corr. et aucta, 1640, 1653); *id.* apud *Cursum Patrologiae*, etc., ed. Mignie (Latin, ibid. 1859, 8vo; Greek and Latin, ibid. 1864, 8vo); Druon, (*Euvres de Synesius, trad. en Francais* (ibid. 1878, 8vo); *Synesii Hymni*, ed. Boissonade, apud *Poet. Gr. Sylloge* (ibid. 1824-32);

Synesii Hymni Metrici, ed. Flack (Tub. 1875); *Synesii Epistolae*, ed. Herscher, apud *Epistologr. Gr.* (Paris, 1873); Chladni, *Theologumena Synesii* (Wittenb. 1713, 4to); Boysen, *Philosophunzena Synesii* (Halle, 1714, 4to); Clausen, *De Synesio Philosopho* (Hafin. 1831); Krauss, *Obs. Crit. in Synesii Cyren. Epistolas* (Ratisbon, 1863); Ellies Dupin, *Nouveau Bibliotheque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques*; Tillemont, *Histoire Ecclesiastique*, 12:499-544; Ceillier, *Hist. des Auteurs Sacres*, 10:14, 961-517; Villemain, *L'Eloquence Chretienne au J Ve Siecle* (Paris). (G. F. H.)

Synge, Edward

an Irish prelate, was born at Inishonane, April 6, 1659, and was the second son of Edward, bishop of Cork. He was educated at the grammar-school at Cork, and at Christ Church, Oxford, finishing his studies in the University of Dublin. His first preferment was to two small parishes in the diocesis of Meath, which he exchanged for the vicarage of Christ Church, Cork, where he served for over twenty years. In 1699 he was offered the deanery of Derry, but declined it for his mother's sake. He was chosen proctor for the

chapter in the Convocation of 1703, and soon after was presented with the crown's title to the deanery of St. Patrick's, Dublin. The title being thought defective, the chancellorship was presented to Mr. Synge, which gave him the care of St. Werburgill's, Dublin. In 1713 he was chosen proctor for the chapter of St. Patrick's, and on Dr. Sterne's promotion to the see of Dromore, the archbishop of Dublin appointed Dr. Synge his vicargeneral, in which office he continued until he was appointed bishop of Raphoe, in 1714. He was made archbishop of Tuam in 1716, over which see he presided until his death, July 21, 1741. He published many sermons and religious tracts, of which a collective edition, under the title of *Works* (Lond. 1740, 4 vols. 12mo; 1744, 1759), was issued. The best-known of his works is *The Gentleman's Religion*. His *Treatise on the Holy Communion* was published at Philadelphia in 1849, 32mo. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Synisactse

(*συνείσακται*), a Greek term for priests *concubines*. *SEE SUBINTRODUCTAE.*

Synistameni

(*συνιστάμενοι*, *standing together*), a name given in the Eastern Church to the fourth order of penitents, called in the Latin Church *consistentes*. They were so called from their having liberty (after the other penitents were dismissed) to stand with the faithful at the altar, and join in the common prayers and see the oblation offered. Still they could not yet make their own oblations, nor partake of the eucharist. See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 18 ch. 2.

Synnada, Council of

(*Conilium Synnadense*), was held about 230, or, according to some, in 256, upon the subject of Cataphrygian baptism. Baptism received out of the Church was declared to be null and void. See Mansi, *Concil.* 1, 760.

Synod

(from *σύνδοδος*, *a gathering*), a meeting or assembly of ecclesiastical persons to consult on matters of religion. (See the monographs cited in Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 165.) Of these there are four kinds, viz. —

1. General, where bishops, etc., meet from all nations. These were first called by the emperors; afterwards by Christian princes; till, in later ages, the pope usurped to himself the greatest share in this business, and by his legates presided in them when called. See AECUMENICAL.
2. National, where those of one nation only come together to determine any point of doctrine or discipline. The first of this sort, which we read of, in England, was that of Herudford, or Hertford, in 673; and the last was held by cardinal Pole in 1-555. *SEE COUNCIL.*
3. Provincial, where those only of one province meet, now called the *convocation* (q.v.).
4. Diocesan, where those of but one diocese meet to enforce canons made by general councils or national and provincial synods, and to consult and agree upon rules of discipline for themselves. These were not wholly laid aside till, by the act of submission (25 Hen. VIII, art. 19), it was made unlawful for any synod to meet but by royal authority. *SEE SYNODS.*

Synod is also used to signify a Presbyterian Church court, composed of ministers and elders from the different presbyteries within its bounds, and is only subordinate to the General Assembly (q.v.).

Synod, Associate,

the highest ecclesiastical court among the united Presbyterian Dissenters in Scotland, the powers of which are, in a great measure, analogous to those of the General Assembly in the established kirk. *SEE SCOTLAND, CHURCHES IN.*

Synod, Holy,

the highest court of the Russo-Greek Church, established by the czar Peter in 1723, and meeting now at St. Petersburg. Each diocese sends in a half-yearly report of its churches and schools. The members composing it are two metropolitans and as many bishops, with procurators, attorneys, and other 4ay officials. *SEE RUSSIAN CHURCH.*

Synod, Holy Governing,

is the highest court of the Greek Church, established in Greece after the recovery of its independence. It met first at Syra in 1833, and in 1844 was recognized by the constitution, which also enacted that the king should be

a member of the established Church. The members of synod were at first appointed by the king, but: are now chosen by the clergy, the bishop of Attica being perpetual president. In 1850 it was formally recognized by the patriarch of Constantinople, through the mediation of Russia, but on the condition that it should always receive the holy oil from the mother Church. *SEE GREEK CHURCH.*

Synod, Reformed.

SEE COVENANTERS; SEE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES.

Synod, Relief.

SEE SCOTLAND, CHURCHES IN.

Syniodales Testes

were persons anciently summoned out of every parish in order to appear at the episcopal synods, and there attest or make preferment. of the disorders of the clergy and people. In aftertimes they were a kind of empanelled jury, consisting of two, three, or more persons in every parish, who were, upon oath, to present all heretics and other irregular persons. These, in process of time, became standing officers in several places, especially in great cities, and hence were called SYDESMEN *SEE SYDESMEN* (q.v.). They were also called *Questmen*, from the nature of their office in making inquiry concerning offenses. But this latter duty devolved mostly upon the church-wardens.

Synodals

was a term applied to (1) provincial constitutions or canons read after the synods in parish churches; (2) to procurations, so called because the bishop held his synod and visitation together; (3) to the payments made a bishop by his clergy in virtue of his holding a synod. *SEE SYNODATICUM* *SEE SEE SYNODATICUM* .

Synodat'cum

or CATHEDRATICUM, is the annual tribute paid by incumbents of benefices in the Church of Rome to the bishop of the diocese, in token of subjection to the episcopal *cathedra*. It is generally paid at the time of the convening of the diocesan synod. The earliest direct mention of this impost

occurs in the transactions of the second Synod of Braga, A.D. 572 (sess. 2, can. 2, in c. 1, cans. 10:qu. 3), where various extortions on the part of Spanish bishops are forbidden, and they are permitted only in connection with the visitations of their districts “honorem cathedrae suae id est duos solidos per ecclesias tollere.” The same synod forbids the payment of an impost by candidates for ordination, which is also termed *cathedraticum*, but must not be confounded with the *synodaticum*, The seventh Council of Toledo, A.D. 646 confirmed the action of Braga; and Charles the Bald, in 844, directed the payment of two solidi, or an equivalent in kind (Pertz, *Monum. Germanice*, 3, 378), and devolved this collection for the bishops on the archpresbyters. Pope Alexander III conceded to bishops who should obtain a church from the hands of the laity the right to impose on it the *cathedraticum* (c. 9, X, *De Censibus*, 3, 39); and both Innocent III (c. 20, X, *De Censibus*) and Honorius III (c. 16, X, *De Officio Judicis Ordinarii*, 1, 31) expressed themselves in favor of its being rendered. Other references may be found in Du Fresne, s.v. “Cathedraticum” and “Synodus;” Benedict XIV, *De Synod. Dimcessana*, lib. 5, c. 6:1 and 2; Richter, *Kirchenrecht* (5th ed.), § 233, note 4, etc.; Gudenus, *Cod. Diplom.* 1, No. 93, p. 260. The Council of Trent discontinued the payment of many heavy impositions connected with visitations (sess. 24:can. 3, *De Reform.*); but various declarations of the *Congregatio pro Interpret. Conc. Trident* have left the *cathedraticum* in force (see Ferraris, *Bibl. Canon*, s.v. “Cathedraticum;” Thomassin, *Vet. ac Nov. Eccl. Discipl.* II, 2, 32, 34; Benedict XIV, *ut sup.* 6 and 7; *Declarationes* 18-26 in the edition of Trent by Richter and Schulte, *loc. cit.*). This impost is termed *cathedraticum* “in honorem cathedrae,” and *synodaticum* as being collected during the session of synod; but it has in practice been paid at other times as well and is exacted even where no synod is held, unless a custom recognized in law forbids (Benedict XIV, *ut sup. etc.*). A tax expressive of subordination is required in any case, amounting generally to two solidi. It must be paid by all churches and benefices and their incumbents, and also by seminaries with which benefices are incorporated, and lay unions having a church of their own. Regulars are exempt with reference to convents and convent churches in which they personally minister. The Order of St. John of Jerusalem is likewise exempt. In practice, however, it has not always been possible to collect these taxes. Austria ceased to pay them under imperial rescripts of 1783 and 1802, and in many other districts of Germany they were quietly discontinued. Their validity was decreed in Bavaria, on the

other hand, so late as 1841 (see Permaneder, *Handb. d. Kirchenrechts*, 3rd ed., p. 319, note). —Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Synodicae

(*συνδικαί*) were letters written by a new bishop informing other bishops of his promotion, and to testify his desire to hold communion with them. A neglect to write such letters was interpreted as a refusal to hold such communion and a virtual charge of heresy upon his fellows. Circular letters summoning the bishops to a provincial synod were also called *Synodicae*.

Synoditee

(from *σύνδοξ*, *a community*) were monks who lived in communities or convents, differing in this respect from the *Anchorets*.

Synods

form a noticeable feature in the history of the general Church. Particular synods have served to indicate particular stages in the progress or retrogression of the life of the Church, as respects the development of knowledge and teaching, the formation of the worship and the constitution of the Church itself; and all synods serve, more clearly than other institutions, to reveal the ruling spirit, the measure of strength, or the type of disease, in any given period. The breadth of the field covered by this title will appear from the fact that Mansi's (q.v.) collection of the acts, etc., of councils, extending only into the 15th century, embraces 31 volumes folio.

With respect to the origin of synods opinions differ. Some authors hold them to have been divinely instituted through the agency of the apostles (Acts 15 especially ver. 28, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us"), while others concede to them a merely accidental rise. The council in Acts 15 must certainly be considered a synod, though it does not appear that it was designed to introduce a permanent institution. On the other hand, the situation of the Church and the progress of events furnished the providential conditions by which ecclesiastical assemblies became necessary, so that- the theory of a merely human origin for them cannot be accepted. The history of our subject, excluding the period since the Reformation, admits of being divided into five periods.

I. *The Beginnings of the Institution of Synods as Furnished by Provincial Synods* (to A.D. 325). — The earliest of such synods of which mention is

made are one alleged to have been held in Sicily in A.D. 125 against the gnostic Heracleon (q.v.), and one at Rome under bishop Telesphorus (d. 139); but there is not the slightest evidence that either of them was held. The earliest of which we have authentic information were held in Asia Minor against the Montanists (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 5, 16), probably not before A.D. 150. Soon afterwards various synods were held to discuss the celebration of Easter (*ibid.* 5, 23) and other questions; so that Tertullian speaks (*De Jejuniis*, c. 13) of the convening of such bodies as a custom among the Greeks, and thereby at the same time implies that such assemblies were not known in his own (African) Church.

Such conferences promoted Christian unity and laid the foundation for a government of the churches by superior authority. By the middle of the 3rd century synods were regularly held in each year, and were attended by bishops and elders, so that they had already become a fixed and periodically recurring institution, in which the different churches shared in the persons of their appropriate representatives (see Firmilian's letter to Cyprian, *Epp.* No. 75). The earliest synods in the West were held in Africa about A.D. 215, and soon such assemblies became frequent. The next stage in the development of synods appears in the extension of their jurisdiction over larger areas than a single district or province, by which the inauguration of ecumenical councils was prepared for. At Iconium in 256, representatives were present from Galatia, Cilicia, etc. Every part of Spain was represented at Elvira; and the Synod of Aries, in 314, was attended by bishops from Gaul, Britain, Germany, Spain, North Africa, and Italy.

II. A.D. 325 to 869. —The ecumenical synods of the Greek Church, beginning with that of Nicaea (q.v.) and closing with the fourth Council of Constantinople (q.v.).

III. A.D. 869 to 1311. —Councils of the Western Church under the direction of the papacy, including a great number of provincial and national synods whose proceedings indicated both the utmost devotion and the most decided opposition to the rule of the popes—ending with the general Council of Vienne in Gaul (q.v. severally).

IV. A.D. 1311 to 1517. —Councils ostensibly aiming to secure reform “in head and members” Pisa, Constance, and Basle (q.v. severally).

V. A.D. 1517 to' 1563. —The Reformation and the reactionary Synod of Trent (q.v.).

For an enumeration and characterization of the more important synods see the article COUNCILS *SEE COUNCILS*, to which we also refer for a list of sources. —Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.

Synodus

(**σύνδοξ**), a term applied in the early Church to the building (church) in which the synod was held. It was simply transferred from the assembly to denote the place of assembly, as was done with the word *ecclesia*.

Synthronus

(**σύνθρονον**), a Greek term to signify the seats of a bishop and his clergy in the bema of an Oriental Church.

Syn'tyche

(**Συντύχη**, *with Fate*), a female member of the Church of Philippi; mentioned (^{ROM}Philippians 4:2, 3) along with another named Euodias (or rather Euodia). A.D. 57. To what has been said under the latter head the following may be added: The apostle's injunction to these two women is that they should live in harmony with each other, from which we infer that they had, more or less, failed in this respect. Such harmony was doubly important if they held office as deaconesses in the Church, and it is highly probable that this was the case. They had afforded to Paul active co-operation under difficult circumstances (**ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ συνήθλησάν μοι**, ver. 3), and perhaps there were at Philippi other women of the same class (**αἴτινες**, *ibid.*). At all events, this passage is an illustration of what the Gospel did for women, and women for the Gospel, in the apos-' tolic times; and it is the more interesting as having reference to that Church which was the first founded by Paul in Europe, and the first member of which was Lydia. Some thoughts on this subject will be found in Rilliet, *Comm. sur l'Épître aux Philipp.* p. 311-314.

Synusiastme

(**συνουσιασταί**) were those who held that the incarnation of our Lord was effected by a blending or commixture of the Divine substance with the substance of the human flesh. The name is taken from the statement of the

doctrine **συνουσίωσιν γεγενῆσθαι καὶ κρᾶσιν τῆς θεότητος** (Theod. *Her. Fab.* 4:9). Theodoret calls this sect *Polemians*, one of the Apollinarist sects; and Apollinaris himself, in the latter part of his life, added to his distinguishing heresy regarding the soul of our Lord either this heresy or one closely akin to it. At the Lateran Council in A.D. 649 were quoted two extracts from Polemon's works, from which it appears that the Synusiastue retained the heresy regarding the soul of our Lord, denying him a human will, and asserting that he was to himself a rational soul. They seem to have been led to the adoption of the heresy in this manner. At the outbreak of the controversies regarding the incarnation, some asserted the conversion of the substance of the Godhead into the substance of flesh, others that the Divine nature supplied in Christ the place of the human soul. The attempt to hold these two tenets together resulted in a denial of an **ἐνανθρώπησις** altogether. To avoid this denial, it was allowed that the flesh of man was assumed, but so blended with the Divine substance as to eliminate that tendency to sin which it was alleged could not but be resident in human nature. Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodotus of Antioch wrote against this heresy. See Cave, *Hist. Lit.*; Blunt, *Dict. of Sects*, etc., s.v.

Syr'acuse

Picture for Syracuse 1

(**Συρακοῦσαι**; Lat. *Syracusce*), a celebrated city on the eastern coast of Sicily, whither Paul arrived in an Alexandrian ship from Melita, on his voyage to Rome (~~40812~~ Acts 28:12). It had a fine prospect from every entrance both by sea and land. Its port, which had the 'sea on both sides of it, was almost all of it environed with beautiful buildings, and all that part of it which was without the city was on both sides banked up and sustained with very fair walls of marble. The city itself, while in its splendor, was the largest and richest that the Greeks possessed in any part of the world. For (according to Strabo) it was twenty-two miles in circumference, and both Plutarch and Livy inform us that the spoil of it was equal to that of Carthage. It was the oldest of the Greek colonies, being founded by Corinthians, and in a manner consisted of our cities united into one; or, as others express it, it was called quadruplex, as being divided into four parts, Acradina, Tyche, Neapolis, and the island of Ortygia. The first of these contained the famous Temple of Jupiter, the second the Temple of Fortune, the third a large amphitheatre, and a wonderful statue of Apollo in the midst of a spacious square, and the fourth the two temples of Diana and

Minerva, and the renowned fountain of Arethusa. For about two hundred and fifty years the city made little noise in the world; but in the next two hundred and eighty it became conspicuous in war, in sea trade, and in wealth, under its kings Gelon, Dionysius, elder and younger, Dion, Agathocles, and Hiero.

About B.C. 210 this city was taken and sacked by Marcellus, the Roman general, and, in storming the place, Archimedes, the great mathematician, who is esteemed the first inventor of the sphere (and who, during the siege, had sorely galled the Romans with astonishing military engines of his own invention), was slain by a common soldier while intent upon his studies. After it was thus destroyed by Marcellus, Augustus rebuilt that part of it which stood upon the island, and in time it so far recovered as to have three walls, three castles, and a marble gate, and to be able to send out twelve thousand horse soldiers and four hundred. ships. In A.D. 675 the Saracens seized on it, but in 1090 it was taken from them by Roger, duke of Apulia. It yet exists under its original name (Ital. *Siracusa*),. and is still much frequented on account of its commodious harbor. Paul stayed here three days as he went prisoner to Rome (^{<427>}Acts 27:12); here also Christianity was early planted, and still, at least in name, continues; but the city has lost its ancient splendor, though it is a bishop's see.

The magnificence which Cicero describes as still remaining in his time was no doubt greatly impaired when Paul visited it. The whole of the resources of Sicily had been exhausted in the civil wars of Caesar and Pompey, and the piratical warfare which Sextus Pompeius, the youngest son of the latter, subsequently carried on against the triumvir Octavius. Augustus restored Syracuse, as also Catania and Centoripa, which last had contributed much to the successful issue of his struggle with Sextus Pompeius. Yet the island Ortygia and a very small portion of the mainland adjoining sufficed for the new colonists and the remnant of the former population. But the site of Syracuse rendered it a convenient place for the African corn ships to touch at, for the harbor was an excellent one, and the fountain Arethusa in the island furnished an unfailing supply of excellent water. The prevalent wind in this part of the Mediterranean is the W.N.W. This would carry the vessels from the corn region lying eastward of Cape Bon, round the southern point of Sicily, Cape Pachynus, to the eastern shore of the island. Creeping up under the shelter of this, they would lie either in the harbor of Messina or at Rhegium, until the wind changed to a southern point and enabled them to fetch the Campanian harbor Puteoli or Gaeta, or to

proceed as far as Ostia. In crossing from Africa to Sicily, if the wind was excessive, or varied two or three points to the northward, they would naturally bear up for Malta; and this had probably been the case with the “Twins,” the ship in which Paul found a passage after his shipwreck on the coast of that island. Arrived in Malta, they watched for the opportunity of a wind to take them westward, and with such a one they readily made Syracuse. To proceed farther while it continued blowing would have exposed them to the dangers of a lee-shore, and accordingly they remained “three days.” They then, the wind having probably shifted into a westerly quarter so as to give them smooth water, coasted the shore and made (περιελθόντες κατηνήσαμεν εἰς) Rhegium. After one day there, the wind got round still more and blew from the south; they therefore weighed, and arrived at Puteoli in the course of the second day of the run (~~481~~ Acts 28:12-14).

Picture for Syracuse 2

In the time of Paul’s voyage, Sicily did not supply the Romans with corn to the extent it had done in the time of king Hiero, and in a less degree as late as the time of Cicero. It is an error, however, to suppose that the soil was exhausted; for Strabo expressly says that for *corn* and some other productions, Sicily even surpassed Italy. But the country had become depopulated by the long series of wars, and when it passed into the hands of Rome, her great nobles turned vast tracts into pasture. In the time of Augustus the whole of the center of the island was occupied in this manner, and among its exports (except from the neighborhood of the volcanic region, where excellent wine was produced), fat stock, hides, and wool appear to have been the prominent articles. These grazing and horse-breeding farms were kept up by slave labor; and this was the reason that the whole island was in a chronic state of disturbance, owing to the slaves continually running away and forming bands of brigands. Sometimes these became so formidable as to require the aid of regular military operations to put them down; a circumstance of which Tiberius Gracchus made use as an argument in favor of his measure of an Agrarian law (Appian, *B. C.* 1, 9), which would have reconverted the spacious grasslands into small arable farms cultivated by Roman freemen. In the time of Paul there were only five Roman colonies in Sicily, of which Syracuse was one. The others were Catana, Tauromenium, Thermae, and Tyndaris. Messana too, although not a colony, was a town filled with a Roman population. Probably its

inhabitants were merchants connected with the wine-trade of the neighborhood, of which Messana was the shipping port. Syracuse and Panormus were important as strategical points, and a Roman force was kept up at each. Sicilians, Sicanians, Morgetians, and Iberians (aboriginal inhabitants of the island, or very early settlers), still existed in the interior, in what exact political condition it is impossible to say; but most likely in that of villains. Some few towns are mentioned by Pliny as having the Latins franchise, and some as paying a fixed tribute; but, with the exception of the five colonies, the owners of the soil of the island were mainly great absentee proprietors, and almost all its produce came to Rome (Strabo, 6:2; Appian, *B. C.* 4:84 sq.; 5, 15-118; Cicero, *Verr.* 4:53; Pliny, *H. rN.* 3, 8). For a full account of ancient Syracuse, see Smith's *Dict. of Geog.* s.v., and the literature there cited; also Goller, *De Situ et Or. qine Syracusarum* (Lips. 1818); for the modern city, Badeker, *Southern Italy*, p. 308 sq. **SEE SICILY.**

Syr'ia

Picture for Syria 1

a province and kingdom of Western Asia, the name, extent, and boundaries of which have been subjects of no little difficulty to both sacred and classical geographers. As including Palestine, it is of intense interest in Bible geography.

I. Name. —

1. The word *Syria* does not occur in Hebrew; but in the A. V. it is the usual, though not the uniform, rendering of the word *Aram* (אַרַם). Thus in ^{<0102>}Genesis 10:22, *Aram*, the youngest son of Shem, is mentioned as the founder of the Aramsean nation, from whom the whole country colonized by his descendants took its name. The country is therefore rightly calledu “Aram” in ^{<0217>}Numbers 23:7; but the very same Hebrew word is rendered *Mesopotamia* in ^{<0230>}Judges 3:10, and *Syria* in 10:6.

Aram was a wide region. It extended from the Mediterranean to the Tigris, and from Canaan to Mount Taurus. It was subdivided into five principalities:

1. *Aram-Dammesek* (called in the A.V. “Syria of Damascus”);
2. *Aram-Maachah*;

3. *Aram-Beth-Recaob*;
4. *Aram-Zobah*; and
5. *Aram-Naharaim* (Mesopotamia in the A. V.).

These have already been described. *SEE ARAM*. When the kingdom of Damascus attained to great power under the warlike line of Hadad, it was called by way of distinction *Anram*, which unfortunately is rendered "Syria" in the A. V. (^{<1085>}2 Samuel 8:5, 12; ^{<1109>}1 Kings 10:29; 15:18; 2 Kings 5, 1; 24:2, etc.). This lax method of translation was borrowed from the Sept. and Vulg. versions. The Targums retain *Aram*; and it would tend much to geographical accuracy and distinctness were the Hebrew proper names uniformly retained in the A.V.

The region comprehended by the Hebrews under the name Aram was not identical with that which the Greek writers and the authors of the iNew Test. included under Syria. It embraced all Mesopotamia and Assyria, while it excluded Phoenicia and the whole territory colonized by the Canaanites. *SEE CANAAN*.

In the New Test. the name Syria (*Συρία*) is not employed with great definiteness. In fact, it is doubtful if ever the Greek geographers were agreed as to the exact boundaries of the country so called. Matthew, after mentioning the mighty works and wondrous teachings of our Lord in Galilee, says: "His fame went throughout all Syria," alluding apparently to the country adjoining Galilee on the north (^{<1004>}Matthew 4:24). Luke applies the name to the Roman province of which Cyrenius was governor, and which did not include Palestine (^{<1012>}Matthew 2:2). In the same restricted sense the word is used in ^{<4152>}Acts 15:23. The apostles in Jerusalem wrote ^{<4004>}unto the brethren of the Gentiles in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia;" and afterwards it is said that Paul, setting out from Antioch, "went through Syria and Cilicia" (ver. 41; comp. ^{<1021>}Galatians 1:21). A wider signification seems to be attached to the name in other passages. It is said of Paul, when going to Jerusalem, "that he sailed thence (from Greece) into Syria" giving this general name to Palestine as well as the country north of it (^{<4188>}Acts 18:18; 20:3). In one passage taken from the Sept. the name is employed as an equivalent of the Hebrew *Aram* (^{<1027>}Luke 4:27; comp. 2 Kings 5. 20).

2. The origin of the word is not quite certain. Some make it a contraction or corruption of *Assyria* (Scylax, *Peripl.* p. 80; Dionys. *Perieg.* 970-975;

Eustath. *Comment.* ad loc., etc.). Herodotus says, “The people whom the Greeks call *Syrians* are called *Assyrians* by the barbarians” (7, 63); and these names were frequently confounded by the later Greek writers (Xenoph. *Cyrr.* 6:2, 19; 8:3, 24); and apparently also by some of the Latins (Pliny, *H. N.* 5, 13). A much more probable etymology is that which derives *Syria* from *Tsur* (רשׁ), the Hebrew name of the ancient city of “Tyre. The distinction between Syria and Assyria is very great in Hebrew. The Greek form of the name derived from *Tsur* would be *Tsuria*; but as this could not be expressed by Greek letters, it was softened down to **Συρία**, *Assyria* is in Hebrew רשׁוואי and in Greek **Ἀσσυρία**, and sometimes **Ἀτουρία**. “A still greater distinction between the names is found in the Assyrian inscriptions, where Assyria is called *As-sur*, while the Tyrians are the *Tsur-ra-ya*, the characters used being entirely different” (Rawlinson, *Herod.* 1, 63, note). Tyre was the most important city along the Mediterranean coast. With it and its enterprising merchants the Greeks soon became familiar; and they gave to the country around it the general name *Syria* — that is, “region of Tyre.”

It is interesting to observe that the connection between Syria and Aram is noticed by Strabo when commenting on a stanza of Pindar: “Others understand *Syrians* by the *Arimi*, who are now called *Aramcei*” (13, 626, and 16:785); and again, “Those whom we call *Syrians* (**Σύρους**) are by the *Syrians* themselves called *Armenians* and *Arammaeans*” (**Ἀραμμαίους**, 2, 34).

The name *Syria* was thus of foreign origin. It was never adopted or acknowledged by the people themselves; nor was it ever employed by native authors except when writing in Greek for Greeks. At the present day it is unknown in the country. It has been seen that in ancient times the name *Aram* was specially applied to Damascus and its kingdom. There is something analogous to this in modern usage. *Esh-Sham* is the name now commonly given to both city and country, though in more correct language the former is styled *Dimishk esh-Sham*.

II. *Extent and Boundaries.* —

1. Ancient geographers do not agree as to the extent of Syria. Herodotus makes it reach to the Black Sea on the north (1, 6); to Paphlagonia and the Mediterranean on the west (1, 72; 2, 12, 116); to Egypt on the south (2, 158, 159); and to Media and Persia on the east (7, 63). He confounded

Syria and Assyria, and hence arose the error into which he fell regarding the extent of the former. The same view is taken by Xenophon (*Anab.* 1, 4,11-19). Even Strabo states in one place that “the name Syria seems to extend from Babylonia as far as the bay of Issus, and anciently from this bay to the Euxine. Both tribes of the Cappadocians—those near the Taurus, and those near the Pontus are called to this day Leuco-Syrians.” It is clear, however, from a subsequent sentence, that he in this place fell into the error of Herodotus; for he thus remarks, “When the historians of the Syrian empire say that the Medes were conquered by the Persians, and the Syrians by the Medes, they mean no other Syrians than those who built the royal palaces of Babylon and Nineveh; and Ninus who built Nineveh in Aturia was one of these Syrians” (16, 737). It is evident that for Syrians the name *Assyrians* should here be substituted. The great similarity of the names, no doubt, tended to create this confusion.

When writing directly of the country of Syria, Strabo is more accurate. He describes its extent, boundaries, and divisions with great minuteness. “Syria is bounded on the north by Cilicia [comp. ⁴⁴¹⁵²³Acts 15:23] and Mount Amanus; on the east by the Euphrates and the Arabian Scenitee, who live on this side [west] of the Euphrates; on the south by Arabia Felix and Egypt; on the west by the Egyptian and Syrian seas, as far as Issus” (16, 749). Pliny gives substantially the same boundaries. He says, however, that some geographers divide the country into four provinces: Idumaea, Judaea, Phoenicia, and Syria (*H. N.* 5, 13; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 10:6, 1).

Ptolemy confines Syria within the same limits on the north, west, and east; but he marks its southern boundary by a line running from Dor, at the base of Carmel, by Scythopolis and Philadelphia, to Alsadamus Mons (Jebel Hauran). He thus includes Phoenicia, Galilee, and a portion of Persea, but excludes Judaea and Idumaea (5, 15).

2. In this article the name Syria is confined to what appears to be its more strict New Test. signification. Its boundaries may be given as follows: Palestine on the south; the Mediterranean on the west; Cilicia and Mount Amanus on the north; and the Euphrates and desert of Palmyra on the east. Its length, from the mouth of the Litany on the south to the bay of Iskanderun on the north, is 250 miles, and its breadth averages about 130 miles. Its area may thus be estimated at 32,500 square miles. It lies between lat. 33° 13' and 36° 42' N., and long. 35° 45' and 38° E.

3. *Physical Geography.* — Syria, like Palestine, is divided into a series of belts, extending in parallel lines from north to south.

(1.) A narrow belted plain along the seaboard. It embraces the plains of Issus, now Iskanderun, on the north, extending as far as the bold promontory of Ras el-Khanztr. South of the promontory is the fertile plain of Seleucia, now Suweidlyeh, at the mouth of the Orontes. Then follows the peak of Casius, which dips into the sea; and from its southern base down to the mouth of the Litany stretches the plain of Phoenicia, varying in breadth from ten miles at Ladiklyeh to half a mile at Sidon. It is nearly all fertile; and some portions of it at Sidon, Beirut, and Tripoli are among the richest and most beautiful in Syria.

(2.) A belt of mountains, the backbone of the country. It commences with the ridge of Amanus on the north; then follows Bargylus in the center, and Lebanon on the south.

(3.) The great valley of Caele-Syria, and its northern extension the valley of the Orontes, form the next belt, and constitute one of the most remarkable features of the country.

(4.) The mountain chain of Antilebanon, though broken by the plain of Hamath, finds a natural prolongation in the ridge which rises in the parallel 'of the city of Hamath and runs northward beyond Aleppo.

(5.) Along the whole eastern border from north to south extends an arid plateau, bleak and desolate, the home of the roving Bedawin.

1. *Plains.* — The plains of Phoenicia have already been noticed under that head.

By far the most important part of Syria, and, on the whole, its most striking feature, is the great valley which reaches from the plain of Umk, near Antioch, to the narrow gorge on which the Litany enters in about lat. $33^{\circ} 30'$. This valley, which runs nearly parallel with the Syrian coast, extends the length of 230 miles, and has a width varying from 6 or 8 to 15 or 20 miles. The more southern portion of it was known to the ancients as Coele-Syria, or "the Hollow Syria," and has already been described. *SEE COELE-SYRIA*. In length this portion is rather more than 100 miles, terminating with a screen of hills a little south of Hums, at which point the north-eastern direction of the valley also ceases, and it begins to bend to the north-west.

The plain of Hamath is very extensive. It joins Coele-Syria on the south, and extends northward on both sides of the Orontes as far as Apamea, about seventy miles; while its breadth from the base of Lebanon to the desert is nearly thirty. Its surface is almost perfectly flat, its soil generally a rich black mould; water is abundant. Upon it once stood the large cities of Riblab, Laodicea ad Libanum, Emesa, Arethusa, Larissa, Hamath, and Apamea; all of which, with the exception of Hamath and Emesa (now Hums), are either in ruins or have dwindled down to poor villages.

The plain of Damascus and its continuation towards Haurn on the south are exceedingly fertile. *SEE DAMASCUS.*

The little plain of Issus between the mountains and the bay is now a pestilential marsh, on the borders of which stands the miserable village of Iskanderun, the only seaport of Antioch and Aleppo.

The plain of Suweidlyeh, at the mouth of the Orontes, is still a lovely spot, in part covered with orchards and mulberry plantations. On its northern border lie the ruins of Seleucia, the port from which Paul embarked on his first missionary journey (^{411D}Acts 13:2-4), and once so celebrated for its docks and fortifications (Polybius, bk. 5).

2. *Mountains.* —

(1.) The parallel ranges of Lebanon and Antilebanon have already been noticed under their own titles. At the southern end of the former is the pass called in Scripture “the entrance of Hamath” (q.v.).

(2.) Beyond this, in a line with Lebanon, rises the range of Bargylus, which extends to Antioch. It is a rugged limestone ridge, rent and torn by wild ravines, thinly peopled, and sparsely covered with oaks. Its elevation is much inferior to Lebanon, and does not average more than 4000 feet.’ In the parallel of Antioch the chain meets the Orontes, and there sweeps round in a sharp angle to the south-west, and terminates in the lofty peak of Casius (now Jebel Akra), which rises abruptly from the sea to a height of 5700 feet, forming one of the most conspicuous landmarks along the coast of Syria. The Bargylus range has received the name Jebel en-Nusairlyeh, from the mysterious and warlike tribe of Nusairlyeh, who form the great bulk of its inhabitants.

At the northern extremity of the range, on the green bank of the rapid Orontes, stand the crumbling walls and towers of Syria’s ancient capital,

Antioch (q.v.), now dwindled down to a poor town of some 6000 inhabitants. A few miles west of it, in a secluded mountain glen, are the fountains and ruins of Beit el-Ma, which mark the site of the once celebrated Daphne (Murray, *Handbook for Syr. and Pal.* p. 602)

(3.) Beyond the valley through which the Orontes breaks narrow and wild, rises steeply another mountain range, which runs northward till it joins the Taurus, and has an average elevation of nearly 6000 feet. The scenery of this range is very grand—deep ravines shut in by cliffs of naked rock, conical peaks clothed with the dark foliage of the prickly oak, and foaming torrents fringed with dense copses of myrtle and oleander. On the west it sends out the lofty promontory of Ras el-Khanzir, which shuts in the plain of Suweidiyeh; and farther north the curve of the bay of Iskanderun sweeps so close to the rocky base of the range as to leave a pass only a few feet broad between the cliff and the sea. Here are the ruins of an ancient arch marking the site of the celebrated Syrian Gates; to the north of it is the battle-field of Issus. The southern section of this range was anciently called Pieria, and gave its distinguishing name to the city (*Seleucia Pieria*) at its base; the northern section as called Amanus. The whole ridge is now usually called Jawar Dagh, though the southern portion is perhaps more commonly known as Ras el-Khanzir.

(4.) On the eastern bank of the Orontes, near the ruins of Apamea, rises another but much lower range of hills, which runs northward, not in a regularly formed ridge, but rather in detached clumps, to the parallel of Aleppo. The hills are mainly calcareous, well wooded in places, and intersected at intervals by fertile plains and vales. They are interesting to the traveler and antiquarian as containing some of the most remarkable ruins in Syria (Murray, *Handbook*, p. 615 sq.). The southern section is called Jebel Riha, the central Jebel el-Ala, and the northern Jebel Siman, from its having been the home of St. Simeon Stylites.

3. *The Northern Highlands.* — Northern Syria, especially the district called Commagene, between Taurus and the Euphrates, is still very insufficiently explored. It seems to be altogether an elevated tract, consisting of twisted spurs from Taurus and Amanus, with narrow valleys between them, which open out into bare and sterile plains. The valleys themselves are not very fertile. They are watered by small streams, producing often abundant fish, and, for the most part, flowing into the Orontes or the Euphrates. A certain number of the more central ones, however, unite and constitute the river of

Aleppo," which, unable to reach either of the oceanic streams, forms (as we have seen) a lake or marsh, wherein its waters evaporate. Along the course of the Euphrates there are rich land and abundant vegetation; but the character of the country thence to the valley of the Orontes is bare and woodless, except in the vicinity of the towns, where, fruit-trees are cultivated, and orchards and gardens make an agreeable appearance. Most of this region is a mere sheep-walk, which grows more and more harsh and repulsive as we approach the south, where it gradually mingles with the desert. The highest elevation of the plateau between the two rivers is 1500 feet; and this height is reached soon after leaving the Euphrates, while towards the west the decline is gradual..

4. *The Eastern Desert.* — East of the inner mountain chain, and south of the cultivable ground about Aleppo, is the great Syrian, desert, an "elevated dry upland, for the most part of gypsum and marls, producing nothing but a few spare bushes of wormwood, and the usual aromatic plants of the wilderness," Here and there bare and stony ridges of no great height cross this arid region, but fail to draw water from the sky, and have, consequently, no streams flowing from them. A few wells supply the nomad population with a brackish fluid. The region is traversed with difficulty, and has never been accurately surveyed. The most remarkable oasis is at Palmyra, where there are several small streams and abundant palm-trees. *SEE TADMOR.* Towards the more western part of the region along the foot of the mountain-range which there bounds it, is likewise a good deal of tolerably fertile country, watered by the streams which flow eastward from the range, and after a longer or a shorter course are lost in the desert. The best-known and the most productive of these tracts, which seem stolen from the desert, is the famous plain of Damascus—the el-Ghuitah and el-Merj of the Arabs already described in the account given of that city. *SEE DAMASCUS.* No rival to this "earthly paradise" is to be found along the rest of the chain, since no other stream flows down from it at all comparable to the Barada; but wherever the eastern side of the chain has been visited, a certain amount of cultivable territory has been found at its foot; corn is grown in places, and olive-trees are abundant (Burckhardt, *Travels in Syria*, p. 124-129; Pococke, *Description of the East*, 2, 146). Farther from the hills, all is bare and repulsive; a dry, hard, desert-like, that of the Sinaitic peninsulua, with a soil of marl and gravel, only rarely diversified with sand.

5. *Rivers.* —

(1.) The Orontes is the largest river in Syria. It is now called el-'Asy ("The Rebellious"), and also el-Makllb ("The Inverted"), from the fact of its running, as is thought, in a wrong direction. Its highest source: is in the plain of Buka'a (Caele-Syria), at the base of Antilebanon, beside the ruins of the ancient city of Lybo. It runs north-west across the plain to the foot of Lebanon, where its volume is more than trebled by the great fountain of Ain el-Asy. Hence it winds along the plain of Hamath, passing Riblah, Hums, Hamath, and Apamea. At Antioch it sweeps round to the west through a magnificent pass, and falls into the Mediterranean at Seleucia. Its scenery is in general tame and uninteresting. Its volume above Hamath is less than that of the Jordan, but lower down it receives several tributaries which greatly increase it. Its total length is about 154 miles.

(2.) The Litany is the next river in magnitude. Its principal sources are in the valley of Buka'a, at Baalbek, Zahleh, and Anjar (the ancient Chalcis). After winding down the Buka'a to its southern end, it, forces its way through a: sublime glen, which completely intersects Lebanon, and falls into the sea a few miles north of Tyre.

(4.) The rivers Eleutherus, Lycus and Adonis have been noticed in the article LEBANON, and the Abana and Pharpar under DAMASCUS.

(5.) A small stream called Nahr Koweik rises near the village of Aintab, flows southward through a narrow glen to Aleppo, waters the town and its gardens, and empties itself in winter into a marsh some twenty miles farther south. It seems to be the Chalus of Xenophon (*Anab.* 1, 4, 9).

(6.) The Sajur rises a little farther to the north, in the mountains north of Aintab. Its course for the first twenty-five miles is south-east, after which it runs east for fifteen or twenty miles, finally resuming its first direction, and flowing by the town of Sajur into the Euphrates. It is a larger river than the Koweik, though its course is scarcely so long.

6. *Lakes.* — There are only two lakes of any importance in Syria.

(1.) One lies some miles north of Antinch, and is called Bahr el-Abiad, "White Lake." It is about twenty-five miles in circuit, but has a broad margin of marsh, which is flooded after heavy rains.

(2.) The other lake is on the Orontes, west of Hums, and is called Bahr Kades. It is about six miles long by from two to three broad, and is in a great measure, if not entirely, artificial. It is formed by a dam built across

the valley. The water is thus raised to an elevation sufficient to supply the town and irrigate the surrounding plain (Porter, *Damascus*, 2, 344).

(3.) The Sabakhah is a salt lake, into which only insignificant streams flow, and which has no outlet. It lies midway between Balls and Aleppo, the route between these places passing along its northern shore. It is longer than the Lake of Antioch, but narrower, being about thirteen miles from east to west, and four miles only from north to south, even where it is widest.

(4.) The Bahr el-Merj, like the piece of water in which the Koweik, or river-of Aleppo, ends, scarcely deserves to be called a lake, since it is little better than a large marsh. The length, according to colonel Chesney, is nine miles, and the breadth two miles (*Euphrat. Exp.* 1, 503); but the size seems to vary with the sea sops, and with the extent to which irrigation is used along the course of the Barada. A recent traveler, who traced the Barada to its termination, found it divide a few miles below Damascus, and observed that each branch terminated in a marsh of its own; while a neighboring stream, the Awaj, commonly regarded as a tributary of the Barada, also lost itself in a third marsh separate from the other two (Porter, in *Geograph. Journ.* 26:43-46).

7. Cities. — The principal cities and towns of Syria are the following: Damascus, pop. 150,000; Aleppo, pop. 70,000; Beirut, pop. 80,000; Hamath, pop. 30,000; Hums, pop., 20,000; Tripoli, pop. 13,000; Antioch, Sidon, and Ladiklyeh. Besides these, which occupy ancient sites, there were in former times Palmyra, in the eastern desert; Abila, on the river Abana; Chalcis, Heliopolis, and Lybo, in the valley of Caele-Syria; Laodicea ad Libanum, Arethusa, and Apamea, in the valley of the Orontes; Seleucia, Aradus, and Byblos, *SEE GEBAL*, on the seacoast, and many others of less importance.

IV. Political Geography. — Syria has passed through many changes. Its ancient divisions were numerous, and constantly varying. The provinces of the Biblical Aram have already been noticed. *SEE ARAM*. Phoenicia was generally regarded as a distinct principality, *SEE PHOENICIA*, and the warlike tribes of Lebanon appear to have remained almost in a state of independence from the earliest ages. *SEE LEBANON*. The political divisions, as enumerated by Greek and Roman geographers, are indefinite and almost unintelligible. Strabo mentions five great provinces:

1. *Commagene*, a small territory in the extreme north, with Samosata: for capital, situated on the Euphrates.
2. *Seleucia*, lying south of the former, was subdivided into four districts according to the number of its chief cities:

- (1) Antioch Epidaphne;
- (2) Seleucia, in Pieria;
- (3) Apamea; and
- (4) Laodicea.

In the district of Antioch was another subdivision, situated near the Euphrates, and called Cyrrestice, from the town Cyrrestis, which contained a celebrated temple of Diana. Southward were two subdivisions (apparently) of Apamea, called Parapotamia and Chalcidice, bordering on the Euphrates, and inhabited by Scenitme. The territory of Laodicea extended south to the river Eleutherus, where it bordered on Phoenicia and Coele-Syria.

3. *Cale-Syria*, comprising Laodicea ad Libanum, Chalcis, Abilelie, Damascis, Itursea, and others-farther south, included in Palestine.

4. *Phoenicia*.

5. *Itursea* (*Geogr.* 16:748, sq.).

Pliny's divisions are still more numerous than those of Strabo. It appears that each city on rising to importance gave its name to a surrounding territory, larger or smaller, and this in time assumed the rank of a province (Pliny, *If. Nouv*, 14-21).

Ptolemy mentions thirteen provinces: Commagene, Pieria, Cyrrestica, Seleucis, Casiotis, Chalibonitis, Chalcis, Apamene, Laodicene, Phoenicia, Coele-Syria, Palmyrene, and Batanea, and he gives a long list of the cities contained in them. He excludes Palestine altogether (*Geogr.* 5, 15).

Under the Romans Syria became a province of the empire. Some portions of it were permitted to remain for a time under the rule of petty princes, dependent on the imperial government. Gradually, however, all these were incorporated, and Antioch was the capital. Under Hadrian the province was divided into two parts: *Syria Malor* on the north, and *Syria-Phanice* on the south. Towards the close of the 4th century another partition of Syria was made, and formed the basis of its ecclesiastical government: 1.

Syria Prima, with Antioch as capital; 2. *S. Secunda*, with Apamea as capital; 3. *Phoenicia Prina*, including the greater part of ancient Phoenicia-Tyre was its capital; 4. *Phenicia Secunada*, also called *Phoenicia ad Libanum*, with Damascus for capital (“Cara St. Paul,” *Geog. Sac.* p. 287).

At the present time Syria forms a portion of three pashalics-Aleppo, Damascus, and Sidon.

V. *Climate, Inhabitants, etc.* —

1. The temperature of Syria greatly resembles that of Palestine. The summits of Hermon and Lebanon are crowned with perpetual snow, and the high altitudes along these ranges are as cool as the south of England; but, on the other hand, the low marshy plains of the interior are very hot. The seaboard, being much exposed to the sun’s rays, and sheltered by the mountains behind, is generally sultry and subject to fevers; but there are a few places such as Sidon, Beirut, and Suweidveh — where the soil is dry and the air pure. Rain is more abundant than in Palestine, and even during summer light showers occasionally fall in the mountains.

2. The present population of Syria is estimated at 1,880,000. Arabic is their vernacular. They consist of Mohammedans, Yezidees, Druses, Romanists, Jews, and Greek Christians. The Mohammedans, who probably comprise three fourths of the whole, are seldom associated with the progress of arts or industry, and, though possessing the influence, which belongs to the ruling authorities, are rarely instrumental in the creation of capital or the diffusion of civilization. Most of the commercial establishments are either in the hands of the Christian or Jewish population. The agricultural produce of Syria is far less than might be expected from the extensive tracts of fertile lands and the favorable state of the climate. Regions of the highest fertility remain fallow, and the want of population for the purposes of cultivation is most deplorable. The commerce of Syria is in an equally low state. Volney but faithfully depicted Syria when he described it as “a land of almost unparalleled natural resources, comprising within its limits every estimable variety of climate and of soil.” Yet Syria, under the execrable Mussulman rule is almost the lowest in the scale of nations; but even in the present state of things she produces silk, cotton, and wool—three staple articles of demand. A change has been brought about during the last few years in the external features of Oriental dress, and in Syria

more especially, which, with the decline of their own manufactures, has tended to introduce the cheaper fabrics of Europe. The issue of the recent Turko-Russian war has been to place Syria under the nominal protectorate of Great Britain, with promises of social-reform, which, however, the Turks are slow in bringing about. *SEE TURKEY.*

VI. *History.* —

1. The first occupants of Syria appear to have been of Hamitic descent. The Canaanitish races, the Hittites, Jebusites, Amorites, etc., are connected in Scripture with Egypt and Ethiopia, Cush and Mizraim (^{<0106>}Genesis 10:6, 15-18); and, even independently of the evidence, there seems to be sufficient reason for believing that the races in question stood in close ethnic connection with the Cushitic stock (Rawlinson, *Herod.* 4:243-245). These tribes occupied not Palestine only, but also Lower Syria, in very early times, as we may gather from the fact that Hamath is assigned to them in Genesis (^{<0108>}Genesis 10:18). Afterwards they seem to have become possessed of Upper Syria also, for when the Assyrians first push their conquests beyond the Euphrates, they find the Hittites (*Khatti*) established in strength on the right bank of the great river. After a while the first comers, who were still to a great extent nomads, received a Shemitic infusion, which most probably came to them from the south-east. The family of Abraham, whose original domicile was in Lower Babylonia, *may*, perhaps be best regarded as furnishing us with a specimen of the migratory movements of the period. Another example is that of Chedorlaomer with his confederate kings, of whom one at least—Amraphelmulist have been a Shemite. The movement *may* have begun before the time of Abraham, and hence, perhaps, the Shemitic names of many of the inhabitants when Abraham first comes into the country, as Abimelech, Melchizedek, Eliezer, etc. The only Syrian town whose existence we find distinctly marked at this time is ϐ Damascus (^{<0145>}Genesis 14:15; 15:2), which appears to have been already a place of some importance. Indeed, in one tradition Abraham is said to have been king of Damascus for a time (Nic. Dam. *Fragm.* 30); but this is quite unworthy of credit. Next to Damascus must be placed Hamath which is mentioned by Moses as a well known place (^{<0421>}Numbers 13:21; 34:8), and appears in Egyptian papyri of the time of the eighteenth dynasty (*Cambridge Essays*, 1858, p. 268). Syria at this time, and for many centuries afterwards, seems to have been broken up among a number of petty kingdoms. Several of these are mentioned in Scripture, as Damascus,

Rehob, Maachah, Zobah, Geshur, etc. We also hear occasionally of “*the kings of Syria and of the Hittites*” (^{<1102>}1 Kings 10:29; ^{<1106>}2 Kings 7:6) — an expression indicative of that extensive subdivision of the tract among numerous petty chiefs which is exhibited to us very clearly in the early Assyrian inscriptions. At various times different states had the pre-eminence, but none was ever strong enough to establish an authority over the others.

2. The Jews first come into hostile contact with the Syrians, *under that name*, in the time of David. The wars of Joshua, however, must have often been with Syrian chiefs, with whom he disputed the possession of the tract about Lebanon and Hermon (^{<6102>}Joshua 11:2-18). After his time the Syrians were apparently undisturbed, until David began his aggressive wars upon them. Claiming the frontier of the Euphrates, which God had promised to Abraham (^{<0158>}Genesis 15:18), David made war on Hadadezer, king of Zobah whom he defeated in a great battle, killing 18,000 of his men, and taking from him 1000 chariots, 700 horsemen, and 20,000 footmen (^{<1083>}2 Samuel 8:3,4, 13). The Damascene Syrians, having endeavored to succor their kinsmen, were likewise defeated with great loss (ver. 5); and the blow so weakened them that they shortly afterwards submitted and became David’s subjects (ver. 6). Zobah, however, was far from being subdued: as yet. When, a few years later, the Ammonites determined on engaging in a war with David, and applied to the Syrians for aid, Zobah, together with Beth-Rehob, sent them 20,000 footmen, and two other Syrian kingdoms furnished 13,000 (^{<0106>}Genesis 10:6). This army, being completely defeated by Joab, Hadadezer obtained aid from Mesopotamia (ver. 16), and tried the chance of a third battle, which likewise went against him, and produced the general submission of Syria to the Jewish monarch. The submission thus begun continued under the reign of Solomon, who “reigned over all the kingdoms from the river [Euphrates] unto the land of the Philistines and unto the border of Egypt; they brought presents and served Solomon all the days of his life” (^{<1021>}1 Kings 4:21). The only part of Syria which Solomon lost seems to have been Damascus, where an independent kingdom was set up by Rezon, a native of Zobah (11, 23-25). On the separation of the two kingdoms, soon after the accession of Rehoboam, the remainder of Syria no doubt shook off the yoke. Damascus now became decidedly the leading state, Hamath being second to it, and the northern Hittites, whose capital was Carchemish, near Barnbuk, third. *SEE CARCHEMISH*. The wars of this

period fall most properly into the history of Damascus, and have already been described in the account given of that city. *SEE DAMASCUS*. Their result was to attach Syria to the great Assyrian empire, from which it passed to the Babylonians, after a short attempt on the part of Egypt to hold possession of it, which was frustrated by Nebuchadnezzar. From the Babylonians Syria passed to the Persians, under whom it formed a satrapy in conjunction with Judaea, Phoenicia, and Cyprus (Herod. in, 91). Its resources were still great, and probably it was his confidence in them that encouraged the Syrian satrap Megabazus to raise the standard of revolt against Artaxerxes Longimanus (B.Q. 447). After this we hear little of Syria till the year of the battle of Issus (B.C. 333), when it submitted to Alexander without a struggle.

3. Upon the death of Alexander, Syria became, for the first time, the head of a great kingdom. On the division of the provinces among his generals (B.C. 321), Soecus Nicator received Mesopotamia and Syria, and though, in the twenty years of struggle which followed, this country was lost and won repeatedly, it remained finally, with the exception of Caele-Syria, in the hands of the prince to whom it was originally assigned. That prince, whose dominions reached from the Mediterranean to the Indus, and from the Oxus to the Southern Ocean, having, as he believed, been exposed to great dangers on account of the distance from Greece of his original capital, Babylon, resolved, immediately upon his victory of Ipsus (B.C. 301), to fix his metropolis in the West, and settled upon Syria as the fittest place for it. Antioch was begun in B.C. 300, and, being finished in a few years, was made the capital of Seleucus's kingdom. The whole realm was thenceforth ruled from this center, and Syria, which had long been the prey of stronger countries, and had been exhausted by their exactions, grew rich with the wealth, which now flowed into it on all sides. The luxury and magnificence of Antioch were extraordinary. Broad straight streets, with colonnades from end to end, temples, statues, arches, bridges, a royal palace, and various other public buildings dispersed throughout it made the Syrian capital by far the most splendid of all the cities of the East. At the same time, in the provinces, other towns of large size were growing up. Seleucia in Pieria, Apamea, and both Laodiceast were foundations of the Seleucidae, as their names sufficiently indicate. Weak and indolent as were many of these monarchs, it would seem that they had a hereditary taste for building; and so each aimed at outdoing his predecessors in the number, beauty, and magnificence of his constructions. As the history of Syria

under the Seleucid princes has been already given in detail in the articles treating of each monarch, *SEE ANTIOCHUS; SEE DEMETRIUS; SEE SELEUCUS*, etc.], it will be unnecessary here to do more than sum it up generally. The most flourishing period was the reign of the founder, Nicator. The empire was then almost as large as that of the Achaemenian Persians, for it at one time included Asia Minor, and thus reached from the Egean to India. It was organized into satrapies, of which the number was seventy-two. Trade flourished greatly, old lines of traffic being restored and new ones opened. The reign of Nicator's son, Antiochus I, called Soter, was the beginning of the decline, which was progressive from his date with only one or two slight interruptions. Soter lost territory to the kingdom of Pergamus, and failed in an attempt to subject Bithynia. He was also unsuccessful against Egypt. Under his son, Antiochus II, called Θεός, or "the God," who ascended the throne in B.C. 261, the disintegration of the empire proceeded more rapidly. The revolt of Parthia in B.C. 256, followed by that of Bactria in B.C. 254, deprived the Syrian kingdom of some of its best provinces, and gave it a new enemy which shortly became a rival and finally a superior. At the same time, the war with Egypt was prosecuted without either advantage or glory. Fresh losses were suffered in the reign of Seleucus II (Callinicus), Antiochus II's successor. While Callinicus was engaged in Egypt against Ptolemy Euergetes, Eumenes of Pergamus obtained possession of a great part of Asia Minor (B.C. 242); and about the same time Arsaces II, king of Parthia, conquered Hyrcania and annexed it to his dominions. An attempt to recover this latter province cost Callinicus his crown, as he was defeated and made prisoner by the Parthians (B.C. 226). In the next reign, that of Seleucus III (Ceraunus), a slight reaction set in. Most of Asia Minor was recovered for Ceraunus by his wife's nephew, Achseus (B.C. 224), and he was preparing to invade Pergamus when he died poisoned. His successor and brother, Antiochus III, though he gained the surname of Great from the grandeur of his expeditions and the partial success of some of them, can scarcely be said to have really done anything towards raising the empire from its declining condition, since his conquests on the side of Egypt, consisting of Caele-Syria, Phoenicia, and Palestine, formed no sufficient compensation for the loss of Asia Minor, which he was forced to cede to Rome for the aggrandizement of the rival kingdom of Pergamus (B.C. 190). Even had the territorial balance been kept more even, the ill policy of making Rome an enemy of the Syrian kingdom, with which Antiochus the Great is taxable, would have necessitated our placing him among the princes to

whom its ultimate ruin was mainly owing. Towards the east, indeed, he did something, if not to thrust back the Parthians, at any rate to protect his empire from their aggressions. But the exhaustion consequent upon his constant wars and signal defeats more especially those of Raphia and Magnesia-left Syria far more feeble at his death than she had been at any former period. The almost eventless reign of Seleucus IV (Philopator), his son and successor (B.C. 187/175), is sufficient proof of this feebleness. It was not till twenty years of peace had recruited the resources of Syria in men and money that Antiochus IV (Epiphanes), brother of Philopator, ventured on engaging in a great war (B.C. 171) a war for the conquest of Egypt. At first it seemed as if the attempt would succeed. Egypt was on the point of yielding to her foe of so many years, when Rome, following out her traditions of hostility to Syrian power and influence, interposed her mediation, and deprived Epiphanes of all the fruits of his victories (B.C. 168). A greater injury was about the same time (B.C. 167) inflicted on Syria by the folly of Epiphanes himself. Not content with replenishing his treasury by the plunder of the Jewish Temple, he madly ordered the desecration of the Holy of Holies, and thus caused the revolt of the Jews, which proved a permanent loss to the empire and an aggravation of its weakness. After the death of Epiphanes the empire rapidly verged to its fall. The regal power fell into the hands of an infant, Antiochus V (Eupator), son of Epiphanes (B.C. 164); the nobles contended for the regency; a pretender to the crown started up in the person of Demetrius, son of Seleucus IV; Rome put in a claim to administer the government; and amid the troubles thus caused the Parthians, under Mithridates I, overran the eastern provinces (B.C. 164), conquered Media, Persia, Susiana, Babylonia, etc., and advanced their frontier to the Euphrates. It was in vain that Demetrius II (Nicator) made an attempt (B.C. 142) to recover the lost territory; his boldness cost him his liberty; while a similar attempt on the part of his successor, Antiochus VII (Sidetes), cost that monarch his life (B.C. 128). Meanwhile, in the shorn Syrian kingdom, disorders of every kind were on the increase; Commagene revolted and established her independence; civil wars, murders, mutinies of the troops, rapidly succeeded one another; the despised Jews were called in by both sides in the various struggles; and Syria, in the space of about ninety years, from B.C. 154 to B.C. 64, had no fewer than ten sovereigns. All the wealth of the country had been by this time dissipated-much had flowed Romewards in the shape of bribes; more, probably, had been spent on the wars; and still more had been wasted by: the, kings, in luxury of every kind. Under these

circumstances, the Romans showed no eagerness to occupy the exhausted region, which passed under the power of Tigranes, king of Armenia, in B.C. 83, and was not made a province of the Roman Empire till after Pompey's complete defeat of Mithridates and his ally Tigranes in B.C. 64. The chronology of this period has been well worked out by Clinton (*Fast. Hell.* 3, 308-346), from whom the following table of the kings, with the dates of their accession, is taken:

Picture for Syria 2

4. As Syria holds an important place, not only in the Old Test., but in the New, some account of its condition under the Romans must now be given. That condition was somewhat peculiar. While the country generally was formed into a Roman province, under governors who were at first proprietors or questors, then proconsuls, and finally legates, there were exempted from the direct rule of the governor, in the first place, a number of "free cities," which retained the administration of their own affairs, subject to a tribute levied according to the Roman principles of taxation; and, secondly, a number of tracts which were assigned to petty princes, commonly natives; to be ruled at their pleasure, subject to the same obligations with the free cities as to taxation (Appian, *Syr.* 50). The free cities were Antioch, Seleucia, Apamea, Epiphaneia, Tripolis, Sidon, and Tyre; the principalities, Commagene, Chalcis ad Belum (near Baalbek), Arethusa, Abila or Abilene, Palmyra, and Damascus. The principalities were sometimes called kingdoms, sometimes tetrarchies. They were established where it was thought that the natives were so inveterately wedded to their own customs, and so well disposed for revolt, that it was necessary to consult their feelings, to flatter the national vanity, and to give them the semblance without the substance of freedom.

(a.) Commagene was a kingdom (*regnum*). It had broken off from Syria during the later troubles, and become a separate state under the government of a branch of the Seleucidae, who affected the names of Antiochus and Mithridates. The Romans allowed this condition of things to continue till A.D. 17, when, upon the death of Antiochus III, they made Commagene into a province; in which condition it continued till A.D. 38, when Caligula gave the crown to Antiochus IV (Epiphanes), the son of Antiochus III. Antiochus IV continued king till A.D. 72, when he was deposed by Vespasian, and Commagene was finally absorbed into the empire. He had a son, called also Antiochus and Epiphanes who was

betrothed to Drusilla, the sister of “king Agrippa,” and afterwards the wife of Felix, the procurator of Judaea.

(b.) Chalcis “ad Belum” was not the city so called near Aleppo, which gave name to the district of Chalcidice, but a town of less importance near Heliopolis (Baalbek), whence probably the suffix “ad Belum.” It is mentioned in this connection by Strabo (16, 2, 10), and Josephus says that it was under Lebanon (*Ant.* 14:7, 4), so that there cannot be much doubt as to its position. It must have been in the “Hollow Syria” the modern Buka’a, to the south of Baalbek (Josephus, *War.* 1, 9, 2), and therefore probably at Anjar, where there are large ruins (Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* 3, 496, 497). This, too, was generally, or perhaps always, a “kingdom.” Pompey found it under a certain Ptolemy, “the son of Mennaes,” and allowed him to retain possession of it, together with certain adjacent districts. From him it passed to his son, Lysanias, who was put to death by Antony at the instigation of Cleopatra (about B.C. 34), after which we find its revenues farmed by Lysanias’s steward, Zenodorus, the royalty being in abeyance (Josephus, *Ant.* 15:10,1). In B.C. 22 Chalcis was added by Augustus to the dominions of Herod the Great, at whose death it probably passed to his son Philip (*ibid.* 17:11, 4). Philip died A.D. 34; and then we lose sight of Chalcis, until Claudius, in his first year (A.D. 41), bestowed it on a Herod, the brother of; Herod Agrippa I. still as a “kingdom.” From this Herod it passed (A.D. 49) to his nephew, Herod Agrippa II, who held it only three or four years, being promoted from it to a better government (*ibid.* 20:7, 1). Chalcis then fell to Agrippa’s cousin, Aristobulus, son of the first Herodian king, under whom it remained till A.D. 73 (Josephus, *War.* 7:7, 1). About this time, or soon after, it ceased to be a distinct government, being finally absorbed into the Roman province of Syria.

(c.) Arethusa (now Restun) was for a time separated from Syria, and governed by phylarchs. The city lay on the right bank of the Orontes, between Hamah and Hums, rather nearer to the former. In the government were included the Emiseni, or people of Hums (Emesa), so that we may regard it as comprising the Orontes valley from the jebel Erbayn, at least as high as the Bahr el-Kades, or Baheiret-Hums, the lake of Hums. Only two governors are known—Sampsiceramus. and Jamblichus, his son (Strabo, 16:2, 10). Probably this principality was one of the first absorbed.

(d.) Abilene, so called from its capital Abila, was a “tetrarchy.” It was situated to the east of Antilibanus, on the route between Baalbek and

Damascus (*Itin. Anf.*). Ruins and inscriptions mark the site of the capital (Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* 3; 479-482), which was at the village called el-Suk, on the river Barada, just where it breaks forth from the mountains. The limits of the territory are uncertain. We first hear of this tetrarchy in Luke's gospel (~~4:13~~ Luke 3:1), where it is said to have been in the possession of a certain Lysanias at the commencement of John's ministry, which was probably A.D. 25. Of this Lysanias nothing more is known; he certainly cannot be the Lysanias who once held Chalcis, since that Lysanias died above sixty years previously. Thirteen years after the date mentioned by Luke (A.D. 38), the heir of Caligula bestowed "the tetrarchy of Lysanias," by which Abilene is no doubt intended, on the elder Agrippa (Josephus, *Ant.* 18:6, 10), and four years later Claudius confirmed the same prince in the possession of the "Abila of Lysanias" (*ibid.* 19:5, 1). Finally, in A.D. 53, Claudius, among other grants, conferred on the younger Agrippa "Abila, which had been the tetrarchy of Lysanias" (*ibid.* 20:7, 1). Abila was taken by Placidus, one of the generals of Vespasian, in B.C. 69 (Josephus, *War*, 4:7, 6), and then forth was annexed to Syria.

(e.) Palmyra appears to have occupied a different position from the rest of the Syrian principalities. It was in no sense dependent upon Rome (Pliny, *H. N.* 5, 25), but, relying on its position, claimed and exercised the right of self government from the breaking-up of the Syrian kingdom to the reign of Trajan. Antony made an attempt against it in B.C. 41, but failed. It was not till Trajan's successes against the Parthians, between A.D. 114 and A.D. 116, that Palmyra was added to the empire.

(f.) Damascus is the last of the principalities, which it is necessary to notice here. It appears to have been left by Pompey in the hands of an Arabian prince, Aretas, who, however, was to pay a tribute for it, and to allow the Romans to occupy it at their pleasure with a garrison (Josephus, *Ant.* 14:4, 5; 5, 1; 11, 7). This state of things continued most likely to the settlement of the empire by Augustus, when Damascus was attached to the province of Syria. During the rest of Augustus's reign, and during the entire reign of Tiberius, this arrangement was in force; but it seems probable that Caligula, on his accession, separated Damascus from Syria and gave it to another Aretas, who was king of Petra, and a relation (son?) of the former. **SEE ARETTAS.** Hence the fact noted by Paul (~~4:13~~ 2 Corinthians 11:32), that at the time of his conversion Damascus was held by an "ethnarch of king Aretas." The semi-independence of Damascus is thought to have continued through the reigns of Caligula and Claudius (from A.D. 37 to A.D. 54), but

to have come to an end under Nero, when the district was probably reattached to Syria.

The list of the governors of Syria, from its conquest by the Romans to the destruction of Jerusalem, has been made out with a near approach to accuracy, and is as shown in the adjoining table.

The general history of Syria during this period may be summed up in a few words. Down to the battle of Pharsalia, Syria was fairly tranquil, the only troubles being with the Arabs, who occasionally attacked the eastern frontier. The Roman: governors labored hard to raise the condition of the province, taking great pains to restore the cities, which had gone to decay under the later Seleucidae. Gabinius, proconsul in the years B.C. 56 and 55, made himself particularly conspicuous in works of this kind. After Pharsalia (B.C. 46) the troubles of Syria were renewed. Julius Caesar gave the province to his relative Sextus in B.C. 47; but Pompey's party was still so strong in the East that in the next year one of his adherents, Cecilius Bassus, put Sextus to death, and established himself in the government so firmly that he was able to resist for three years three proconsuls appointed by the Senate to dispossess him, and only finally yielded upon terms which he himself offered to his antagonists. Many of the petty princes of Syria sided with him, and some of the nomadic Arabs took his pay and fought under his banner (Strabo, 16:2, 10). Bassus had but just made his submission, when, upon the assassination of Caesar, Syria was disputed between Cassius and Dolabella, the friend of Antony, a dispute terminated by the suicide of Dolabella, B.C. 43, at Laodicea, where he was besieged by Cassius. The next year Cassius left his province and went to Philippi, where, after the first unsuccessful engagement, he, too, committed suicide. Syria then fell to Antony, who appointed as his legate L. Decidius Saxa, in B.C. 41. The troubles of the empire now tempted the Parthians to seek a further extension of their dot minions at the expense of Rome, and Pacorus, the crown prince, son of Arsaces XIV, assisted by the Roman refugee Labienus, overran Syria and Asia Minor, defeating Antony's generals, and threatening Rome with the loss of all her Asiatic possessions (B.C. 40-39). Ventidius, however, in B.C. 38, defeated the Parthians, slew Pacorus, and recovered for Rome her former boundary. A quiet time followed. From B.C. 38 to B.C. 31 Syria was governed peaceably by the legates of Antony, and, after his defeat at Actium and death at Alexandria in that year, by those of Augustus. In B.C. 27 'took place that formal division of the provinces between Augustus and the Senate from which the

imperial administrative system dates; and Syria, being from its exposed situation among the *provinciae principis*, continued to be ruled by legates, who were of consular rank (*consulares*), and bore severally the full title of “Legatus Augusti pro praetore.” During the whole of this period the province enlarged or contracted its limits according as it pleased the reigning emperor to bestow tracts of land on the native princes, or to resume them and place them under his legate. Judaea, when attached in this way to Syria, occupied a peculiar position. Partly, perhaps, on account of its remoteness from the Syrian capital, Antioch, partly, no doubt, because of the peculiar character of its people, it was thought best to make it, in a certain sense, a separate government. A special procurator was therefore appointed to rule it, who was subordinate to the governor of Syria, but within his own province had the power of a legatus. *SEE JUDAEA*. Syria continued without serious disturbance from the expulsion of the Parthians (B.C. 38) to the breaking out of the Jewish war (A.D. 66). In B.C. 19 it was visited by Augustus, and in A.D. 18-19 by Germanicus, who died at Antioch in the last-named year. In A.D. 44-47 it was the scene of a severe famine. *SEE AGABUS*.

Picture for Syria 3

5. A little earlier Christianity had begun to spread into it, partly by means of those who “were scattered” at the time of Stephen’s persecution (^{<411B>}Acts 11:19), partly by the exertions of Paul (^{<402>}Galatians 1:21). The Syrian Church soon grew to be one of the most flourishing (^{<413>}Acts 13:1; 15:23, 35, 41, etc.). Here the name of “Christian” first arose at the outset no doubt a gibe, but thenceforth a glory and a boast. Antioch, the capital, became, as early probably as A.D. 44, the see of a bishop, and was soon recognized as a patriarchate. The Syrian Church is accused of laxity both in faith and morals (Newman, *Arians*, p. 10); but, if it must admit the disgrace of having given birth to Lucian and Paul of Samosata, it can claim, on the other hand, the glory of such names as Ignatius, Theophilus, Ephraem, and Babylas. It suffered many grievous persecutions without shrinking; and it helped to make that emphatic protest against worldliness and luxuriousness of living at which monasticism, according to its original conception, must be considered to have aimed. The Syrian monks were among the most earnest and most self-denying; and the names of Hilarion and Simeon Stylites are enough to prove that a most important part was played by Syria in the ascetic movement of the 4th and 5th centuries.

6. The country remained under Roman and Byzantine rule till A.D. 634, when it was overrun by the Mohammedans under Khaled. Sixteen years later Damascus was made the capital of the Mohammedan empire. In the 11th century the Crusaders entered it, captured its principal cities, with the exception of Damascus, and retained possession of them about a hundred years. For more than two centuries after the expulsion of the Crusaders, Syria was the theatre of fierce contests between the warlike hordes of Tartary and the Mameluke rulers of Egypt. At length, in A.D. 1517, it was captured by the Turks under sultan Selim I, and became a portion of the Ottoman Empire.

In 1798 Bonaparte landed in Egypt with a powerful army, and, having subjected that country to the arms of France, marched into Syria, affecting the utmost respect for the Mohammedan doctrine and worship, and claiming a divine commission as regenerator of the East. He laid siege to Acre; but, the Turkish garrison being animated by the presence of 300 British sailors under sir Sidney Smith, at the expiration of sixty days the French general was compelled to retire, after the sacrifice of a large number of his most gallant soldiers. A powerful army of Turks, who had advanced from Damascus to raise the siege of Acre, were next attacked by Napoleon at the base of Mount Tabor, and routed with great slaughter, thousands being driven into the Jordan. Jaffa (Joppa) fell into his hands, and, contrary to the usages of war, 1200 prisoners were shot or dispatched with the bayonet. But the French campaign in Syria was of short duration. On June 15, 1799, the army under Bonaparte arrived at Cairo, having traversed the Great Desert; and after the battle of Aboukir, in the following month, when 18,000 Turks perished on the field, the general deputed the command to Kleber, and sailed for France.

Syria remained under the Turks till 1830, when Mohammed Ali, pasha of Egypt, declaring war with his sovereign, the sultan, sent an army into Palestine, under the command of his son Ibrahim, which speedily captured Acre, Tripoli, Aleppo, and Damascus, and, defeating the Turks in various battles, crossed the Taurus, and prepared to march on Constantinople itself. The sultan was obliged to invoke the aid of Russia against the conqueror of Syria; and 20,000 Russians, under count Orloff, hastily landed on the Asiatic territory encamping between Ibrahim and the Bosphorus. The sultan then entered into negotiation with the Egyptian general, and solemnly confirmed to Mohammed Ali the viceroyalty of the whole territory from Adana on the frontiers of Asia Minor, to the Nile. The

Syrians soon discovered that their new masters were not a whit less rapacious than the Turks, and several insurrections took place in Mount Lebanon and various districts of Syria in 1834. The presence of Mohammed Ali himself, with large reinforcements, suppressed for a moment the spirit of disaffection, and in the following year the Druses and Christians of Lebanon were disarmed. Ground down, however, by the utmost tyranny, the Syrians again revolted in 1837; they were chastised by Ibrahim, and again reduced to subjection. In 1840, in consequence of a treaty between England, Russia, Austria, and Prussia, the seaport towns of Syria were bombarded by a British squadron; and, the Egyptians being compelled to evacuate the whole of Syria, the supremacy of the Turks was once more established over the country which they have ever since held.

VII. Literature. See, in general, Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v.; M'Cullough, *Geog. Dict.* s.v. On the geography, see Poccoke, *Description of the East*, 2, 88-209; Burckhardt, *Travels in Syria and the Holy ILatnd*, p. 1-309; Robinson, *Later Biblical Researches*, p. 419-625; Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 403-414; Porter, *Five Years in Damascus*; Ainsworth, *Travels in the Track of the Ten Thousand*, p. 57-70; *Researches*, etc., p. 290 sq.; Wortabet, *The Syrians* (Lond. 1856); Chesney, *Euphrates Expedition*; Thomson, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. 5; Burton and Drake, *Unexplored Syria* (Lond. 1872).. On the history under the Seleucidae, see (besides the original sources) Clinton, *Fasti Hellenici*, vol. 3, Appendix 3, p. 308-346; Gardner, *Seleucid Coins* (Lond. 1878); Vaillant, *In7periumm Seleucidarum* (Par. 1681); Frolich, *Annales Rerum et Regunm Syrice* (Vien. 1744); and Flathe, *Gesch. Macedon.* (Leips. 1834). On the history under the Romans, see Norisius, *Cenotaphia Pisana*, in *Opp.* 3, 424-531; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, etc. On the modern history and condition, see Castille, *La Syrie sous Mehemet Ali*; Bowring, *Report on Syria*; Ritter, *Syrien und Palast.*; Murray and Badeker, *Syria and Palest.*

Syria, Missions In.

The origin of the Syrian mission dates back as far as 1823. When the two American missionaries Bird and Goodell arrived in that year, the civil and the social condition of Jerusalem and Palestine were such that these gentlemen were advised to make Beirut the center of their operations. Soon: several English missionaries were added to the Protestant force at that time, and the papal Church became thoroughly alarmed. Letters were addressed from Rome to the different patriarchs to render, if possible, the

undertaking of the missionaries ineffectual. The letters were answered by the anathemas against the "Bible men;" yet, notwithstanding all this, the missionaries took a hopeful view of their prospects, and commenced schools in 1824 at Beirut. The first was a mere class of six Arab children, taught daily by the wives of the missionaries. Soon an Arab teacher was engaged, and before the year ended the pupils had increased to fifty. In 1827 they had already 600 children in thirteen schools, and more than 100 of these pupils were girls. That the Romish ecclesiastics were hostile to these schools need not be mentioned. The troubles which commenced in 1826 with the invasion of the Greeks, and the constant apprehension of an approaching war, made it necessary to suspend the mission; for a time, which happened in the year 1828. and thus the first period in the Syrian mission closed., The second period commences with the year 1830, when the station at Beirut was resumed. In 1834 an Arabic press arrived at Beirut, which proved a great help in the mission work, especially in the controversy which Mr. Bird had with the papal bishop of Beirut. In 1835 a high-school was commenced, but missionary work was impeded by the wars of Lebanon. These troubles lasted till the year 1842. In the year 1844 the missionaries held a convention, the result of which was that it was recognized as a fact of fundamental importance that the people within the bounds of the mission were Arabs, whether called Greeks, Greek Catholics, Druses, or Maronites, and that the divers religious sects really constituted one race. It was also agreed upon that wherever small companies were ready to make a credible profession of piety, they were entitled to be recognized as churches and had a right to such a native ministry as could be given them. About that time a call for preaching came from Hasbeiya, a village of four or five thousand inhabitants, situated at the foot of Mount Hermon, and about lifts miles south-east of Beirut. A considerable body of Hasbeyians had seceded from the Greek Church, declared themselves Protestants, and made a formal application to the mission for religious instruction. Seventy-six of these people were added to the Church of Christ. A persecution against the Protestants now ensued, who fled to Abeih, where the high-school was revived under the charge of Mr. Calhoun. A chapel for public worship was fitted up, and here, as also at Beirut, there was preaching every Sabbath in the Arabic language, with an interesting Sabbath-school between the services. In the spring of the year 1845 war broke out afresh between the Druses and Maronites, and Lebanon was again purged by fire. The consequence was that the schools in the mountains were broken up; but in the following year, when Dr. Van

Dyck was ordained to the work of the Gospel ministry, there were ten schools in the charge of the station at Abeih, with 436 pupils. Connected with the Beirut station were four schools for boys and girls, and one for girls alone. In Sulk el-Ghurb, a village four miles from Abeih, a Protestant secession from the Greek Church was in progress, embracing fourteen families, and religious services were held with them every Sabbath. At Bhamduin, the summer residence for the brethren of the Beirut station, there were a number of decided Protestants, and even in Zahleh, the hot-bed of fanaticism, there were men who openly argued from the Gospel against the prevailing errors. Missionary work had now so increased that in the year 1847 an earnest and eloquent appeal from the missionaries for an increase to their number was made to the Prudential Committee. The appeal was published, but it continued painfully true that the harvest was plenteous, while the laborers were few. In the same year the Protestants of Hasbeiya sent one of their number to Constantinople to lay their grievances before the sultan. The appeal was successful, and the principle of tolerating and acknowledging the Protestants as a Christian sect was recognized, in spite of the bull of excommunication of the Greek patriarch. The most important event, however, in the year. 1848 was the formation of a purely native Church at Beirut, and the beginning of translating the Scriptures into Arabic, which was committed to Mr. Eli Smith, who was assisted by Butrus el-Bistany and Nasif el-Yasiji. In the same year Aleppo was made a missionary station, but it was left in 1855 to be cultivated by the Armenian mission, the language in that region being chiefly the Turkish. At that time the Gospel was preached stately at sixteen places. At four of these — Beirut, Abeih, Sidon, and Hasbeiya, churches had been organized. The anathemas of the Maronite clergy, once so terrific, had lost their power, and the most influential inhabitants were on friendly terms with the mission, and in favor of education and good morals. Things had changed in the last fifteen years for the better in a most remarkable way. We have now arrived at the year 1857, which opened with the death of Dr. Eli Smith, the translator of the Bible into Arabic. He had departed at Beirut, Sabbath morning, January 11, and was succeeded in the work of translation by Dr. Van Dyck, who had been removed for that purpose from Sidon to Beirut. In the year 1859 the translation of the New Test. was completed and published under the care of Dr. Van Dyck, who then proceeded with the translation and publication of the Old Test., which was completed Aug. 22, 1.864. The British and Foreign Bible Society requested permission to adopt this version, instead of the one formerly issued by them. The result

of a friendly negotiation was that the American and the British and Foreign Bible Society agreed to publish the version conjointly from electrotype plates furnished by the former.

The civil war which broke out in Syria in 1860, and which was noted for savage massacres on Lebanon, at Hasbeiya, Damascus, and elsewhere, although doubtless injurious to the missionary work in its direct effects, was the means of an interesting development of the missionary spirit. Not less than six different missionary societies were formed, embracing nearly all the Protestants of the various towns and villages, and a commendable degree of liberality was shown by the natives in collecting and contributing. The number of converts increased, churches and stations were multiplied and provided with native preachers and, pastors, and a proposal was made for a Protestant college. The demand for the Scriptures and other religious works was so great that the press was unable to meet it. In 1862 the printing alone amounted to 8000 volumes and 9000 tracts, making an aggregate of 6,869,000 pages. Besides the Protestant college, which was proposed in 1861 and incorporated in 1863, in accordance with the laws of the state of New York, a theological seminary was commenced at Abeih in May, 1869, which opened with seven students. In the year 1870 the Syrian mission was transferred from the American Board to the Presbyterian Board of Missions, under whose care it is still carried on.

Beirut is one of the missionary centers for the revival of Bible Christianity in Bible lands. Among the chief instrumentalities for the development of this city are the benevolent and literary institutions founded by foreign missionary zeal. First among them are the American Protestant institutions under the care of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions in New York. They are manned by a noble band of Christian scholars, as Drs. H. H. Jessup, D. Bliss, C.V. A. Van Dyck, G. E. Post and Profs. James S. Dennis, E. R. Lewis, and Hall. In the year 1877, when Dr. Philip Schaff visited Beirut, a new mission chapel, with a native pastor, had just been opened in the eastern part of the city.: There are the American Female Seminary and the printing-press and Bible depository, which sent forth in 1876 no less than 38,450 volumes (or 13,786,980 pages) of Bibles, tracts, and other books, including a series of text-books and juvenile works. There is the "Syrian Protestant College," which is independent of the mission, but grew out of it, and promotes its interest. In 1877 it numbered over 100 pupils of different creeds and nationalities. The college embraces, besides the literary department Arabic language and literature, mathematics, the

natural sciences, the modern languages, and Turkish law and jurisprudence a medical school, under the management of Dr. Post; an observatory, under Dr. Van Dyck, who sends daily by telegraph meteorological observations to the observatory of Constantinople; a library, and a museum of natural curiosities. The entire Syrian mission of the American Presbyterian Board embraces, according to the statistics of 1879, 29 American missionaries (12 men and 17 women), 3 native pastors, 112 teachers, 15 licensed preachers, 10 other helpers— total force, 140; 12 churches, 716 communicants, 115 received on profession; 66 preaching places, and 45 Sunday-schools with 1895 pupils. The principal stations outside of Beirut are Tripoli, Abeih, Sidon, and Zahleh. Besides these flourishing Presbyterian institutions, the schools of Mrs. M. Mott, Miss Jessie Taylor, and the deaconesses of Kaiserswerth deserve most honorable mention. The Jesuits are also very active in Beirut in the interest of the Roman Catholic Church. They are just now issuing a new Arabic translation of the Bible, evidently in opposition to Dr. Van Dyck's translation, which is widely circulated in the East. From Dr. Schaff's work, *Through Bible Lands*, we subjoin the following statistics concerning the

Picture for Syria 1

Besides Beirut, we may mention Damascus, the hot-bed of Mohammedan fanaticism. A daily diligence connects this place with Beirut. "It seems a hopeless task," says Dr. Schaff, "to plant Protestant Christianity in such a place as Damascus. Nevertheless, the tiling has been done, and not altogether without result." Since 1843 the United Presbyterian Church of America and the Presbyterian Church of Ireland have maintained jointly a mission, with a church for converts from Jews and Greek Christians, and with schools. The buildings were burned during the massacre of 1860, but have been substantially rebuilt. The Protestant community there is now larger than before the massacre. Worship is conducted twice every Sunday in Arabic, and occasionally in English. Besides this Presbyterian mission, there is all Episcopal mission, with a chapel built by the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews. Adjoining the chapel are several fine schoolrooms for boys and girls. Altogether this society employs there a missionary staff of five persons. Connected with this society is also a depot, where Bibles and other books, such as the *Pilgrim's Progress*, are for sale. The missionary operations at Damascus are but small beginnings;

but the time is not far distant when, as Abd-elKader prophesied, “the mosques of Damascus will be turned into Christian churches.”

From the work recently published by Dr. Schaff, *Through Bible Lands*, we extract the following table.

Picture for Syria 2

In conclusion, we will mention the fact that the last mission year has been signalized by the establishment of a British protectorate over Syria and all Asiatic Turkey, and by a new departure in the Syrian Protestant College, in the adoption of the English language as the common medium of instruction. See Anderson, *History of the Missions of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to the Oriental Churches* (Boston, 1872-73, 2 vols.); Schaff, *Through Bible Lands* (N., 1879); besides the annual reports of the different societies. Some of the publications from the Jesuit press at Beirut are mentioned in *Literarischer Handweiser*, 1864, p. 209 sq. (B. P.)

Among the most notable missionary efforts in Palestine are the German colonies at Haifa and Jaffa. They belong to a religious society known as “The Temple,” which originated among the Pietists of Würtemberg, who accept Bengel’s theory of the prophecies of the book of Revelation as set forth in his *Gnomon of the N.T.* In 1867 an expedition of twelve men, sent out from the parent society at Kirschenhardthof, established a themselves at Semfmeh, near Nazareth, but soon died of malarial fever. On Aug. 6, 1868, another company set out, and, arriving in Palestine in October, separated into two colonies, one settling at Haifa, under the presidency of G. D. Hardegg, and the other at Jaffa, under Christopher Hoffmann. Their object was a religious one, to prepare the Holy Land for Christ’s personal coming in the Millennial reign. They purchased land, built houses, and have addressed themselves at once to agriculture. At Jaffa they have two settlements — one called Sarova, about two and a half miles north of the town, consisting in 1872 of ten houses; the second, near the walls of Jaffa, was bought from the surviving members of an American colony which came to grief (for this last see *Ridgeway, Lord’s Land*, p. 485), and this settlement included thirteen houses, with a school and a hotel. The Jaffa colony in all numbered in 1872 one hundred men, seventy women, and thirty five children; two of the colonists were doctors, and some twenty were mechanics, the rest being farmers. The Haifa colony in 1875

numbered 311, having been lately reinforced by new arrivals from Germany. Both colonies are well established, having neat and comfortable houses, and signs of external prosperity, being engaged in various trades and manufactures, as well as farming. They have little influence, however, over the native population and small security for permanence, although for the present fully tolerated by the Turkish authorities and highly respected by their neighbors (see *Conder, Tent-Work in Palest.* 2, 301 sq.).

At Jaffa there has lately been likewise established an agricultural colony of Jews from Germany, who have a small but flourishing establishment just outside the city.

Besides the episcopal mission in Jerusalem, *SEE PALESTINE, MISSIONS IN*, the Church of England has mission stations at Nablus and various other points in Palestine, where religious services are held with more or less regularity. At Nazareth is an elegant Protestant church founded by the English Missionary Society in connection with the Anglo-Prussian bishopric of Jerusalem, where an ordained clergyman (formerly Rev. J. Zeller, now Rev. F. Bellamy) officiates, assisted by a native catechist. In the same town is a hospital founded by the Edinburgh Medical Missionary Society, which dispenses medical aid to all applicants; and likewise an orphanage, established by the Ladies Society for Promoting Female Education in the East, Which educates and cares for about forty girls, chiefly of Christian parentage. *SEE TURKEY.*

Missionary work has thus a foothold in Syria, but owing to the severe Moslem laws against proselytism, it accomplishes as yet but little direct spiritual results (see Collins, *Miss. Enterprise in the East*, Lond. 1873).

Syr'iac

(^{<27014>}Daniel 2:4), or SYRIAN TONGUE (^{<1947>}Ezra 4:7) or LANGUAGE (^{<2186>}2 Kings 18:26; [^{<2371>}Isaiah 37:11]), is the rendering in the A.V. of the Hebrew **תַּמְאַר** *Aramlith*, which is the fem. of, **יַמְאַר** *Aramaeen*, used adverbially l.q. *Anamaziae*, in Aramaic. *SEE ARAMIEAN.*

Syriac Language

Picture for Syriac

This represents the Western dialect of that branch of the Shemitic or Syro-Arabian languages usually termed the Aramaean (q.v.), the Eastern being

represented by the Chaldee (q.v.). The affinity between the Chaldee and Syriac is indeed so close that but for a few orthographical changes, and especially the difference in written character, they would scarcely be distinguishable. In speech they could hardly have differed more than the several dialects of the Greek (e.g. the Doric, Eolic, Attic) from each other. While the Chaldee is written in the square character, now usually called the Hebrew, the Syriac is written in a very different and more cursive hand, and exhibits (in addition to the peculiar forms for final letters, as usual in all the Shemitic group) a method of combining certain letters or running them together in writing, similar to the practice in Arabic. There are also two forms of the characters (which correspond precisely to the Hebrew in number and power); the ordinary or light-stroke form now generally used in printing, and an older form called the Estrangelo, of heavier strokes and more uncouth shape. The vowel-points also (of which there are five, corresponding in general to the modern vowels *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, and *u*, as pronounced in Italian) differ entirely from the Hebrew (and Chaldee), and, moreover, vary in these two methods of writing; with the ordinary letters they consist of modified forms of the Greek vowels (α , ϵ , ι , o , u), while in the Estrangelo they are denoted by two dots in various positions. Other orthographical peculiarities of the Syriac as compared with the Hebrew and Chaldee are the use of a small line (*linea occultins.*) beneath silent letters, the suppression altogether of the Sheva when silent, the disuse of the Dagesh (some writers, however, employing a dot above a Begad Kephath letter, called *Kushoi*, i.e. “hardness,” to remove the aspiration, and a dot beneath it, called *Rukok*, i.e. “softness,” to retain the aspiration), and the indication of the plural (when identical in form with the singular) by two horizontal dots placed above it, called *Ribbui*, i.e. “increase.” For the leading differences in the formation and construction of words in Syriac, which are throughout analogous with the Chaldee, **SEE ARAMIEAN LANGUAGE**. The ancient or proper Syriac is believed to be now wholly a dead language, and is used only in the old liturgies and sacred books. The modern Syriac, which is used almost solely by the Nestorian Christians of Persia, and to some extent by their Koordish neighbors, differs considerably from the old Syriac, or that of literature. The principal value of a knowledge of the latter is its use in the elucidation of rare words in the Old Test. and the comparison with the Heb. roots; and it is also of much importance from the fact that the oldest and best version of the New Test. (the Peshito) is in this language. **SEE SYRIAC VERSIONS**. The principal literature of the Syriac, besides this and the inferior version of the Old

Test., consists of certain historical works of the Early and Middle Ages, particularly the writings of Ephrem Syrus (q.v.), and a number of religious poems and hymns (see *Select Hymns and Homilies* [Lond. 1853], translated from the Syriac by Rev. H. Burgess).

General treatises on the Syriac language and literature, many of them in connection with the Hebrew, but exclusive of those that treat likewise of the Chaldee, are by the following: Lysius (Regiom. 1726), Michaelis [J.B.] (Hal. 1756), Michaelis. [J. D.] (Gött. 1768, etc.), Agrell (Upsal, 1791; Lond. 1816), Svanborg (Upsal, 1795), Lengerke (Regiom. 1836), Larsow, (Berol. 1841).

See the *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* Oct. 1862; an art. on the *Syro-Arubic Languages and Literature*, in the *Christ. Rev.* 17:393 sq.; on *Syriac Biblical Literature*, in the *Church Rev.* 5, 36 sq.; on *Syriac Philology*, in the *Biblioth. Sacra*, 8:554 sq.; and the list in Uhlemann's *Syr. Grammar*, p. 22 sq.

Grammars on the Syriac, exclusively are those of Dillherr (2nd ed. Hal. 1646), Opatius: (Leips. 1691), Leusden (Ultraj. 1658), Beveridge (Lond. 1658), Michaelis [C. B.] (Hal. 1741), Michaelis [J. D.] (Gött. 1784), Adler (Alton. 1784), Zel (Lemgo, 1788), Tyschen (Rost. 1793), Yates (Lond. 1821), Ewald (Erlang. 1826), Hoffmann, (Hal. 1827), Uhlemann (Berl. 1829; N. Y. 1855), Tullberg (Lond. 1827), Phillips (2nd ed. ibid. 1845), Cowper (ibid. 1860), Merx (Halle, 1867). A *Grammar of the Modern Syriac Language*, by Rev. D. T. Stoddard, is printed in the *Jour. of the Amer. Oriental Society* (N. Y. 1855), vol. 5, No. 1. Lexicons have been executed by Gutbir (Hamb. 1667; new ed. by Henderson, Lond. 1836) and Schaaf (Lugd. Bat. 1708); the abstract of the Syriac part of Castell's *Heptaglot Lex.* by Michaelis [J. D.] (Gött. 1788); Smith, *Thesaurus* (Lond. 1858). It is a new and extensive Syriac lexicon was undertaken by Prof. Bernstein of Germany. Syriac chrestomathies are those of Kirsch (Leips. 1789), Grimm (Lemgo, 1795), Knaes (Gött. 1807), Hahn and Sieffert (Leips. 1825), Oberleitner (Vien. 1826), Ddpke (Gött. 1829), Wenig (Innsbr. 1865), and Rodiger (2nd ed. Halle, 1868). The most convenient reading-book for beginners is the *Syrirc New Test.*, published by Bagster (Lond.), and containing a brief lexicon edited by Dr. Henderson. **SEE SHEMITIC LANGUAGES.**

Syriac Literature.

The Syriac literature is preeminently religious. The oldest monument is the Syriac version of the Bible, called the *Peshitha* or *Peshito*, for which **SEE SYRIAC VERSIONS**. Like the Jews, the Syrians treated their Bible in Maasoretic manner which may be seen from the superscriptions added to some books. Thus we read at the end of Job, **abtk μl ç 8gnn8m amgtp hbtya abybf aqydx bwyad**, i.e. "Here ends the book of the just and noble Job; it contains 2553 verses." The result of critical care for the Peshito is contained in a- work speaking of the variety of single readings, of the correct reading of difficult words, and in which the pronunciation of proper names according to the Greek mode is taught. The title of this collection is **atqyt [d atyrqdw ahmçd asrwk atyprq atynml çm ya atdj dw**, i.e. "Book of the names and readings of the Old and New Test. according to the Karkaphic recension." The latter expression denotes that the work was prepared in the Jacobitic monastery *Karkaph*, which by a mistake lent the name and idea of a *Karkaphic ora Karkaphensian recension* (see Martin, *Tradition Karckaphienne, ou la Massore chez les Syriens* [Paris, 1870]). After this, all notices concerning a Karkaphensian version, which are found in the introductions to and cyclopedias and dictionaries of the Bible, must disappear once for all. The same French writer also called attention to the fact that, like the Jews, who have an Eastern and Western, a Babylonian and Palestinian, Masorah, so likewise we must distinguish between an Eastern and Western, a Nestorian and Jacobitian, Masorah among the Syrians; and this he laid down in his *Syriens Orientaux et Occidentaux* (*ibid.* 1872): "Essai sur les deux principaux dialectes Arameens;" to which we may add a third essay by the same author: *Histoire de la Ponctuation ou de la Massore chez les Syriens* (*ibid.* 1875). These three essays are very important for the reading and understanding of the Syriac version. Passing over the other versions, which will be treated in the art. SYRIAC VERSIONS, we must state that the *deuterocanonical books*, which are not found in Lee's edition of the Peshito, were already translated before the 4th century, for Ephlemln the Syrian already quotes them. Thus under the formula of **ἑβραϊστί** he cites Ecclus. 3, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13 (*Opp. Graec.* 1, 85); 11:5 (*ibid.* p. 92); 4:7 (*ibid.* p. 101); with **καθὼς ἑβραϊστί** he quotes Wisd. 4:7; 8:1-17 (*ibid.* p. 241); 3, 1; 4:15 (*ibid.* p. 256); 7:16 (*ibid.* 2, 28); Ecclus. 2, 1 he introduces with **ὡς ἡ γραφή φησι** (*ibid.* 2, 327), etc. In 861 Lagarde published the

apocryphal books of the Old Test. under the title *Libri Apocryphi V. T. Syriace* a Ceriani, in his *Monsumenta Sacra et. Prqofna*, tom. 1, published the apocalypse of Baruch and the epistle of Jeremiah; in the 5th vol. the 4th book of Esdras; and in the 7th vol. (Mediol. 1874) he published the Wisdom of Solomon and Ecclesiasticus.

The apocryphal literature of the New Test., as far as it has been published, is given by Renan, *Fragments du Livre Gnostique institut. Apocal. d'Adam ou Penitence ou Testament d'Adam, publiq d'apres deux versions Syr.*, in the *Jour. As.* ser. 5, tom. 2, p. 427; by Lagarde, in *Didascalia Apostoolarum Syriace*. (Lips. 1854); by Cureton, in his *Ancient Documents*, and Lagarde's *Reliquice Jusris Eccles. Antiquissimae Syriace*, 1856; by H. Cowper, in, the *Apocr. Gospels and other Documents*, etc. (2nd ed. Lond. 1867); and by Wright, *Contributions to the Apocryphal Literature of the New Test., collected and edited from Syriai MSS. in the British Museum* (ibid. 1865).

Between the translation of the Scriptures and the classic period of Syriac literature there existed a gap covering about three hundred years, which is now filled through. Curetol's *Ancient Syriac Documents relative to the Earliest Establishment of Christianity in Edessa* (Lond. 1864). Eusebius, in his Church History, tells us that he translated the correspondence: between Christ and king Abgar of Edessa, together with the narrative of the healing and conversion of that king by Thaddaeus, one of the seventy disciples, from the archives of Edessa. A part of this report has been found in Nitrian MSS. of the 5th and 6th centuries, under the title *The Doctrine of Addai* (lately published, with an English translation by Philipps, Lond. 1876). From this we learn that Addai, one of the seventy, converted not only the king Abgar Ukkama, but also a great many of the people, and built churches in and about Edessa. Addai was succeeded by Aggaeus, who was murdered. Besides Aggaeus, a good many others suffered martyrdom, for which comp. *Acta Martyroruns Orient. et Occident.* (Rom. 1748, 2 tom, ed. Assemani).

I. Orthodox Writers. — Towards the middle of the 4th century begins *the golden cera of, Syriac literature*, and under this head we mention Jacob, bishop: of Nisibis (q.v.). Although later MSS. contain something under his name, yet no genuine works are now extant. Contemporary with Jacob was Aphraat or Farhad, surnamed the "Persian sage," the author of homilies written between 337 and 345, and published by Antonelli in the Arrenian,

with a Latin paraphrase, in 1756, but of late in the original Syriac by Wright (Lond. 1869). Prof. Bickell translated eight of these homilies into German (in the *Bibliothek der Kirchengvafer* [Kempten, 1874], No. 102,103). On Aphraat see Sasse, *Prolegomena in Aphraatis Sapientis Perse Seraones Homileticos* (Lips. 1878), and Schonfelder, in the *Tübingen theolog. Quartalschrift*, 1878, p. 195-256.

Of greater renown was Ephrem. (q.v.), who died in A.D. 373, and whose writings were translated not only into Latin and Greek, but also into the Armenian, Coptic, Arabic, Abyssinian, and Slavonic. Besides Ephrem, we mention Gregory, abbot in Cyprus about 390, author of epistles; Baleus, whose hymns are given by Overbeck in his *S. Ephremi Syri, BabvuZe, Balcei aliorumgue Opera Selecta* (Oxford, 1865); by Wenig, in his *Schola Syriaca* (Innsbruck, 1866); and in a German translation by Bickell, in *Ausgewählte Gedichte der syrischen Kirchengviter* (Kempten, 1872). Balaeus's contemporary was Cyrillonas, whose *hymns* were also translated by Bickell (*loc. cit.*).

Towards the end of the 4th and beginning of the 5th century lived and wrote Marilthas, bishop of Tagrit, author of a martyrology (printed in Assemani's *Bibliotheca*) and hymns. The canons of the Synod of Seleucia (410) concerning Church discipline, and bearing his name and that of Isaac, bishop of Seleucia, have been published after a Paris MS. by Lamy: *Concilium Seleucice et Ctesiphonti-habutum anno 410, ed. vert. illustr.* (Louvain, 1869); Rabula, bishop of Edessa (died 435), author of epistles, canons, and hymns, for which comp. Overbeck (*loc. cit.*); and Bickell; In the year 460 died Isaac the Great (q.v.), presbyter of Antioch. His hymns are translated by Zingerle, in the *Tübingen theolog. Quartalschrift*, 1870, and by Bickell, in the *Kemptzner Bibliothek der Kirchengvder*, 1872, No. 44. The latter has also published *S. Isaaci Antiocheni, Doctoris Syrorum, Opera omnia, ex omnibus, quotquot extant, Codicibus Manuscriptis cum varia lectione Syriace Arabiceque primus edidit, Latine vertit, Prolegomenis. et Glossario auxit* (Giessen, 1873-77, 2 vols.); see also Zingerle, *Monumenta Syriaca ex Ronanlis Codicibus Collecta* (Eniponti, 1869), 1, 13-20. Contemporary with Isaac was the monk Dada, who wrote about three hundred works on Biblical, homiliacal, and hagiographical matter. About the same time lived Cosmas, the biographer of Simeon the Stylite (see *Biblioth. Orient.* and *Acta A Martyrorum Oriental.*). Towards the end of the 5th and beginning of the 6th century lived Joshua the Stylite of Edessa, author of a chronicle covering the years 495-507, which has

been edited by Martin, *Chronique de Josug le Stylite, écrite vers l'an 515. Texte et Traduction* (Leips. 1876), and Jacob, bishop of Sarug (q.v.). In the work by Abbelfus, *De Vita et Scriptis S. Jacobi Batnarum Sarugi in Mesopotamnia Episcopi* (Louvain, 1867), three biographies of Sarug are given. More recent is Martin's *Eveque-Pobte au Vet au Vie Siecles, ou Jacques de Saroug, sa Vie, son Temps, ses Livres, ses Croyances*, in the *Revue des Sciences Ecclesiastiques*, Oct. and Nov. 1876, p. 309-352, 385419. According to Martin, Sarug was a heretic, for he says, "Jacob was born, lived, and died in heresy; he loved everything which the Church condemned, and condemned everything that the Church loved at that time." His hymns Bickell published in a German translation in the *Ausgewahlte; Gedichte syrischer Kircheanvter*. Of Sarug's writings, some were published in the *Monumenta Syriaca*, 1, 21-96; 2, 52-63; 76-166; in Assemani's *Acta Martyr.* 2, 230; Cureton, *Ancient Documents*, p. 86 sq.; Wenig, *Schola Syr.* p. 155; by Zingerle, in the *Zeitschrift der, deutsch. morgenl. Gesellsch.* 1858, p. 115; 1859, p. 44; 1860, p. 679; 1864, p. 751; 1866, p. 511; by the same author, six homilies were published at Bonn in 1867. Martin published in the *Zeitschrift der deutsch. morgenl. Gesellsch.* 1875, p. 107-137, *Discours de Jacques de Saroug sur la Chute des Idoles*; and *ibid.* 1876, p. 217-275, *Lettres de Jacques de Saroug aux moins du Convent de Mar Bassus et a Paul d'Edesse, relevges et traduits*; Dr. K. Schrfter, *ibid.* 1877, p. 360, the *Consolatory Epistle to the Hinmyaritic Christians*, in the original Syriac, with notes. In the 6th century also lived John Saba, a monk, a native of Nineveh, author of sermons and epistles, published in Greek (Leips. 1770), and Isaac of Nineveh (q.v.) (see *Monumenta Syriaca*, 1, 97-101), author of an ascetic work in seven books, and known in the Greek translation, made by Fabricius and Abraham, and given under the title *Libri de Contemptu Mundi*, in the 11th vol. of the *Maga Bibliotheca Patrum*, where they are erroneously ascribed to Isaac of Antioch. With Isaac of Nineveh the list of orthodox writers is closed, and we come now to:

II. Heterodox Writers. —

1. The Nesforians. — Without entering upon the history of these Christians, we will only remark that the catalogue of Ebedjesu on Nestorian writers was first published by Abraham Ecchellensis (Rome, 1653), but more correctly by Assemani in the 3rd vol. of his *Biblioth. Orient.* Besides, we find many literary and historical notices in Assemani's

catalogue of the Oriental MSS. of the Vatican Library, or in the *Bibliothecae Apoatol. Vatic. Codicum MSS. Catalogus S. E. et J. S. Ass. recensuerunt Tom. II, complectens Libros Chald. sive Syros* (ibid. 1758), and in the Appendix by Cardinal Mai, in the *Catal. Codd. Bibl. Vatic. Arabb. etc. item ejus paitis Hebr. et Syriacc. quarn. Assemani in editione praetermiserunt* (ibid. 1831). **SEE NESTORIANS.**

The earliest writers among the Nestorians were Barsuma (q.v.), bishop of Nisibis and author of epistles; Narses (d. 496), surnamed "the Harp of the Spirit," author of commentaries on the Old Test., three hundred and sixty orations, a liturgy, a treatise on the sacrament of baptism, another on evil morals, various interpretations, paracletic sermons, and hymns (see Schonfelder; *Hymnen, Proklamationen u. Martyrergesdngne des Nestorian Breviers, in the Tübingen theolog. Quartalschrift*, 1866, p. 177 sq.); Mar Abba (d. 552), who wrote a commentary on the Old Test. and a translation of the Old Test. from the Sept., the latter not extant; Abraham of Kashkar, author of epistles and a commentary on the dialectics of Aristotle; Paul of Nisibis, an exegetical writer; Babseus or Babi, surnamed "the Great," archimandrite of Nisibis in 563, a voluminous writer and author of *On the Incarnation*, an exposition of the ascetical treatise of Evagrius of Pontus, a history of the Nestorians, hymns for worship through the circle of the year, an exposition of the sacred text, monastic rules, etc.; Iba, Kuma, and Proba, doctors of Edessa, who translated in the 5th century the commentaries of Theodore of Mopsuestia and the writings of Aristotle into Syriac; Hanana of Adiabene, an exegetical writer; Joseph the Huzite, a mystic; John Saba, author of epistles; John of Apamea, author of ascetical treatises. Famous as grammarians and lexicographers were Honain Ibn-Ishak (d. 876), Bar-Ali (about 885), Bar-Bahlul (about 963), and Elias bar-Shinaja (d. 1049).

Of the writers whose works were published, at least in parts, we mention Jesujabh of Adiabene, patriarch about 660, and author of *Da-Huphok Chusobee*, or *On the Conversion or Change of Opinions*, an exhortation to certain disciples, and a ritual; Thomas Margensis, about the middle of the 9th century, author of a history of the monastery of Beth-Abe, published by Assemani; John bar-Algora, patriarch about 900, and author of, canons, Church questions, and decisions, in part given by Assemanui; George, metropolitan of Arbela and Mossil, author of an explanation of the liturgy, by Assemani; and Timothy II, patriarch about 1318, author of a treatise on the sacraments, also given by Assemani. The ethical work, *The Book of the*

Bee, by Solomon, bishop of Bassora (about 1222), has lately been published with a Latin translation by Schfelder, *Salomonis Ep. Bassorensis Liber Apis, Syriacum Arabicumque textum Latine vertit* (Bamberg, 1866); George Varda, two of whose hymns are given in an English translation by Badger, in his *The Nestorians and their Rituals* (Lond. 1852), 2, 51, 83, 95; Chamis bar-Kardache, whose hymn on the incarnation is also given by Badger (*loc.cit.* p. 39). The latest writer among the Nestorians was Ebedjesu (q.v.), metropolitan of Saba (d. 1318).

After the 16th century, a great part of the Nestorians returned to the Church of Rome. From their midst a number of polemical writings in the Syriac language were published against the errors of their countrymen, as the *Three Discourses on Faith*, about the year 1600, by the archimandrite Adam (afterwards as bishop of Amida, called Timothy). These discourses are given by P. Strozza, in his *De Dogmatibus Chaldeorum Disput.* (Rom. 1617), and in *Synodalia Chaldeorum* (*ibid.*), where also the synodical letter of the patriarch Elias to Paul V, in a Latin translation, and the hymn of the patriarch Ebedjesu in honor of Pius IV, in the Syriac, is given. About, 1700 the patriarch Joseph II wrote the *Clear Mirror*, parts of which are given by *Assemanii* and in our days the Chaldean priest Jos. Guriel published at Rome (1858) his *Lectiones Dogmatt. de Divini Incarnatione quas in Perside habebat*.

2. The Monophysites. — Of this class of writers we mention John, bishop of Tella, whose canons were published by Lamy in *De Syrorum Fide in Re Eucharistie*. — p. 62-97 (see also Land, *Anecdota Syriaca*, 2. 169, and *Cod. AMus. Brit.* add. 12,174, fol. 152); Paul, bishop, of Callinicum, the first translator of Severus's writings; Xenajas or Philoxenus (q.v.), bishop of Hieraplis (Mabug), the author of a Bible translation, commentaries *De Trinitate et Incaarnatione* and *De Uno ex: Trinitate Incarnato et Passo* (Jacob of Edessa calls Xelajas one of the four classic. writers of Syria); Simeon, bishop of Betharsam (d. 525), author of epistles, given by Assemani in the *Bibl. Orient.* 1, 346,361; Peter of Callinicum (578-591), author of polemical works and hymns (see *Cod. Mus. Brit.* add. 14,591, p. 69); John of Ephesus (q.v.), author of an ecclesiastical history; Jacob of Edessa (q.v.), author of a recension of the Syro-Hexaplaric translation, fragments of which are given by Ceriani in the 2nd and 5th vols. of his *Monumenta Easra*; besides, he wrote commentaries and scholia on the Holy Scriptures (published by Philipps, *Scholia on Passages of the Old Test.* [Lond. 1864]), epistles (given in the *Bibl. Orient.* 1, 479, and by

Wright, in *the Jour. of Sac. Lit.* Jan. 1867), canons (given by Lagarde, in *Reliquiae Juris Eccles. Syr.* p. 117, and by Lamy, in *De Syrorum Fide in Re Eucharistica*, p. 98); his essay on the *Shekem Hammephorash* was published by Nestle in the *Zeitschrif, der deutsch. mogenl. Gesellschaft*, 1878, 3, p. 465 sq.; he also introduced a more correct vocalization (see Martin, *Jacques d'Edesse et les Voyelles Syriennes* [Paris, 1870]); George, bishop of the Arabs, in the beginning of the 8th century (see Lagarde, *Analecta*, I. 108-134); Dionysius, patriarch of Telmachar, who, perusing the works of Eusebius, Socrates, and Josli of Ephesus, wrote annals from the Creation to A.D. 1775, the first book of which was published by F. Tullberg, *Dionysii Tetahrensis* (Upsala, 1850), lib. 1; John of Dara (q.v.), author of four books on the resurrection of the body (extant), two books on the ecclesiastical and celestial hierarchies, four books on the priesthood, and a liturgy (see Zingerle. in the *Tübingen theolog. Quartalschritf*, 1867, p. 183-205; 1868, p. 267-285; *Monumenta Syriaca ex Rom. Collecta*, 1, 105 sq., and Overbeck, *loc. cit.* p. 409); Moses bar-Cephas (q.v.), author of a commentary on the Paradise (published by Masius in a Latin translation at Antwerp in 1569); besides, he wrote on the hexaemeron, an exposition of the Old and New Test., tracts on the liturgy, and seven homilies: Masius's *Mosis Barceph. 3. Libri Comment. de Paradiso ad Igsnat. Lat. redd.* is also found in the *Bibl. Patr. Lugdun.* 17:456; Dionysius bar-Calib (d. 1171), commentator; of his commentaries only those on the four gospels are extant: he also wrote on the incarnation and sacraments (not extant), against certain heresies (not extant), and an oration and tracts on ordination, schism, and confession (extant); John of Mardin (d. 1165) (see the *Bibl. Orient.* 2, 217 sq.); Jacob of Maiperkin, author of a dogmatical work, *The Book of Treasures*, mentioned by Assemani, and an address to such as are to be ordained (given in part in a Latin translation by Denzinger in his *Ritus Orientalium in Administrandi Sacram.* [Würzburg. 1863], 2, 106 sq.). The series of monophysitic writers is closed by a man who surpassed all his predecessors, namely, Gregory Abulfaraj bar-Hebraeus. As the literature given under the art.

ABULFARAJ *SEE ABULFARAJ* (q.v.) is very deficient, and has of late greatly increased, we give it here by way of supplement. As a historian, Bar-Hebrmeus proved himself in his chronicle, which is now complete in the edition by Abbelus and Lamy, *Gregorii bar-Hebrai Chronicon Ecclesiasticum quod e Codiae Musei Britannici Descriptum Conjuncta Opera Ediderunt, Latinitate Donarunt Annotationibusque Theologicis, Historicis, Geographicis et Archcologicis Illustrarunt* (Louvain, 1872,

1874, 1877, 3 vols.); that part of the chronicle which traits of the crusade of king Richard I of England is given in the original with an English translation in the *Syritic Reading Lessons*, published by Bagster and Sons (Lond.). Of his dogmatical works, we mention, *Menoorath Kudsai*, i.e. “the lamp of the sanctuary,” a body of theology extant in Arabic written in the Syrian character; *Kotholt Dazelfie*, i.e., “the, book of rays,” a compendium of theology, extensively described by Assemani. He also wrote *Kothobo da-Dubori*. i.e. “the book of morals,” a compendium of ethics, chiefly deduced from the fathers and ascetical writers, and *Kothobo da-Tunoye Maphreg’isi*, “the book of pleasant narratives,” a collection of anecdotes, stories, and sentiments from Persian, Indian, Hebrew, Mohammedan, and Christian writers, in twenty chapters (see Adler, *Brevis Linguae Syriac Institutio* [Altona, 1784]). The ecclesiastical and civil law he treats in his *Kothobo da-Hudoye* i.e. “the book of directions,” published in a Latin translation by Mai in the 10th vol. of his *Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio* (Rom. 1838). His *Autsar Rozi*, or “treasury of mysteries” his greatest exegetical work is a commentary on the Holy Scriptures, and has elicited many monographs. Larsow’s intention to publish a new edition has not been realized. Of monographs, we mention the general *Paroanion* and the *Scholia on Job*, in *Kirsch Chrestoma. Syr.* (Leips. 1832, ed. Bernstein), p. 143, 186; Rhode, *Abulpharagii Scholia in Psalm 5 et 18* (Breslauri, 1832); Winkler, *Carmen Deborce cur Scholiis Barhebraeanis* (ibid. 1839); Tullberg, *Scholia in Jesajam et in Psalmos Scholiorum Specimen (Proaem. et Scholia in Psalm 1, 2, 22 [Upsala, 1842])*; Knobloch, *Greg. B. 1. Scholia in. Psalm 68 primums ed. eti.* (Breslauri, 1852; Korsenarid Wellberg, *Greg. B.H. Scholia in Jerem.* (Upsala, 1852); id., *Geq. Scholia in ^{<390B>}Psalm 8:40, 41, 50* (Breslau. 1857. ed. R.S.F. Schrster); id. *Scholia in ^{<049E>}Genesis 49:50; —Exodus 32-34; Judges 5*, in *Zeitschrift der deutsch. moygenl. Gesellsch.* 24:495 sq.; id. *Scholia on Psalm 3*, in 6:7, 9-15. 23:53 (together with bar-Hebraeus’s preface to the New Test. in the same review, 29:247303); id. *Greg. B.H. B Scholia in Jobi* (Breslau, 1858, B4 Bernstein) Schwarz, *Gregorii bar-Ebhrya in vangeliium Johannis Commentarins. E Thesauro Mysteriorum Desumptum*, edidit (Gött. 1878); Klamroth, *Gregorii Abulal agii bar-Ebhrya in Actus Apostolorum et Epistulcas Catholicas Adnotationes, Syricae* (ibid. 1878). He was also not only distinguished as a poet and grammarian, but combined also both qualities in that of a grammatical poet. His short grammar in meter was published by Bertheau, *Greg BH. Granamm. Linguae Syr. in Metro Ephrcemeo* (Gött. 1843), while Martin

published the (*Etuves Grammaticales d'Abou faradj dit bar-Hebraeus* (Paris, 1872, 2 vols.). Of his poems, Wolff published a *Specimen Carminum. ed. vert. in.* (Lips. 1834), and Lengerke, *Ab. Carmns. Syrr. aliquot. adhuc inedita ed. ert. in.* (Konigsberg, 1836-38); but lately they have been published by. A. Scebabi, *Gregorii bar-Hebräer Carmina Corrsecta, ac ab eodem Lexicon Adjunctum* (Rom. 1877). **SEE MONOPHYSITES.**

3. Monothelitic Writers. —The only writer who certainly belonged to this sect was homas of Haran, bishop of Kapharlab, who in 1089 sent an apology of the monothelitic doctrine to the patriarch John of Antioch. But there is a controversy where the patriarch of Antioch, John Maro, was a Catholic, monothelite, or a mystical person, and whether the Maronites were already orthodox before the crusades. The writings, which go under his name, the *Metul Kohunotha*, a treatise on the priesthood, and, a commentary on the liturgy, are not his — the former belongs to John of Dara, the latter to Dionysius bar-Calib. But there is no reason to deny him the authorship of the treatise on the faith of the Church against the Monophysites and Nestorians, which is preserved in a MS. dated 1392, and written in Syriac with an Arabic translation.

III. Translations. — The translations made from the Greek into Syriac are very numerous, especially of the writings of the apostolic fathers. The Syrians had both epistles of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians (see Lagarde, *Clementis Romani Recognitiones Syriace* [Lips. 1861]; id. *Clementina* [ibid. 1865]; Funk, *Die yrische Uebersetzung der Clemensbriefe*, in the *Theolog. (Quartalschrift*, 1877, p. 477; and Hilgenfeld, *Die Brief des romischen Clemens undihre syrische Uebersetzung*, in the *Zeitschrift für wissensch. Theol.* 1877, 20 pt. 4). On the seven epistles of Ignatius of Antioch, see, as for the controversy, the art. **SEE IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH**, and add Lipsius, *Ueber das Verhältniss der 3 syr. Briefe des Ignatius zu den übrisqen Recenss. der ignat. Literatur* (ibid. 1859), and Merx, *Meletemata Ignatiana* (Breslau, 1861).

A somewhat peculiar work is the *Gnomology* mentioned by Origen, and ascribed to Sixtus I (in the beginning of the 2nd century), published in Latin by Hillesemius in 1574 and by Siber in 1725. Lagarde has published it in the Syriac according to Nitrial MSS. in his *Analecta*. Very important also are the contributions of the Syrian Church to the apologetic literature

of the 2nd century. In Cureton's *Spicilegium* we find an oration of Melito of Sardes, written about A.D. 160 to Iarc Aurel, in which he tries to show the folly of polytheism and seeks to gain him for the Christian faith. A German translation of this oration was made by Wette, in the *Tübingen Quarfalschrift*, 1862. Besides this oration, Cureton also gives some fragments from Melito's writings on the body and soul, on the cross and faith. In the same *Spicilegium* we find another apologetic work, which is otherwise mentioned as the "oration to the Greeks" by Justin. The Syrian text ascribes it to Ambrose, a Greek. Fragments of a Syrian translation of Irenaeus are given by Pitra in the *Spicilegium Solesnmense* (Paris, 1852), 1, 3, 6.

The Nitrian MSS. also contain much material pertaining to the works of Hippolytus, the author of the *Philosophumena*. Lagarde, who published a Greek edition of Hippolytus (*ilippolyti Romanoī quae feruntur tannia Greece* [Lips. 1858]), has collected the Syriani fragments in his *Analecta*, 1). 79-91; and in his *Appendix ad Analecta sua Syriaca* (ibid. 1858), he gives Arabic fragments of Hippolytus's commentary on the Apocalypse. As for the Syriac fragments, they contain in extract of Hippolytus's commentary on Daniel. Chapters 8 and 11 he refers to Persia, Alexander, and Antiochus Epiphanes; the four kingdoms (ch. 2 and 7) are the Babylonian, Persian, Macedonian, and Roman; the ten horns (ch. 7) he refers to ten kingdoms growing out of the Roman empire, three of which Egypt, Ethiopia, and Libya-will be annihilated by the antichrist. Besides the commentary on Daniel, these fragments also contain a scholium on the authors division, collection, and order of the Psalms, fragments of a commentary on the Song of Songs, also fragments of a treatise on the resurrection (in which the deacon Nicolaus is designated as the author of the Nicolaitans) addressed to the empress Mammaea, on the Passover, the four animals by Ezekiel, and the genealogy of *Jesus Christ*.

In Lagarde's *Reliquie Juris Eccles. Antiquissimae Syriace* (Lips. 1856), we also have the minutes of the Carthaginian Synod of 256, together with Cyprian's epistles and the *Epistola Canonica* of Peter of Alexandria in the Syrian version, while the *Analecta* by the same author contain Syriac writings and fragments of Gregory Thaumaturgus. A fragment of an epistle of pope Felix I to Maximus of Alexandria is contained in Zingerle's *Monumenta Syriaca*. This much for the ante-Nicene period. As to the *post-Nicene period*, we mention two works of Harris' Cowper, *Analecta Nicana* (Lond. 1857), fragments relating to the Council of Nice, and

Syriac Miscellanies (ibid. 1861), or extracts relating to the first and second general councils, and various quotations. In these two works we have Constantia's invitatory address to the bishops of the Nicene Council, his decree against Arius, and the episcopal signatures to councils of the 4th century.

A great favorite with the *Syrian* translators was Eusebius of Caesarea, whose ecclesiastical history is preserved for the greatest part in London and St. Petersburg MSS. of the 5th and 6th centuries. Specimens of the Syriac translation were given by Cureton in the *Corpus Ignatianum*, in the *Spicilegium* and *Ancient Documents*, while Wright is preparing a Syriac edition, who also edited and translated in the *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* July, Oct., 1866, a treatise *On the Star*, ascribed to Eusebius, and which is found in a MS. of the 6th century. *The Theophany* (θεοφανεία), long lost, was discovered by Tattam in a Nitrian monastery, and was edited, under the title *Eusebius on the Theophania or Divine Manifestation of Jesus Christ*, by Lee (Lond. 1842), who also translated the same into English (ibid. 1843). The MS. is now in the British Museum, and Lee assigns it to A.D. 411. The *Theophania* has the same object in view as the ἀπόδειξις εὐαγγελική, the *Demonstratio Evangelica*. It speaks in the *first book* of the Logos, the mediator between God and the world, and the prototype of the divine ideas expressed in the Creation, refuting at the same time atheism, polytheism, pantheism, and materialism. The *second book* treats of the fall and sin, and of the necessity of a divine intervention for the conversion and sanctification of mankind; the *third* speaks of the incarnation of the divine Logos, his redeeming death, resurrection, etc., the *fourth* speaks of the fulfillment of the prophecies of Christ concerning the extension of his kingdom, the destruction of Jerusalem, the Temple, etc.; the *fifth book* refutes the objections made to Christ's miracles as being magical humbug or invented by his disciples.

Of greater import are the *Festal Letters* of Athanasillus, long lost in the Greek original, but found in a Nitrian MS., from which they were edited by Cureton in 1846, who also published an English translation in 1848; another English translation is given by Burgess and Williams in the *Library of the Fathers* (Oxford, 1854); they were translated into German and annotated by Larsow (Leips. 1852), while the original, with a Latin translation, is given by Mai in the *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca* (Rom. 1853), 6:1-168.

Besides the writers already mentioned, we must name Titus, bishop of Bostra, who wrote four books against the Manicheans, imperfect in the Greek, but complete in the Syriac translation, and edited by Lagarde, *Titi Bostreni contra Manichaeos Libri IV Syriace* (Berl. 1859); Cyril of Alexandria, whose commentary on Luke has been edited by Payne Smith, *S. Cyrilli Alex. Archiep. Commentarii in Lucce Evangelium* (Oxford, 1858). Of the translations of Gregory of Nyssa and Chrysostom only a few fragments have been published (see Zingerle, *Monumenta Syriaca*, 1, 111, 117). The *Physiologus*, erroneously ascribed to Basil, was published (1795) by Tyschen, *Physiologus Syrus, seu Hist. Animalium 32 in Sacra Scriptura Memoratorum*. A part of the *Paradise*, an account of the acts and discourses of the most eminent Egyptian monks, erroneously ascribed to Palladius and Jerome, has been published by Dietrich, *Codd. Syriacorum Specimina, quae ad Illustrandam Dogmatis de Cesna Sacra, nee non Scripturae Syr. Historiam facerent* (Marburg, 1855).

After the 5th century, the translations — from Greek Church fathers gradually cease, because the Syrians from that time on either belong to the Nestorians or Monophysites. The Nestorians translated the writings of Diodorus and Theodore of Mopsuestia for excerpts from their writings (see Lagarde, *Analecta*), while Theodore's commentary on Genesis has lately been published by Sachau, *Theodori thopsuesteni Fragmenta Syriaca, edidit aqtgue in Latf. seran. vertit* (Lips. 1869); the Monophysites translated Severus's writings, whose homilies were translated at the same time by Paul of Callinicum, and later by Jacob of Edessa. Four visitation discourses of Severus are translated into Latin from the Syriac by Mai in *Script. Veterum, Nova Coll.* 9:742 sq. Some fragments from Jacob's translation of Severus's homilies are published by Martin, who also published Jacob's epistle to George, bishop of Sarug, concerning Syriac orthography (see *Jacobi Episc. Edesseni Epistola ad Georgium Episc. Sarugensem de Orthographia Syriaca; subsequuntur ejusdem Jacobi necnon Thomsa Diaconi Tractatus de Punctis aliaque Documenta in eandem materiam* (Paris, 1869), to which must be added Phillips, *A Letter by Mar Jacob on Syriac Orthography*, also a *Tract* by the same author, and a *Discourse by Gregorius bar-Hebr. on Syriac Accents* (Lond. 1869), to which are added appendices. In fine, we mention the translation of the epistles of pope Julius I, which is given by Lagarde in his *Analecta*, p. 67-79, while the original Greek is contained in Mai's *SS. Vett. Nova Coll.* 7:165, and in the Appendix to Lagarde's *Titi Bostreni*. Of translations from

other languages besides the Greek, little is to be said, unless we mention the-works into modern Syriac issued from the press at Urumiah, as the translation of the Bible, of Baxter's *Rest of the Saints*, Bunvan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, etc.

IV. Liturgies. — The Syrian churches are rich in sacramental liturgies. The Eastern Syrians use a liturgical form, which has been transmitted to them by the apostles of Edessa and Seleucia, Addai and Maris, while the Western Syrians use the liturgy of James, which has become the basis for the liturgical service throughout the Orient. The works which treat on the Oriental liturgies are Assemani's *Codex Liturg.* (Rom. 1749-66); Renaudot, *Liturgiarum Orientt. Collectio* (Par. 1716); Daniel, *Cod. Lit.* (Lips. 1853), tom. 4; Neale, *History of the Holy Eastern Church* (Lond. 1850); Neale and Littledale, *The Liturgies of SS. Mark, James, Clement, Chrysostom, and Basil, and the Church of Malabar* (2nd ed. *ibid.* 1869), translated with introduction and appendices.

The liturgical service (*Kurbono*, "the oblation or access;" also *Kudsho*, "the holy ritual") of all the Syrian churches consists of two principal parts, the first being performed in the public congregation, composed alike of the faithful and the general hearers, but the second available only to the baptized, or believers. This latter part is called *anaphora*, or "the uplifting," a term referring both to the presentation of the eucharistic materials on the altar and to the devotional elevation of the mind in the communicants. Of these anaphoras, a few are the productions of Syrian fathers; the rest are versions or adaptations from the Greek. The oldest anaphora is that of James, which is the basis of that great number of anaphoras which are used among the Jacobites and Maronites. The lesser liturgy of James is an abridgment of the former by Gregory bar-Hebraeus. This is used on comparatively private occasions, as baptisms and matrimony. To Peter, chief of the apostles, are ascribed the Jacobitic anaphoras, found by Renaudot and by Howard in his *Christians of St. Thomas and their Liturgies from Syriac MSS.* (Oxf. and Lond. 1864). The *Liturgy of the Twelve Apostles*, compiled by Luke, is found by Renaudot, Howard, Neale, and Littledale. There are also liturgies ascribed to John, Mark, Clement of Rome, Dionysius of Athens, Ignatius of Antioch, Matthew the pastor, Xystus and Julius (bishops of Rome), and Celestine, whose liturgy Wright published (*The Liturgy of St. Celestine, Bishop of Rome*) in the *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* April, 1867, p. 332. To orthodox Greek

fathers are ascribed the anaphoras of Eustathius of Antioch, Basil; Gregory of Nazianzum, Chrysostom, and Cyril of Alexandria. To orthodox Syrians are ascribed the anaphoras of Maruthas, Jacob of Sarug, and Simeon the Persian. To Greek heretics belong the anaphoras of Severus of Antioch and Dioscurus of Alexandria.

All these anaphoras are either spurious or very dubious, while those prepared by the bishops, especially the patriarchs of the Syrian Jacobites, have more historical foundation in their favor. Of such we mention Philoxenus, Jacob Bardaeus, Thomas of Charchel, John of Bassora, Jacob of Edessa, Eleazar bar-Sabetha of Babylon (also called "Philoxenus of Bagdad" in the 9th century), Moses Barcepha, John bar-Shushan (d. 1073), John of Haran and Mardin (d. 1165; in Catholic missals erroneously called "Chrysostom"), Dionysius bar-Calib, the patriarchs Michael the Elder, John Scriba or the Lesser (towards the beginning of the 13th century), John Ibn-Maadani (d. 1263), Gregory bar-Hebraeus, Dioscorus of Kardu (at the end of the 13th century), and Ignatius Ibi-Wahib (d. 1332).

All the anaphoras which we have mentioned are published either in the original or in a translation, but there are some which are extant only in MS. or known from incidental quotations. Altogether there are about sixty anaphoras belonging to the family of Syro-Jacobitic liturgies.

From the West-Syrian liturgies we come now to East-Syrians, who, as we have already stated, used a liturgical form transmitted to them from Addai and Maris, which is the *Norma normans*, while sometimes the anaphoras of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius is used. The latter was, according to Ebedjesu, translated by Thomas of Edessa and Marabbau. The anaphoras of Narses, Barsumas, and Diodore of Tarsus, mentioned by Ebedjesu, are lost. The liturgy of the apostles, together with the Gospels and Epistles, is found in Syriac in the *Missale Chaldaicum ex Decreto S. Congreg. de Propaganda Fide editum* (Rom. 1767); *Ordo Chaldaicus Missal 'Beatorum app. juxta Ritum Eccles. Malabar.* (ibid. 1774) *Ordo Chaldaicus Rituum et Lectionum juxta Morem Eccl. Malachi* (ibid. 1775); *Tukhse we Kejane da Chedata wa de Attiketha akh Tekhsa Kaldaja de Malabar* (ibid. 1844) (comp. also Renaudot, Neale, and Littledale [*loc. cit.*]).

V. Ritual — the main work on this subject is Denzinger's *Ritus Orientalium Copo, Copm, Syrorum et Armenorum in Administrandis*

Sacramentis (Würzburg 1863-64, 2 vols.), who collected his material from Assemani, *Codex Liturg. Ecclesice Universae in XV libr. distributus* (Rom. 1749-66), and perused that left by the late Renaudot, as well as the documents copied for that purpose by Zingerle from MSS. at Rome. The ritual for “baptism” among the *Nestorians*, said to be used by the apostles Addai and Maris, and fixed by Jesaujab of Adiabene in the 7th century, is found in the *Cod. Lit.*, by Badger in his *Nestorians*, and Denzinger. The *Jacobites* have many baptismal rituals, one of which is ascribed to James, the brother of the Lord; while another, transmitted by Christ to the apostles, and instituted by Severus, is, according to a Florentine MS., said to have been translated into Syriac by Jacob of Edessa (comp. Assemani, *Bibliothecae Mediceae, Laurentianae et Palatinae Codicum Manuscript. Orient. Catalogus* [Flor. 1742], p. 83). The same Severus is said to have prepared two other baptismal rituals; besides, there is one by Philoxenus for cases of emergency. In three forms (for a boy, a girl, and many candidates) we have an order of baptism ascribed to Jacob of Edessa; another, called after St. Basil, is said to be of Melchitic origin, although the *Jacobites* use it. All these orders are found by Assemani and Denzinger. The *Maronites* also use the formulas of the apostles James and Jacob of Edessa; besides, they have one by Jacob of Sarug, an anonymous one, and one named after St. Basil. The latter two are only found by Deenzinger, the first also by Assemani. The distribution of the “eucharist” is described in the liturgies. The “penitential rite” as prescribed by the Nestorian Jesljab of Adiabene, together with that of the Jacobite Dionysius bar-Calib and other Jacobitic documents, are given by Denzinger, who also gives the Nestorian and Maronitic rite of “ordination,” on which also see Lee, *The Validity of the Holy Orders of the Church of England* (Lond. 1869). The order for “matrimony” according to the Nestorian and Jacobitic rite is also given by Denzinger. The sacrament of “extreme unction” has gradually disappeared among the Nestorians, although there is no doubt that it existed at an early time, as may be seen from several allusions made to it by Ephrem (see also *Codl. Vat. Syr.* 119, p. 127-128). The Jacobitic *Ordo Lamnpadis* (as this sacrament is called by the Western Syrians), Denzinger gives after Trombellii *Tractatus III de Extrema Unctione* (Bologna, 1776). In conclusion, we only add that the extensive Nestorian ritual for the burial of a priest is given, in English by Badger (*loc. cit.* 2, p. 282 sq.), and in the *Officium Defunctorum, ad Usam Maronitarum Gregorii XIII Impensa Chaldaicis Characteribus Impressum* (Rom. 1585), we find the ritual for the dead, both clerical and lay.

VI. *The Breviary.* — On this subject see, besides the breviaries, Badger (*loc. cit.* 2, 16-25), Dietrich (*Commentatio de-Psalterii Usu Publico et Divisione in Ecclesia Syriaca* [Marburg, 1862]), and the art **SEE BREVITARY** in this Cyclopaedia. The Nestorian office in its present form may be traced back to the 5th century. As early as the 5th century Theodul wrote on the mode of the recitation of the psalms in the office (q.v.). Narses wrote proclamations and hymns for the same, and Micha and Abraham of Bethrabban treat of the *Kathismatal* (q.v.) of the nocturn. In the 6th century, Marabba instituted antiphons (canons) for all psalms, while Babeus arranged the hymns for the days of the saints and other festivals. In the 7th century, according to the testimony of Thomas Margensis, the *Proprium de Tempore* (chudra) was arranged by Jesujab of Adiabene, which occasionally was altered by the insertion of new prayers and hymns, until it received its final revision about 1250 in the monastery of Deir Ellaitha at Miosul.

For better understanding, it is necessary to know the division of the Psalter among the Nestorians, which almost corresponds to that of the Greek Church. The book of Psalms is divided into twenty hullalas, to which is added as the twenty-first the song of Exodus 16 and Deuteronomy 32. The hullalas are again subdivided into fifty-seven (inclusive of Exodus 16 and ~~Exodus~~ Deuteronomy 32:60) marmithas. Each marmitha is preceded by a prayer and succeeded by the *Gloria Patri*. Each psalm has an antiphon (canon) after the first verse, which serves very often to impress the whole with a specific Christian character. The psalms thus arranged were printed at Mosul in 1866 and twice at Rome, *Psalterium Chaldaicum in Usum Nationis Chald. editum* (1842), and *Breviarium G. Chald. in Usum Nat. Chald. a Jos. Guriel, secundo editum* (1865). As it is not the object of this article to give a description of the breviary, we here mention only, for such as are interested, Dietrich, *Morgengebete der alten Kirche des Orients für die Festzeiten* (Leips. 1864); *Tatkhsa de teshmeshatha itainjatha de jaumatha shechine ve da star ve methida Kethaba dakdam vadebathar* (Mosutl, 1866); Schinfelder, in the *Tübingen Quartalschrift*, 1866, p. 179 sq.

The Western Syriac or Jacobitic office, with which the Maronitic corresponds for the greater part, is distinguished not only from the Eastern Syriac but also from all others, in not having the psalms as its main substance. The Jacobitic office is found in *Breviarium Feriale Syriacum* ,

*SS. Ephraemi et. Jacobi Syrorum juxta Ritum ejusdem Nationis, quod incipit a Feria II usque ad Sabbatum inclusive; additis variis Hymnis ac Benedictionibus. Ab Athan. Saphar Episcopo Mardin (Rom. 1696). The Sunday office may be found in *Officium Feriale juxta Ritum Ecclesiae Syrorum* (ibid. 1851). The office for the Passion week was published by Clodius from a Leipsic MS. in 1720, *Liturgice Syriacae Septimanae Passionis Dom. N. I. Chr. excerptume Cod. MS. Biblioth. Lips. ed. ac notis illustr.**

The Maronitic festival office is found in *Officia Sanctorum juxta Ritum Ecclesiae Macaronitarum* (Rom. 1666, 2 vols. fol.), and in *Breviarium Syriacum, Officium Feriale jurt. Rit. Eccl. Syr. Maron. Innocentii X Pont. Max. Jussu Editum, Denuo Typis Excusum* (5th ed. ibid. 1863), with an appendix containing the *Officium Defunctorum* and other prayers. An edition of the office was published on Mount Lebanon in 1855, *Be shem abba va bera va ructia de Kudsha alaha sharira tabeinan shechimeth akh ejada de ifa de Maronaje.*

It may not be out of order to speak here of the Syrian Church lectionary. The MSS. of the Syriac New Test., are strangers to the modern division of the books into chapters and verses, instead of which they divide the several books (except the Apocalypse) into reading lessons of different lengths, but averaging about fifteen of our verses. Thus the first lesson (~~1001~~ Matthew 1:1-17) is for the Sunday before Christmas; the second (ver. 1825) is entitled the revelation to Joseph; the third (~~1011~~ Matthew 2:1-12), vespers of Christmas; the fourth (~~1013~~ Matthew 2:13-18), matins of slaughter of the infants, etc. The four Gospels contain 248 lessons, of which seven are unappropriated or serve for any day, and the remaining 241 serve for 252 different occasions. The Acts and the Epistles (which are collectively called the *Apostles*) contain 242 lessons, of which twenty are unappropriated, and the remaining 222 serve for 241 occasions. On most of the occasions there was one lesson appointed from the Gospels, and one also from the Apostles. A tabular view of these lessons is given in the first appendix to Murdock's *New Test.* from the Syriac Peshito version (N.Y. 1869).

VII. Hymnology. — According to Hahn, the first hymnologist of the Syrians was the celebrated Gnostic Bardesanes, who flourished in the second half of the 2nd century. In this he is in some degree supported by Ephrem in his *Fifty-third Homily against Heretics* (2, 553), where, although he does not actually assert that Bardesanes was the inventor of

measures, yet he speaks of him in terms which show that he not only wrote hymns, but also imply that at least he revived and brought into fashion a taste for hymnology:

“For these things Bardesanes
 Uttered in his writings.
 He composed odes,
 And mingled them with music.
 He harmonized psalms
 And introduced measures
 By-measures and balances
 He divided words.
 He has concealed for the simple
 The bitter with the sweet;
 For the sickly do not prefer
 Food which is wholesome.
 He sought to imitate David,
 To adorn himself with his beauty
 So that he might be praised by the likeness.
 He therefore set in order Psalms one hundred and fifty,
 But he deserted the truth of David,
 And only imitated his numbers.”

It is to be regretted that of the hymns of Bardesanes which, it appears, in consequence, of their high poetic merit, exercised an extensive influence over the religious opinions of the age in which he lived, and gave so much strength and popularity to his Gnostic errors a very few fragments only remain. These fragments are to be found scattered through the works of Ephrem. For Bardesanes, see the excellent monograph by Hahn, *Bardesanus Gnosticus Syrorum Primus Hymnologus* (Lips. 1819), who makes the following beautiful remark: “Gnosticism itself is poetry; it is not therefore wonderful that among its votaries true poets should have been found. Tertullian mentions the psalms of Valentinus; and Marcus, his disciple, a contemporary of Bardesanes, inculcated his Gnosticism in a song, in which he introduced the Eons conversing” (*loc. cit.* p. 28). Harmonins, the son of Bardesanes, stands next in the history of this subject, both chronologically and for his successful cultivation of sacred poetry. He was educated in the language and wisdom of Greece, and there can be no question that he would make his knowledge of the exquisite metrical compositions of that literature bear on the improvement of his own. This is said on the presumption that the accounts of the ecclesiastical

historians Sozomen and Theodoret are credible. The former states, in his *Life of Ephrem*, lib. 3 c. 16, that “Harmonius, the son of Bardesanes, having been well educated in Grecian literature was the first who subjected his native language to meters and musical laws (πρῶτον μέτροις καὶ νόμοις μουσικοῖς τὴν πάτριον φωνὴν ὑπαγαγεῖν) and adapted it to choirs of singers, as the Syrians now commonly chant not, indeed, using the Writings of Harmonius, but his numbers (τοῖς μέλεσι); for, not being altogether free from his father’s heresy and the things which the Grecian philosophers boasted of concerning the soul, the body, and regeneration (παλιγγενεσίας), having set these to music he mixed them with his own writings.” The notice of Theodoret is yet more brief. He says (lib. 4 c. 29): “And since Harmonius, the son of Bardesanes, had formerly composed certain songs, and, mingling his impiety with the sweetness of music, enticed his hearers and allured them to destruction, having taken from him metrical harmony (τὴν ἁρμονίαν τοῦ μέλους), Ephrem mixed godliness with it,” etc. This statement is not confirmed by Ephrem, who attributes to the father what the Greek historians ascribe to the son. Hahn admits, without any expressed hesitation, the testimony of the Greek historians, their mistake as to the invention of the meters excepted, and ingeniously traces to Harmonius certain features of the Syriac poetry (*Ueber den Gesangsge in der syrischen Kirche*, p. 61). Assemani, in his *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, 1, 61, makes an incidental allusion to Harmonius, intimating that in the later transcriptions of Syriac literature his name and influence were acknowledged, since both he and his father, Bardesanes, are mentioned in MSS. as the inventors of meters.

Until we come to Ephrem, there is one more name which has historical or traditional importance in Syriac metrical literature — that is Balseus, or more properly Balai, who, as Hahn says (*Bardesanus*, p. 47), “gave his name to the pentasyllabic meter, because the orthodox Syrians entertained a horror of Bardesanes.” Before Ephrem, according to the catalogue of Ebedjesu, lived Simeon, bishop of Seleucia, who suffered martyrdom about the year 296. Two of his hymns are, according to Assemaui, to be found in the sacred offices of the Chaldaeans. The greatest of all hymn-writers whose works are extant, and whose hymns have been translated into German as well as into English (see Burgess, *Aetrical Hymns and Homilies* [Lond. 1853]), was Ephrem Syrus (q.v.). Besides these writers, the following are mentioned by Ebedjesu Paulona, a disciple of Ephrem; Marutha, bishop of Maiphercata; Narses of Edessa, surnamed “the harp of

the spirit," who used the hexasyllabic meter; Jacob of Edessa; Babi bar-Nisibone about A.D. 720; Jacob, bishop of Chalatia, about A.D. 740; Shalita, bishop of Rashana, about A.D. 740; Saliba of Mesopotamia, about A.D. 781; Chabib-Jesu bar-Nun of Bethabara, about A.D. 820; Jesujahab bar-Malkun of Nisibis, about A.D. 1222; Chamisius bar-Kardachi; George Varda, about 1538; Simeon, bishop of Amiola, about 1616; and Gabriel Hesna.

VIII. Literature. —*Assemani, Bibliotheca Orient. Clementino-Vatic.* (Rom. 1719-28, 3 vols.; abridged by Pfeiffer, Erlangen, 1776, 2 vols.); Assemani [S. E. and J. S.], *Bibliothecae Apostol. Vatic. Codic. MSS. Castal.* (Rom. 1785 sq.); Mai, *Catal. Codd. Bibl. Vatic. Arab. etc., item ejus partis. Hebr. et Syriaci quam Assemani in editione sua protermiserunt* (ibid. 1831); Rosen, *Catal. Codd. MSS. Orientalium qui in Museo Britannico asservantur* (Lond. 1838 sq.); Wiseman, *Hore Syriace* (Rom. 1829); Wenrich, *De Auctorum Graec. Versionibus et Commentariis Syriacis* (Lips. 1842). Besides the works already mentioned in this article, see the article "Syrische Sprache u. Literatur" in the *Regensburger Allgemeine Real-Encyklop.*; Etheridge, *The Syrian Churches and Gospels* (Lond., 1846); Bickell, "Syrisches für deutsche Theologen" in the *Liter. Band weiser*, No. 77, 78, 79, 80, 82, 86, 88, 91, 92; id. *Conspectus Rei Syrorum Literarice Additis Notis Bibliographicis et Excerptis Anecdoticis* (Milner, 1871); Hermann, *Bibliotheca Orientalis et Linguistica* (Halle, 1870); and Friederici, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* (Lond. 1876, 1877, 1878). (B.P.).

Syriac Liturgy

SEE JAMES, ST., LITURGY OF; SEE SYRIAC LITERATURE.

Syriac Versions

The following account of the translations of the Holy Scriptures in the ancient Syriac language is sufficiently copious on the general subject. *SEE VEISIONS.*

I. The Old Testament. — There are two Syriac translations of this part of the Bible, one made directly from the original, and the other from an ancient Greek version.

A. From the Hebrew. —

1. Name. — In the early times of Syrian Christianity there was executed a version of the Old Test. from the original Hebrew, the use of which must have been as widely extended as was the Christian profession among that people. Ephrem the Syrian, in the latter half of the 4th century, gives abundant proof of its use in general by his countrymen. When he calls it “our version,” it does not appear to be in opposition to any other Syriac translation (for no other can be proved to have then existed), but in contrast with the original Hebrew text, or with those in other languages (Ephrem, *Opera Syr.* 1, 380, on ^{1024b}1 Samuel 24:4). At a later period this Syriac translation was designated *Peshito*, a term in Syriac which signifies *simple* or *single*, and which is thought by some to have been applied to this version to mark its freedom from glosses and allegorical modes of interpretation (Havernick, *hinleit.* I, 2, 90). It is probable that this name was applied to the version after another had been formed from the Hexaplar Greek text. (See below.) In the translation made from Origen’s revision of the Sept., the critical marks introduced by him were retained, and thus every page and every part was marked with asterisks and obeli, from which the translation from the Hebrew was free. It might, therefore, be but natural for a bare text to be thus designated, in contrast with the marks and the citations of the different Greek translators found in the version from the Hexaplar Greek.

2. Date. — This translation from the Hebrew has always been the ecclesiastical version of the Syrians; and when it is remembered how in the 5th century dissensions and divisions were introduced into the Syrian churches, and how from that time the Monophysites and those termed Nestorians have been in a state of unhealed opposition, it shows not only the antiquity of this version, but also the deep and abiding hold which it must have taken on the mind of the people, that this version was firmly held fast by both of these opposed parties, as well as by those who adhere to the Greek Church, and by the Maronites. Its existence and use prior to their divisions is sufficiently proved by, Ephrem alone. But how much older it is than that deacon of Edessa we have no evidence. From Bar-Hebraeus (in the 13th century) we learn that there were three opinions as to its age; some saying that the version was made in the reigns of Solomon and Hiram; some that it was translated by Asa, the priest who was sent by the king of Assyria to Samaria; and some that the version was made in the days of Addai the apostle and of Abgarus, king of Osrhoene (at which time, he adds, the *Simple* version of the New Test. was also made) (Wiseman,

Harae Syriacae, p. 90). The first of these opinions, of course, implies that the books written before that time were then translated; indeed, a limitation of somewhat the same kind would apply to the second. The ground of the first opinion seems to have been the belief that the Tyrian king was a convert to the profession of the true and revealed faith held by the Israelites; and that the possession of Holy Scripture in the Syriac tongue (which they identified with his own) was a necessary consequence of this adoption of the true belief. This opinion is mentioned as having been held by some of the Syrians in the 9th century. The second opinion (which does not appear to have been cited from any Syriac writer prior to Bar-Hebraeus) seems to have some connection with the formation of the Samaritan *version* of the Pentateuch. As that version is in an Aramaean dialect, any one who supposed that it was made immediately after the mission of the priest from Assyria might say that it was then first that an Aramsean translation was executed; and this might afterwards, in a sort of indefinite manner, have been connected with what the Syrians themselves used. James of Edessa (in the latter half of the 7th century) had held the third of the opinions mentioned by Bar-Hebraeus, who cites him in support of it, and accords with it.

It is highly improbable that any part of the Syriac version is older than the advent of our Lord, those who placed it under Abgarus, king of Edessa, seem to have argued on the theory that the Syrian people then received Christianity, and thus they supposed that a version of the Scriptures was a necessary accompaniment of such a conversion. All that the account shows clearly is, then, that it was believed to belong to the earliest period of the Christian faith among them; an opinion with which all that we know on the subject accords well. Thus Ephrem, in the 4th century not only shows that it was then current, but also gives the impression that this had even then been long the case. For in his commentaries he gives explanations of terms which were even then obscure. This might have been from age if so, the version was made comparatively long before his days; or it might be from its having been in a dialect different from that to which he was accustomed at Edessa. In this case, then, the translation was made in some other part of Syria; which would hardly have been done unless Christianity had at such a time been more diffused there than it was at Edessa. The dialect of that city is stated to have been the purest Syriac; if, then, the version was made for that place, it would no doubt have been a monument of such purer dialect. Probably the origin of the Old Syriac version is to be compared

with that of the Old Latin, *SEE VULGATE*; and it probably differed as much from the polished language of Edessa as did the Old Latin, made in the African province, from the contemporary writers of Rome, such as Tacitus. Even though the traces of the origin of this version of the Old Test. be but few, yet it is of importance that they should be marked; for the Old Syriac has the peculiar value of being the first version from the Hebrew original made for Christian use, and, indeed, 'the only translation' of the kind before that of Jerome which was made subsequently to the time when Ephrem wrote. This Syriac commentator *may* have termed it "our version" in contrast with all others then current (for the Targmums were hardly versions), which were merely reflections of' the Greek and not of the Hebrews original.

3. Origin. — The proof that this version was made from the Hebrew is twofold: we have the direct statements of Ephrem, who compares it in places with the Hebrew, and speaks of this origin as a fact; and who is confirmed (if that were needful) by later Syrian writers; we find the same thing evident from the internal examination of the version itself. Whatever internal change or revision it may have received, the Hebrew groundwork of the translation is unmistakable. Such indications of revision must be afterwards briefly specified.

From Ephrem having mentioned *translators* of this version, it has been concluded that it was the work of several: a thing probable enough in itself, but which could hardly be proved from the occurrence of a casual phrase, nor yet from variations in the rendering of the same Hebrew word; such variations being found in almost all translations, even when made by one person that of Jerome, for instance; and which it would be almost impossible to avoid, especially before the time when concordances and lexicons were at hand. Variations in general phraseology give a far surer ground for supposing several translators.

It has been much discussed whether this translation were a Jewish or a Christian work. Some, who have maintained that the translator was a Jew, have argued from his knowledge of Hebrew and his mode of rendering. But these considerations prove nothing. Indeed, it might well be doubted if in that age a Jew would have formed anything except a Chaldee Targum; and thus diffuseness of paraphrase might be expected instead of closeness of translation. There need be no reasonable objection made to the opinion

that it is a Christian work. Indeed it is difficult to suppose that, before the diffusion of Christianity in Syria, the version could have been needed.

4. History. — The first printed edition of this version was that which appeared in the Paris Polyglot of Le Jay in 1645; it is said that the editor, Gabriel Sionita, a Maronite, had only an imperfect MS., and that, besides errors, it was defective as to whole passages, and even as to entire books. This last charge *seems* to be so made as if it were to imply that books were omitted besides those of the Apocrypha, a part which Sionita confessedly had not. He is stated to have supplied the deficiencies by translating into Syriac from the Vulgate. It can hardly be supposed but that there is some exaggeration in these statements. Sionita may have filled up occasional hiatus in his MS.; but it requires very definite examination before we can fully credit that he thus supplied whole books. It seems needful to believe that the defective books were simply those in the Apocrypha, which he did not supply. The result, however, is, that the Paris edition is but an infirm groundwork for our speaking with confidence of the text of this version.

In Walton's Polyglot, 1657, the Paris text is reprinted, but with the addition of the apocryphal books which had been wanting. It was generally said that Walton had done much to amend the texts upon MS. authority; but the late Prof. Lee denies this stating that "the only addition made by Walton was some apocryphal books." From Walton's Polyglot, Kirsch, in 1787, published a separate edition of the Pentateuch. Of the Syriac Psalter there have been many editions. The first of these, as mentioned by Eichhorn, appeared in 1610; it has by the side an Arabic version. In 1625 there were two editions; the one at Paris edited by Gabriel Sionita, and one at Leyden by Erpenius from two MSS. These have since been repeated; but anterior to them all, it is mentioned that the seven penitential Psalms appeared at Rome in 1584. An English *Translation of the Psalms of David* was made from the Peshito by A. Oliver (Bost. 1861).

In the punctuation given in the Polyglots, a system was introduced which was in part a peculiarity of Gabriel Sionita himself. This has to be borne in mind by those who use either the Paris Polyglot or that of Walton; for in many words there is a redundancy of vowels, and the form of some is thus exceedingly changed.

When the British and Foreign Bible Society proposed more than fifty years ago to issue the Syriac Old Test. for the first time in a separate volume, the

late Prof. Lee was employed to make such editorial preparations as could be connected with a mere revision of the text, without any specification of the authorities. Dr. Lee collated for the purpose six Syriac MSS. of the Old Test. in general, and a very ancient copy of the Pentateuch; he also used in part the commentaries of Ephrem and of Bar-Hebraeus (see the *Class. Journal*, 1821, p. 245 sq.). From these various sources he constructed his text, with the aid of that found already in the Polyglots. Of course the corrections depended on the editor's own judgment; and the want of a specification of the results of collations leaves the reader in doubt as to what the evidence may be in those places in which there is a departure from the Polyglot text. But though more information might be desired, we have in the edition of Lee (Londra 1823) a veritable Syriac text, from Syriac authorities, and free from the suspicion of having been formed in modern times by Gabriel Sionita's translating portions from the Latin.

But we now have in the MS. treasures brought from the Nitrian valleys the means of far more accurately editing this version. Even if the results should not appear to be striking, a thorough use of these MSS. would place this version on such a basis of diplomatic evidence as would show positively how this earliest Christian translation from the Hebrew was read in the 6th or 7th century, or possibly still earlier we could thus use the Syriac with a fuller degree of confidence in the criticism of the Hebrew text, just as we can the more ancient versions of the New Test. for the criticism of the Greek.

In the beginning of 1849 the Rev. John Rogers, canon of Exeter, published *Reasons why a New Edition of the Peshito, or Ancient Syriac Version of the Old Testament, should be published*. There was a strong hope expressed soon after the issue of Canon Rogers's appeal that the work would be formally placed in a proper manner in the hands of the Rev. Wm. Cureton, and thus be accomplished under his superintendence at the Oxford University press. Canon Rogers announced this in an Appendix to his pamphlet. This, however, has not been effected.

The only tolerable lexicon for the Old Test. Peshito is Michaelis's enlarged reprint of Castell (Gött. 1878, 2 pts. 8vo), for Bernstein did not live to publish more than one part of his long-expected lexicon. *SEE SYRIAC LANGUAGE*.

5. Identity. — But, if the printed Syriac text rests on by no means a really satisfactory basis, it may be asked, How can it be said positively that what we have *is* the same version substantially that was used by Ephrem in the 4th century? Happily, we have the same means of identifying the Syriac with that anciently used as we have of showing that the modern Latin Vulgate is substantially the version executed by Jerome. We admit that the common printed Latin has suffered in various ways, and yet at the bottom and in its general texture it is undoubtedly the work of Jerome: so with the Peshito of the Old Test., whatever errors of judgment were committed by Gabriel Sionita, the first editor, and however little has been done by those who should have corrected these things on MS. authority, the identity of the version is too certain for it to be thus destroyed, or even (it may be said) materially obscured.

From the citations of Ephrem, and the single words on which he makes remarks, we have sufficient proof of the identity of the version; even though at times he also furnishes proof that the copies as printed are not exactly as he read. (See the instances of accordance, mostly from the places given by Wiseman, *Hor. Syr.* p. 122, etc., in which Ephrem thinks it needful to explain a Syrian word in this version, or to discuss its meaning, either from its having become antiquated in his time, or from its being unused in the same sense by the Syrians of Edessa.)

The proof that the version which has come down to us is substantially that used by the Syrians in the 4th century is, perhaps, more definite from the comparison of words than it would have been from the comparison of passages of greater length; because in longer citations there always might be some ground for thinking that perhaps the MS. of Ephrem might have been conformed to later Syriac copies of the sacred text; while, with regard to peculiar words, no such suspicion can have any place, since it is on such words still found in the Peshito that the remarks of Ephrem are based. The fact that he sometimes cites it differently from what we now read only shows a variation of copies, perhaps ancient, or perhaps such as is found merely in the printed text that we have.

6. Relations to other Texts. — It may be said that the Syriac in *general* supports the Hebrew text that we have how far arguments may be raised upon minute coincidences or variations cannot be certainly known until the ancient text of the version is better established. Occasionally, however, it is clear that the Syriac translator read one consonant for another in the

Hebrew, and translated accordingly; at times another vocalization of the Hebrew was followed.

A resemblance has been pointed out between the Syriac and the reading of some of the Chaldee Targums. If the Targum is the older, it is not unlikely that the Syriac translator, using every aid in his power to obtain an accurate knowledge of what he was rendering, examined the Targums in difficult passages. This is not the place for formally discussing the date and origin of the Targums (q.v.); but if (as seems almost certain) the Targums which have come down to us are almost without exception more recent than the Syriac version, still they are probably the successors of earlier Targums, which by amplification have reached their present shape. Thus, if existing Targums are more recent than the Syriac, it may happen that their coincidences arise from the use of a common source an earlier Targum.

But there is another point of inquiry of more importance; it is, how far has this version been affected by the Sept. ? and to what are we to attribute this influence? It is possible that the influence of the Sept. is partly to be ascribed to copyists and revisers; while, in part, this belonged to the version as originally made. For, if a translator had access to another version while occupied in making his own, he might consult it in cases of difficulty; and thus he might unconsciously follow it in other parts. Even knowing the words of a particular translation may affect the mode of rendering in another translation or revision. Thus a tinge from the Sept. may easily have existed in this version from the first, even though in whole books it may not be found at all. But when the extensive use of the Sept. is remembered, and how soon it was superstitiously imagined to have been made by direct inspiration, so that it was deemed canonically authoritative, we cannot feel wonder that readings from the Sept. should have been, from time to time, introduced; this may have commenced probably before a Syriac version had been made from the Hexaplar Greek text; because in such revised text of the Sept. the additions, etc., in which that version differed from the Hebrew would be so marked that they would hardly seem to be the authoritative and genuine text. (See the article following.)

Some comparison with the Greek is probable even before the time of Ephrem; for, as to the apocryphal books, while he cites some of them (though not as Scripture), the apocryphal additions to Daniel and the books of Maccabees were not yet found in Syriac. Whoever translated any

of these books from the Greek may easily have also compared with it in some places the books previously translated from the Hebrew.

7. Recensions. — In the book of Psalms this version exhibits many peculiarities. Either the translation of the Psalter must be a work independent of the Peshito in general, or else it has been strangely revised and altered, not only from the Greek, but also from liturgical use. Perhaps, indeed, the Psalms are a different version; and that in this respect the practice of the Syrian churches is like that of the Roman Catholic' Church and the Church of England in using liturgically a different version of the book so much read ecclesiastically.

It is stated that, after the divisions of the Syrian Church, there were revisions of this one version by the Monophysites and by the Nestorians; probably it would be found; if the subject could be fully investigated, that there were in the hands of different parties copies in which the ordinary accidents of transcription had introduced variations.

The *Karkaphensian* recension mentioned by Bar-Hebraus was only known by name prior to the investigations of Wiseman; it is found in two: M-S.: in the Vatican. In this recension Job comes before Samuel; and immediately after Isaiah the Minor Prophets. The Proverbs succeed Daniel. The arrangement in the New Test. is quite as singular. It begins with the Acts of the Apostles and ends with the four Gospels; while the epistles of James, Peter, and John come before the fourteen letters of Paul. This recension proceeded from the Monophysites. According to Assemani and Wiseman, the name signifies *mountainous*, because it originated with those living about Mount Sagara, where there was a monastery of Jacobite Syrians, or simply because it was used by them. There is a peculiarity in the punctuation introduced by a leaning towards the Greek; but it is, as to its substance, the Peshito version.

B. The Syriac Version from the Hexaplar Greek Text.

1. Origin and Character. — The only Syriac version of the Old Test. up to the 6th century was apparently the Peshito as above. The first definite intimation of a portion of the Old Test. translated from the Greek is through Moses Aghelaus. This Syriac writer lived in the middle of the 6th century. He made a translation of the *Glaphyra* of Cyril of Alexandria from Greek into Syriac; and, in the prefixed epistle, he speaks of the versions of the New Test, and the *Psalter*, “which Polycarp (rest his soul!), the

chorepiscopus, made in Syriac for the faithful Xenaias, the teacher of Mabug, worthy of the memory of the good” (Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, 2, 83). We thus see that a Syriac version of the Psalms had a similar origin to the Philoxnian Syriac New Test... We know that the date of the latter was A.D. 508; the Psalter, was probably a contemporaneous work. It is said that the Nestorian patriarch Marabba, A.D. 552, made a version from the Greek; it does not appear to be in existence, so that, if ever it was completely executed, it was probably superseded by the Hexaplar version of Paul of Tela; indeed; Paul may have used it as the basis of his work, adding marks of reference, etc.

This version of Paul of Tela, a Monophysite, was made in the beginning of the 7th century, for its basis he used the Hexaplar Greek text — that is, the Sept., with the corrections of Origen, the asterisks, obeli, etc., and with the references to the other Greek versions. The Greek text at its basis agrees, for the most part, with the Codex Alexandrinus. But it often leans to the Vatican, and not seldom to the Complutensian texts. At other times it departs from all.

The Syro-Hexaplar version was made on the principle of following the Greek, word for word, as exactly as possible. It contains the marks introduced by Origen, and the references to the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, etc. In fact, it is from this Syriac version that we obtain our most accurate acquaintance with the results of the critical labors of Origen.

2. History. — Andreas Masius, in his edition of the book of Joshua (Antwerp, 1574), first used the results of this Syro-Hexaplar text; for, on the authority of a MS. in his possession, he revised the Greek; introducing asterisks and obeli, thus showing what Origen had done, how much he had inserted in the text, and what he had marked as not found in the Hebrew. The Syriac MS. used by Masius has long been lost; though in this day, after the recovery of the Codes Reuchlii of the Apocalypse (from which Erasmus first edited that book) by Prof. Delitzsch, it could hardly be a cause for surprise if this Syriac Codex should again be found.

It is from a MS. in the Ambrosian library at Milan that we possess accurate means of knowing this Syriac versions The MS. in question contains the Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Wisdom, Ecclesiastes, minor prophets, Jeremiah, Baruch, Daniel, Ezekiel, and

Isaiah. Norberg published, at Lund in 1787, the books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel from a transcript, which he had made of the MS. at Milan. In 1788 Bugati published at Milan the book of Daniel; he also edited the Psalms, the printing of which had been completed before his death in 1816; it was published in 1820. The rest of the contents of the Milan Codex (with the exception of the apocryphal books) was published at Berlin in 1835, by Middeldorpf, from the transcript made by Norberg; Middeldorpf also added the fourth (second) book of Kings from a MS. at Paris. Rordam issued *Libri Judicum et Ruth secundum Versionem Syriaco-Hexapalarem ex Codice Musei Britannici nunc primum editi, Grec translati, Notisque illustrati* (in two fasciculi, 1859, 1861, Copenhagen, 4to). A competent scholar has undertaken the task of editing the remainder — Dr. Antonio Ceriani, of Milan. In 1861 appeared his *Monumenta Sacra et Profana* (Milan, tom. 1. fascic. 1), containing, among other ancient documents, the Hexaplar-Syriac Baruch, Lamentations, and the Epistle of Jeremiah. In the preface the learned editor states his intention to publish, from the Ambrosian MS. and others, the entire version, even the books printed before, of whose inaccurate execution he speaks in just terms. A second part has since appeared. Besides these portions of this Syriac version, the MSS. from the Nitrian monasteries now in the British Museum would add a good deal more: among these there are six from which much might be drawn, so that part of the Pentateuch and other books may be recovered. These MSS. are like that at Milan, in having the marks of Origen in the text, the references to readings in the margin; and occasionally the Greek word itself is thus cited in Greek. The following is the notation of these MSS., and their contents and dates:

12,133 (Besides the Peshito Existus), *Joshua* (defective), cesit. 7.

“Translated from a Greek MS. of the Hexapla, collated with one of the Tetrapla.”

12,134, *Exodus*. A.D. 697.

14,434, *Psalms* formed from *two* MSS cent. 8 (with the Song of the Three Children subjoined to the second). Both MSS. are defective. Subscription, “According to the Sept.”

14,437, *Numbers* and *1 Kings*, defective (cent. 7 or 8). The subscription to *1 Kings* says, that it was translated into Syriac at Alexandria in the year 927 (A.D. 616).

17,442, *Genesis*, defective (with 1 Samuel Peshito). “According to the Sept.” (cent. 6).

17,103, *Judges* and *Ruth*, defective (cent. 7 or 8). Subscription to *Judges*, “According to the Sept.,” to *Ruth*, “From the Tetrapla of the Sept.” Riordam issued at Copenhagen in 1859 the first portion of an edition of the MS. 17,103: another part has since been published. Some of these MSS. were written 3 the same century in which the version was made. They may probably be depended on as giving the text with general accuracy.

C. Other Texts. —The list of versions of the Old Test. into Syriac often appears to be very numerous; but on examination it is found that many translations, the names of which appear in a catalogue, are really either such as never had an actual existence, or else that they are either the version from the Hebrew or else that from the Hexaplar text of the Sept., under different names, or with some slight revision. To enumerate the supposed versions is needless. It is only requisite to mention that Thomas of Harkel, whose work in the revision of a translation of the New Test. will have to be mentioned, seems also to have made a translation from the Greek into Syriac of some of the apocryphal books at least, the subscriptions in certain MSS. state this.

II. The Syriac New-Testament Versions. — These we may conveniently enumerate under five heads, including several recensions under some of them, but treating separately the notable “Curetonian text.”

A. The Peshito-Syriac New Test. (text of Widmanstadt, and Cureton’s Gospels). —In whatever forms the Syriac New Test. may have existed prior to the time of Philoxenus (the beginning of the 6th century), Who caused a new translation to be made, it will be more convenient to consider all such most ancient translations or revisions together; even though there may be reasons afterwards assigned for not regarding the version of the earlier ages of Christianity as absolutely one.

1. Date. — It may stand as an admitted fact that a version of the New Test. in Syriac existed in the 2nd century; and to this we may refer the statement of Eusebius respecting Hegesippus, that he “made quotations from the Gospel according to the Hebrews and the Syriac,” ἕκ τε τοῦ καθ’ Ἑβραίους εὐαγγελίου καὶ τοῦ Συριακοῦ (*Hist. Eccl.* 4:22). It seems equally certain that in the 4th century such aversion was as well known of the New Test. as of the Old. It was the companion of the Old Test.

translation made from the Hebrew, and as such was in habitual use in the Syriac churches. To the translation in common use among the Syrians, orthodox, Monophysite, or Nestorian, from the 5th century and onward, the name of Peshito has been as commonly applied in the New Test. as the Old. In the 7th century at least the version so current acquired the name of *old*, in contrast to that which was then formed and revised by the Monophysites.

Though we have no certain data as to the origin of this version, it is probable on every ground that a Syriac translation of the New Test. was an accompaniment of that of the Old; whatever therefore bears on the one, bears on the other also.

2. History. — There seem to be but few notices of the old Syriac version in early writers. Cosmas Indicopleustes, in the former half of the 6th century, incidentally informs us that the Syriac translation does not contain the Second Epistle of Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Jude. This was found to be correct when, a thousand years afterwards, this ancient translation became again known, to Western scholars. In 1552, Moses of Mardin came to Rome to pope Julius III, commissioned by Ignatius, the Jacobite (Monophysite) patriarch, to state his religious opinions, to effect (it is said) a union with the Romish Church, and to get the Syriac New Test. printed. In this last object Moses failed both at Rome and Venice. At Vienna he was, however, successful. Widmanstadt, the chancellor of the emperor Ferdinand I, had himself learned Syriac from Theseus Ambrosius many years previously; and through his influence the emperor undertook the charge of an edition which appeared in 1555, through the joint labors of Widmanstadt, Moses, and Postell. Some copies were afterwards issued with the date of 1562 on the back of the title.

In having only three Catholic epistles, this Syriac New Test. agreed with the description of Cosmas; the Apocalypse was also wanting, as well as the section ~~
~~John 8:1-11; this last omission, and some other points, were noticed in the list of errata. It also wants some words in ~~<OB>~~Matthew 10:8 and 27:35; two verses in Luke 22 viz. 17, 18; and 1 John 5. 7, all which are absent from Syriac MSS. In 2 Corinthians 5, 8 it has *in the leaven of purity*, which is found in Nestorian sources alone; but it has the usual reading in ~~<SB>~~Hebrews 2:9, not the Nestorian one χωρὶς θεοῦ. The editors appear to have followed their MSS. with great fidelity, so that the edition is justly valued. In subsequent editions endeavors were made conjecturally

to amend the text by introducing ~~ⲁⲓⲏⲧ~~ 1 John 5:7 and other portions which do not belong to this translation. One of the principal editions is that of Leusden and Schaaf; in this the text is made as full as possible by supplying every lacuna from any source; in the punctuation there is a strange peculiarity, that in the former part Leusden chose to follow a sort of Chaldee analogy, while, on his death, Schaaf introduced a regular system of Syriac vocalization through all the rest of the volume. The Lexicon which accompanies this edition is of great value. This edition was first issued in 1708: more copies, however, have the date 1709; while some, have the false and dishonest statement on the title page, “Secinda editio amendis purgata,” and the date 1717. The late Prof. Lee published an edition in 1816, in which he corrected or altered the text on the authority of a few MSS. This is so far independent of that of Widmanstadt. It is, however, very far short of being really a critical edition. III 1892 the edition of Mr. William Greenfield (often reprinted from the stereotype plates), was published by; Messrs. Bagster; if this the text of Widmanstadt was followed (with the vowels fully expressed), and with certain supplements within brackets from Lee’s edition For the collation with Lee’s text Greenfield was not responsible. There are now in Europe excellent materials for the formation of a: critical edition of this version it may, however, be said that, as in its first publication the MSS. employed were honestly used, it is in the text of Widmanstadt in a far better condition than is the Peshito Old Test. The best lexicon, which also serves for a concordance, is Schaaf’s (1709, 4to). The Peshito has been translated into English by Eltherilge (1846, 1849, 2 vols. 12mo); and better by Murdock (in 1 vol. 8vo, N.Y. 1851).

3. Character. — This Syriac version has been variously estimated; some have thought that in it they had a genuine and unaltered monument of the 2nd, or perhaps even of the 1st century. They thus naturally upheld it as almost co-ordinate in authority with the Greek text, and as being of a period anterior to any Greek copy extant. Others, finding in it indubitable marks of a later age, were inclined to deny that it had any claim to a very remote antiquity. Thus La Croze thought that the commonly printed Syriac New Test. is not the Peshito at all, but the Philoxenian executed in the beginning of the 6th century. The fact is, that this version as transmitted to us contains marks of antiquity and also traces of a later age. The two things are so blended that, if either class of phenomena alone were regarded, the most opposite opinions might be formed. The opinion of Wettstein was

one of the most perverse that could be devised; he found in this version readings which accord with the Latin; and then, acting on the strange system of criticism which he adopted in his later years, he asserted that any such accordance with the Latin was a proof of corruption from that version: so that with him the proofs of antiquity became the tokens of later origin, and he thus assigned the translation to the 7th century. With him the real indications of later readings were only the marks of the very reverse. Michaelis took very opposite ground to that of Wettstein; he upheld its antiquity and authority very strenuously. The former point could be easily proved, if one class of readings alone were considered; and this is confirmed by the contents of the version itself. But, on the other hand, there are difficulties, for very often readings of a much more recent kind appear; it was thus thought that it might be compared, with the Latin as found in the Codex Brixianus, in which there is an ancient groundwork, but also the work of a reviser is manifest. Thus the judgment formed by Griesbach seems to be certainly the correct one as to the peculiarity of the text of this version. He says (using the terms proper to his system of recensions): *Nulli harum recensionum Syriaca versio, prout quidem typis excusa est, similis, verum nec ulli prorsus dissimilis est. In multis concinit cum Alexadrina: recensione, in pluribus cum Occidentali, in nonnullis etiam cum Constantinopolitana, ita tamen ut quae in hanc posterioribus demum seculis invecta sunt, plerique repudiet. Diversis ergo temporibus ad Graecos codices plane diversos iterum iterumque recognita esse videtur*" (*Nov. Test. Proleg.* 75). In a note Griesbach introduced the comparison of the Codex Brixianus, "Illustrari hoc potest codicum nonnullorum Latinorum exemplo, qui priscam quidem versionem ad Occidentalem recensionem accommodatam representant, sed passim ad juniores libros Grsecos refictam. *Ex hoc genere. est Brixianus Codex Latinus, quimmon raro a Graeco-Latinis et vetustioribus Latinis omnibus solus discedit, et in Graecorum partes transit.*" Some proof that the text of the common printed Peshito has been re-wrought will appear when it is compared with the Curetonian Syriac Gospels.

4. Minor Recensions. —Whether the whole of this version proceeded from the same translator has been questioned. Not only may Michaelis be right in supposing a peculiar translator of the Epistle to the Hebrews, but also other parts may be from different hands; this opinion will become more general the more the version is studied. The revisions to which the version was subjected may have succeeded in part, but not wholly, in effacing the

indications of a plurality of translators. The Acts and Epistles seem to be either more recent than the Gospels, though far less revised; or else, if coeval, far more corrected by later Greek MSS.

There is no sufficient reason for supposing that this version ever contained the four catholic epistles and the Apocalypse, now absent from it, not only in the printed editions but also in the MSS.

Some variations in copies of the Peshito have been regarded as if they might be styled Monophysite and Nestorian recensions; but the designation would be far too definite, for the differences are not sufficient to warrant the classification.

The MSS. of the *Karkaphensian* recension (as it has been termed) of the Peshito Old Test. contain also the New with a similar character of text.

B. *The Curetonian Syriac Gospels.* — This, although in reality but a variety of the Peshito, exhibits such marked peculiarities that it may almost be called a distinct version.

1. *History, Date, and Contents.* — Among the MSS. brought from the Nitrian monasteries in 1842, Dr. Cureton noticed a copy of the Gospels differing greatly from the common text, and this is the form of text to which the name of “Curetonian Syriac” has been rightly applied. Every criterion, which proves the common Peshito not to exhibit a text of extreme antiquity, equally proves the early origin of this. The discovery is in fact that of the object, which was wanted, the want of which had been previously ascertained. Dr. Cureton considers that the MS. of the Gospels is of the fifth century, a point in which all competent judges are probably agreed. Some persons, indeed, have sought to depreciate the text, to point out its differences from the Peshito, to regard all such variations as corruptions and thus to stigmatize the Curetonian Syriac as a corrupt revision of the Peshito, barbarous in language and false in readings. This peremptory judgment is as reasonable as if the old Latin in the Codex Vercellensis were called an ignorant revision of the version of Jerome. The judgment that the Curetonian Syriac is older than the Peshito is not the peculiar opinion of Cureton, Alford, Tregelles, or Biblical scholars of the school of ancient evidence in this country, but it is also that of Continental scholars, such as Ewald, and apparently of the late Prof. Bleek.

The MS. contains ~~<1008>~~ Matthew 1:8, 22; 10:31-23, 25, Mark, the four last verses only; ~~<1001>~~ John 1:1-42; 3:6-7, 37; 14:11-29; ~~<1028>~~ Luke 2:48; 3:16; 7:33; 15:21; 17:24-24, 41. It would have been a thing of much value if a perfect copy of this version had come down to us; but as it is, we have reason greatly to value the discovery of Dr. Cureton, which shows how truly those critics have argued who concluded that such a version must have existed, and who regarded this as a proved fact, even when not only no portion of the version was known to be extant, but also when even the record of its existence was unnoticed. For there is a record showing an acquaintance with this version, to which, as well as to the version itself, attention has been directed by Dr. Cureton. Bar-Salibi, bishop of Amida in the 12th century, in a passage translated by Dr. C. (in discussing the omission of three kings in the genealogy in Matthew), says, "There is found occasionally a Syriac copy, made out of the Hebrew, which inserts these three kings in the genealogy; but afterwards it speaks of *fourteen* and not of *seventeen* generations, because fourteen generations has been substituted for seventeen by the Hebrews on account of their holding to the septenary number," etc. This' shows that Bar-Salibi knew of a Syriac text of the Gospels in which Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah were inserted in ~~<1008>~~ Matthew 1:8; there is the same reading in the Curetonian Syriac: but this might have been a coincidence. But in ver. 17 the Curetonian text has, in contradiction to ver. 8, *fourteen* generations and not *seventeen*; and so had the copy mentioned by Bar-Salibi: the former point might be a mere coincidence; the latter, however, shows such a kind of union in contradiction as proves the identity very convincingly. Thus, though this version was unknown in Europe prior to its discovery by Dr. Cureton, it must in the 12th century have been known as a text sometimes found; and, as mentioned by the Monophysite bishop, it might be more in use among his co-religionists than among others. Perhaps, as its existence and use is thus recorded in the 12th century, some further discovery of Syriac MSS. may furnish us with another copy so as to supply the defects of the one happily recovered.

2. Relation to the Peshito and to Older Texts. — In examining the Curetonian text with the common printed Peshito, we often find such identity of phrase and rendering as to show that they are not wholly independent translations; then, again, we meet with such variety in the forms of words, etc., as seems to indicate that in the Peshito the phraseology had been revised and refined. But the great (it might be said

characteristic) difference between the Curetonian and the Peshito gospels is in their readings; for while the latter cannot in its present state be deemed an unchanged production of the 2nd century, the former bears all the marks of extreme antiquity, even though in places it may have suffered from the introduction of readings current in very early times.

The following are a few of the very many cases in which the ancient reading is found in the Curetonian, and the later or transition reading in the Peshito. For the *general authorities* on the subject of each passage, reference must be made to the notes in critical editions of the Greek New Test.

<097> Matthew 19:17, **τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ**; the *ancient* reading, as we find in the best authorities, and as we know from Origen; so the Curetonian: **τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν**; the common text with the Peshito.

<092> Matthew 20:22, the clause of the common text, **καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι** (and the corresponding part of the following verse), are in the Peshito; while we know from Origen that they were in his day a peculiarity of Mark. Omitted in the Curetonian with the other best authorities. In fact except the Peshito and some revised Latin copies, there is no evidence at all extant for these words prior to the 5th century.

<094> Matthew 5:4, 5: here the ancient order of the beatitudes, as supported by Origen, Tertullian, the canons of Eusebius, and Hilary, is that of placing **μακάριοι οἱ πραεῖς, κ.τ.λ.,** before **μακάριοι οἱ πενθοῦντες, κ.τ.λ.;** here the Curetonian agrees with the distinct testimonies for this order against the Peshito. In 1:18, we know from Irenaeus that the name “Jesus” was not read; and this is confirmed by the Curetonian: in fiat, the common reading, however widely supported, could not have originated until **Ἰησοῦς χριστὸς** was treated as a combined proper name, otherwise the meaning of **τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ ἡ γένεσις** would not be “the birth of Jesus Christ,” but “the birth of Jesus as the Christ.” Here the Curetonian reading is in full accordance with what we know of the 2nd century in opposition to the Peshito. In 6:4 the Curetonian omits **αὐτός**; in the same ver. and in ver. 6 it omits **ἐν τῷ φανερωῖ**: in each case with the best authorities, but against the Peshito. <094> Matthew 5:44 has been amplified by copyists in an extraordinary manner; the words in brackets show the amplifications, and the place from which each was taken: **ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν. Ἀγαπάτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν ἑὺλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς,** <092> Luke 6:28; **καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς,** ver. 27], **καὶ προσεύχεσθε**

ὕπερ τῶν ἑπιηραζότων ὑμᾶς καὶ, ver. 35] διωκόντων ὑμᾶς. The briefer form is attested by Irenaeus, Clement, Origen, Cyprian, Eusebius, etc.; and though the inserted words and clauses are found in almost all Greek MSS. (except Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus), and in many versions, including the Peshito, *they are not in the Curetonian Syriac*. Of a similar kind are ^{<185>}Matthew 18:35, τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν: ^{<185>}Luke 8:54, ἐκβαλὼν ἔξω πάντα καὶ: 9:7, ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ; ver. 54, ὡς καὶ Ἡλίας ἐποίησεν: Xi, 2, γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς: ver. 29, τοῦπροφήτου: ver. 44, γραμματεῖς καὶ φαρισαῖοι ὑποκριταί: ^{<143>}John 4:43, καὶ ἀπῆλθεν: 5, 16, καὶ ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι: 6:51, ἦν ἐγὼ δώσω: ver. 69, τοῦ ζῶντος.

On the other hand, the Curetonian often changes the text for the worse, as in the following examples:

In Luke 24 the fortieth verse is omitted, contrary to the Peshito and the most ancient uncial MSS. A, B, a. In ^{<125>}Matthew 22:35, καὶ λέγων is read by the Curetonian; but it is absent from the Peshito, which is supported by B and a. In 7:22, the words “have we not eaten and drunk in thy name?” are inserted without any MS. authority, apparently from ^{<135>}Luke 13:26. In 11:23, instead of the usual Greek text, it has “*thou* shalt not be exalted to heaven, but;” contrary to all authority, and betraying at the same time a Greek original with μή. In 21:9, it is added at the *end*, “and many went out to meet him, and were rejoicing and praising God concerning all that which they *ate*,” words wholly unauthorized. In ver. 23, διδάσκοντι is omitted without authority. In 23:18, from ὅς ε ν to ἐστιν are also left out, contrary to all external evidence. In ^{<165>}Luke 8:16, is the unauthorized addition “he set forth another parable.” In 11:29, “except the sign of the prophet Jonas” is omitted, contrary to MSS. ^{<112>}Luke 20:12 is omitted without authority. In 22:ver. 20 is wanting, and ver. 19 is put before ver. 17; διδόμενον is also absent in ver. 19 without authority. In John 5, 8, we have the addition “go away to thy house.” So, too, in ver. 9, “and he took up his bed” is omitted. In 6:20, μὴ φοβεῖσθε are left out, against MS. authority.

The following are points of comparison with the noted early MSS. It often agrees with B, C, D, and the old Latin version before it was corrected by Jerome, especially its MSS. a, b, c; with D most of all. Very seldom does it coincide with A alone. Thus in ^{<100>}Matthew 19:9 the words καὶ ὁ

ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσας, μοιχᾶται are omitted, as in D, a, b, e, if; and to ver. 28.a long passage is added which is only in D, a, b, c, d. It omits 16:2, 3, with B and two other *uncial* MSS.; though the *old Italic* has them, as well as D. In 13:55, it has *Joseph* with B, C, the *old Italic*, *Vulgate*, and other authorities.

3. Hebrew Original of Matthew. — It is not needful for very great attention to be paid to the phraseology of the Curetonian Syriac in order to see that the Gospel of Matthew differs in mode of expression and various other particulars from what we find in the rest. This may lead us again to look at the testimony of Bar-Salibi; he tells us when speaking of this version of Matthew, there is found occasionally a Syriac copy *made out of the Hebrew*; we thus know that the opinion of the Syrians themselves in the 12th century was that this translation of Matthew was not made from the Greek, but from the Hebrew original of the evangelist: such, too, is the judgment of Dr. Cureton: “this Gospel of Matthew appears at least to be built upon the original Aramaic text, which was the work of the apostle himself (*Preface to Syriac Gospels*, p. 6).

We know from Jerome that the Hebrew Matthew had **רj m** where the Greek has ἐπιούσιον. We do not find that word here, but we read for both ἐπιούσιον and σήμερον at the end of the verse, “constant of the day.” This might have sprung from the interpretation, “morrow by morrow,” given to **רj m**; and it may be illustrated by Old Test. passages, e.g. ⁴⁰⁴⁷Numbers 4:7. Those who think that if this Syriac version had been made from Matthew’s Hebrew we ought to find **רj m** here forget that a translation is not a verbal transfusion.

We know from Eusebius that Hegesippus cited from the gospel according to the Hebrews, and from the Syriac. Now in a fragment of Hegesippus (Routh, 1, 219) there is the quotation, μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὑμῶν οἱ βλέποντες καὶ τὰ ὠτα ὑμῶν τὰ ἀκούοντα, words which might be a Greek rendering from ⁴¹³⁶Matthew 13:16, as it stands in this Syriac gospel as we have it, or probably also in the Hebrew work of the apostle himself.

From these and other particulars, Dr. Cureton concludes that in this version Matthew’s gospel was translated from the apostle’s Hebrew (Syro-Chaldaic) original, although injured since by copyists *or* revisers. The same view is maintained by the abbé Lehir (*Etude*, etc. [Par. 1859]); but it is

vigorously rejected by Ewald (*Jahrb. d. bibl. Wissenschaft*, vol. 9) and many later critics.

C. *The Philoxenian Syriac Version, and its Revision by Thomas of Harkel.* — Philoxenus, or Xenaïas, bishop of Hierapolis or Mabug at the beginning of the 6th century (who was one of those Monophysites that subscribed the *Henoticon* of the emperor Zeno), caused Polycarp, his chorepiscopus, to make a new translation of the New Test. into Syriac. This was executed in A.D. 508, and it is generally termed. Philoxenian from its promoter. In one passage Bar-Hebrseus says that it was made *in the time of* Philoxenus; in his *Chroniecon* that it was done by *his desire*; and in another place of the same — work that it- was his own production. Moses Aghelaeus (Assemani, *Biblioth. Oriental.* 2, 83) states that its author was Polycarp, rural bishop of Philoxenus. In an Arabic MS., quoted by Assemani (*ibid.* 2, 23), Philoxenus is said by a Jacobite author to have translated the four Gospels into Syriac.

1. *History.* — This version has not been transmitted to us in the form in *which* it was first made; we only possess a revision of it, executed by Thomas of Harkel in the following century (*The Gospels*, A.D. 616). Pococke, in 1630, gives an extract from Bar-Salibi, in which the version of Thomas of Harkel is mentioned; and though Pococke did not know *what* version Thomas had made, he speaks of a Syriac translation of the Gospels communicated to him by some learned man whom he does not name, which, from its servile adherence to the Greek, was no doubt the Harklean text. In the *Bibliotheca Orientalis* of Assemani there were further notices of the work of Thomas; and in 1730 Samuel Palmer sent from the ancient Amida (now Diarbekir) Syriac MSS. to Dr. Gloucester Ridley, in which the version is contained. Thus he had two copies of the Gospels, and one of all the rest of the New. Test., except the end of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse. No other MSS. appear to have yet come to light which contain any of this version beyond the Gospels. From the subscriptions we learn that the text was revised by Thomas with *three* (some copies say *two Greek* MSS. *One* Greek copy is similarly mentioned at the close of the Catholic epistles.

Ridley published in 1761 an account of the MSS. in his possession, and a notice of this version. He had intended to edit the text; this was, however, done by White, at different times from 1778 to 1803. After the publication of the Gospels, the researches of Adler brought more copies into notice of

that part of the Harklean text. From one of the MSS. in the Vatican, John's Gospel was edited by Bernstein in 1851. It will be noticed that this version differs from the Peshito in containing all the seven Catholic epistles.

2. Character. — In describing this version as it has come down to us, the *text* is the first thing to be considered. This is characterized by extreme literality the Syriac idiom is constantly bent to suit the Greek, and everything is in some manner expressed in the Greek phrase and order. It is difficult to imagine that it could have been intended for ecclesiastical reading. It is not independent of the Peshito, the words, etc., of which are often employed. As to the kind of Greek text that it represents, it is just what might have been expected in the 6th century. The work of Thomas in the text itself is seen in the introduction of obeli, by which passages which he rejected were condemned; and of asterisks, with which his insertions were distinguished. His model in all this was the Hexaplar Greek text. The MSS. which were used by Thomas were of a different kind from those employed in making the version; they represented in general a much older and purer text. The margin of the Harklean recension contains (like the Hexaplar text of the Sept.) readings mostly, apparently, from the Greek MSS. used. It has been questioned whether these readings are not a comparison with the Peshito; if any of them are so, they have probably been introduced since the time of Thomas. It is probable that the Philoxenian version was very literal, but that the slavish adaptation to the Greek is the work of Thomas; and that his *text* thus bore about the same relation to that of Philoxenus as the Latin Bible of Arias Montanus does to that of his predecessor Pagninus. For textual criticism this version is a good authority as to the text of its own time, at least where it does not merely follow the Peshito. The amplifications in the margin of the book of Acts bring a MS. used by Thomas into close comparison with the Codex Beze. One of the MSS. of the Gospels sent to Ridley contains the Harklean text, with some revision by Bar-Salibi.

The marginal readings are probably the most valuable part of the version in a critical view. One of the Greek MSS. compared by Thomas had considerable affinity to D in the Gospels and Acts. Of 180 marginal readings, about 130 are found in B, C, D, L, 1, 33, 69, etc. With D alone of MSS. it harmonizes nineteen times in the Gospels; with D and B seven times. With the Alexandrian, or A, alone, it agrees twice, but with it and others, D, L, eight times. With the Vatican, or B, alone, it harmonizes twice, but with it and others four times (see Adler, p. 130, 131).

D. *Syriac Versions of Portions Wanting in the Peshito.* —

(I.) *The Second Epistle of Peter, the Second and Third of John, and that of Jude.* —The fact has already been noticed that the old Syriac version did not contain these epistles. They were published by Pococke 2, 1630 from a MS. in the Bodleian. The version of these epistles so often agrees with what we have in the Harklean recension that the one is at least dependent on the other. The suggestion of Dr. Davidson (*Biblical Criticism*, 2, 196) that the text of Pococke is that of Philoxenus before it was revised by Thomas seems most probable. But, if it is objected that the translation does not show as great a knowledge of Greek as might have been expected in the translation of the rest of the Philoxenian, it must be remembered that here he had not the Peshito to aid him. In the Paris Polyglot these epistles were added to the Peshito, with which they have since been commonly printed, although they have not the slightest relation to that version.

(II.) *The Apocalypse.* — In 1627 De Dieu edited a Syriac version of the Apocalypse from a MS. in the Leyden library, written by one “Caspar from the land of: the Indians,” who lived in the latter part of the 16th century. A MS. at Florence, also written by this Caspar, has a subscription stating that it was copied in 1582 from a MS. in the writing of Thomas of Harkel in 622. If this is correct, it shows that Thomas by himself would have been but a poor translator of the New Test. But the subscription seems to be of doubtful authority; and, until the Rev. B. Harris Cowper drew attention to a more ancient copy of the version, we might well be somewhat uncertain if this were really an ancient work. It is of small critical value, and the MS. from which it was edited is incorrectly written. It was in the MS. which Abp. Usher sent as a present to De Dieu in 1631, in which the *whole* of the Syriac New Test. is said to have been contained (of what version is unknown), that having been the only complete MS. of the kind described; and of this MS., in comparison with the text of the Apocalypse printed by De Dieu, Usher says, “the Syriac lately set out at Leyden may be amended by my MS. copy” (Todd, *Walton*, 1, 196, note). This book, from the Paris Polyglot and onward, has been added to the Peshito in this translation.

Some have erroneously called this Syriac Apocalypse the *Philoxenian*, a name to which it has no title: the error seems to have originated from a verbal mistake in an old advertisement of Greenfield’s edition (for which he was not responsible), which said “the *Apocalypse* and the *Epistles* not found in the Peshito are given from the Philoxenian version.”

(III.) *The Syriac Version of ^{<600>}John 8:1-11.* — From the MS. sent by Abp. Usher to De Dieu, the latter published this section in 1631. From De Dieu it was inserted in the London Polyglot, with a reference to Usher's MS., and hence it has passed with the other editions of the Peshito, where it is a mere interpolation.

A copy of the same version (essentially) is found in Ridley's *Codex Basrsalibcei*, where it is attributed to Maras, 622; Adler found it also in a Paris MS. ascribed to Abbas Mar Paul.

Bar-Salibi cites a different version, out of Maras, bishop of Amida, through the chronicle of Zacharias of Melitina. See Assemani (*Biblioth. Orient.* 2, 53 and 170), who gives the introductory words. Probably the version edited is that of Paul (as stated in the Paris MS.), and that of Maras the one cited by Bar-Salibi; while in Ridley's MS. the two are confounded. The Paul mentioned is apparently Paul of Tela, the translator of the Hexaplar Greek text into Syriac.

E. *The Jerusalem Syriac Lectionary.* — The MS. in the Vatican containing this version was pretty fully described by S. E. Assemani in 1756 in the catalogue of the MSS. belonging to that library; but so few copies of that work escaped destruction by fire that it was virtually unpublished and its contents almost: unknown. Adler, who, at Copenhagen, had the advantage of studying one of the few copies of this catalogue, drew public attention, to this peculiar document in his *Kurze Uebersicht seiner biblisch-kritischen Reise nach Rom* (Altona, 1783), p. 118-127, and, still further, in 1789, in his valuable examination of the Syriac versions. The MS. was written in 1031 in peculiar Syriac writing; the portions are, of course, those for the different festivals, some parts of the Gospels not being there at all. The dialect is not common Syriac; it was termed the *Jerusalem* Syriac from its being supposed to resemble the Jerusalem Talmud in language and other points. The grammar is peculiar; the forms almost Chaldee rather than Syriac; two characters are used for expressing PH and P.

In Adler's opinion its date as a version would be from the 4th to the 6th century; but it can hardly be supposed that it is of so early an age, or that any Syrians then could have used so corrupt a dialect. It may rather be supposed to be a translation made from a Greek lectionary, never having existed as a substantive translation. To what age its execution should be assigned seems wholly uncertain. A further account of the MS. of this

version, drawn up from a comparison of Assemani's description in the Vatican catalogue, and that of Adler, with the MS. itself in the Vatican Library, is given in Horne's *Introd.* 4:284-L287. The only complete passage published till recently was owing to Adler-viz. ^{<4273>}Matthew 27:3-32; and scholars could only repeat or work upon what he gave. But the version has been published entire by Minischalchi Erizzo (Verona, 1861, 1864, 2 vols. 4to; the first containing the text, with a Latin translation; the second, prolegomena and a glossary). Critical editors of the Greek Testament cannot now overlook this very valuable document, whose readings are so important. It contains the following portions of the Gospels: all Matthew except 3:12; 5:34-41; 6:25-34; 7:19-23; 8:14-19; 10:9-15, 23-31, 34-36; 11:16-26; 12:1-29, 38-50; 13:1-43, 55-58; 14:1-13: 35, 36; 15:1-20, 29-31; 16:12, 20-28; 17:20, 27; 18:5-9, 11:21, 22; 19:1, 2, 13-15; 20:17-28; 21:44-46; 26:40-43; all Mark except 1:12-34, 45; 2:13, 18-22; 3:6-35; 4:5, 1-23, 35-43; 6:6-13, 31-56; 7:1-23; 8:1-26, 32, 33; 9:1-15, 31, 41-50; 10:1-31, 46-52; 11:1-21, 26-33; 12:12; 13; 14; 15:1-15, 33-42; all Luke except 1:69-75, 77-79; 3:23-38; 4:1-15, 37-44; 5:12-16, 33-39; 6:11-16, 24-30, 37-49; 7:17, 18, 30-35 — viz, 22-25, 40; 9:7-21, 45-56; 10:13-15, 22-24; 11:1-26, 34-54; 12:1, 13-15, 22-31, 41-59; 13:1-10, 30-35; 14:12-15, 25-35; 15:1-10; 16:1-9, 16-18; 17:1, 2, 20-37; 18:1, 15-17, 28-34; 19:11-48; 20:9-44; 21:5-7, 20-24, 37, 38; 22:40, 41, 46-71; 23:1-31, 50-56; all John except 2:23-25; 3:34-36; 4:1-4, 43-45; 6:34, 45, 46, 71; 7:30-36; 11:46, 55-57; 13:18-30; 19:21-24.

As to the readings, it appears to us that they are such as characterized the 5th and 6th centuries. The text is not that of *a*, *B*, *Z*, or even *D*, but rather that of *A* and *C*. In Matthew 6: it has the doxology of the Lord's Prayer, which is not in *a*, *B*, *D*, *Z*; it has ^{<4273>}John 7:53-8, 11; contains John 5, 3, 4; has the usual order of the fourth and fifth verses in Matthew 5; and has the later enlarged form of ver. 44. It also contains the last twelve verses of Mark 16: contrary to *a* and *B*; has *υιος*, not *θεός*, in John 1, 18; and in ^{<4273>}Matthew 22:35 has the later reading *καὶ λέγων*, omitted in *B*, *L*, and the Peshito. It has also *οἱ δώδεκα* in ^{<4274>}Luke 22:14, with *A*, *C*, *E*, etc., but contrary to *a*, *B*, *D*. the Curetonian Syriac, and Italic. In ^{<4072>}John 1:27 it has the words *ἐμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν*, contrary to *a*, *B*, *L*, and the Curetonian Syriac; but with *A*, *E*, *F*, etc., the old Italic, Vulgate, and Peshito. In ^{<4097>}Matthew 19:17 it has the old and genuine *τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ*, in John 3. 15, *μὴ ἀπόληται ἀλλά* are omitted with *a*

and the Curetonian Syriac, E, etc. On the whole, while it is easy to see a number of the oldest readings in the text, such as those in a, B, the old Italic, D, etc., yet the readings of a later period prevail. Its text, though often differing from the Peshito, is neither older nor better.

III. Literature. — Adler, *N.T. Versiones Syriacae, Simplex, Philoxeniana et Hierosolymitana denuo examinatae* (1789); Wiseman, *Horce Syriacae* (1827); Ridley, *De Syriacarum N. Fasderis Version Indole atque Usu*, etc. (1761); Winer, *Commentatio de Versionis N.T. Syriacae Usu Critico caute Instituendo* (1823); Wichelhaus, *De Novi Test. Fersione Syriaca-Antiqua quam Peschitho vocant* (1850); Bernstein, *De Charklensi N.T. Translatione Syriaca Commentatio* (1857); Cureton, *Ancient Recension of the Syriac Gospels* (preface, etc., 1858); Lee, *Prolegomena to Bagster's Polyglot*; Reulsch, *Syrus Interpres cum Fonte N.T. Greco collatus* (1741); Storr, *Observationes super N.T. Versionibus Syriacis* (1772); Lohlein, *Syrus Ep. ad Ephesios Interpres* (1835); Michaelis [J. D.], *Cuace in Versionem Syriacam Actuum Apostolicorum* (1755); Credner, *De Prophetarum Min. Vers. Syr. quam Peschito vocant Indole* (1827); the *Introductions* of De Wette, Herbst, and Bleek, with Davidson's *Treatise on Biblical Criticism*, vol. 2; also the literature referred to by Walch, *Bibl. Theol.* 4:143 iq.; Rosenmüller, *handbuch*, 3, 19 sq., 91 sq.; Danz, *Theol. Worterb.* p. 927; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog. col.* 70; and Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*

Syriac (Peshito) Version, Relation Of, To The Septuagint And Chaldee.

One of the most mooted points which have vexed scholars is the question as to the relation of the Peshito to the Sept. and Chaldee version.

I. Relation to the Septuagint. — A good deal has been written concerning this question, *pro* and *con*. To the former side belong Gesenius, Credner, Havernick, and Bleek; to the latter, Hirzel and Herbst. Without adducing the arguments used on both sides, it must be admitted that an influence of the Sept. upon the Peshito cannot be denied, and to this supposition we are led by a comparison of the one with the other. To make our assertion good, we will present the following passages from different books, and the reader can draw his own inferences. We commence with the book of Genesis:

2:2. Sept. **τῆ ἕκτη** Syr. **aytytç**. From the ant. *Talmundic Notices on the Septuagint*, s.v. SEPTUAGINT in this *Cyclopaedia*, it will be seen that the Sept. changed here purposely “seventh” into “sixth.” If the Peshito version were made only from the original Hebrew, there was no reason *why* the **y[γβçh** of the Hebrew should *h* be translated as if it read **yççh**, like the reading of the Samuel, Samuel vers., and Syr., which all followed the Sept.;

2:4. **μγμçw /ra** — Sept. **τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν**; Syr. **a[æaw aymç**.

23. **çyam**-Sept. **ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτίς**; Syr. **hrbg ^md**.

24. **wyhw**-Sept. **καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο**; Syr. **^wwhnw ^whyrt**.

3:2. **/[γrpm**-Sept. **ἀπὸ παντὸς ξύλου**; Syr. also has **l k**.

7. **hl [** — Sept. **φύλλα**; Syr. **aprf**.

9. **rmayw**-Sept. **καὶ εἶπεν Ἀδάμ**; Syr. also supplies **da**.

11. **rmayw**-Sept. **καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεός**; Syr. **rmaw ayrm hl**.

16. **hçahAl a** — Sept. **καὶ τῆ γυναικί**; Syr. **attnal w**.

4:8. **wyj a**-Sept. **διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πῆδιον**; Syr. **Adrn atl qhl**.

10. **rmayw**-Sept. **καὶ εἶπε κύριος**; Syr. **hl rmaw ayrm**.

μγq[x — Sept. **βοῶ**; Syr. **al g**.

15. **^kl** -Sept. **οὐχ οὕτως**; Syr. **ankhal**.

17. **μçk**-Sept. **ἐπι τῷ ὀνόματι**; Syr. **μçl [**.

25. **wtçaAta**-Sept. **Εὖαν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ**; Syr. **httna awj l**.

dl tw-Sept. **καὶ συλλαβοῦσα ἔτεκεν**; Syr. **tdl yw tnfbw**.

5:23. **yhyw**-Sept. **καὶ ἐγενοντο**; Syr. **wwhw** (id. ver. 31).

29. **wnc[mm**-Sept. **ἀπὸ τῶν ἐργῶν ἡμῶν**; Syr. **^m ^ydb [**.

^m-Sept. **καὶ ἀπό**; Syr. **^mw**.

6:20. I km-Sept. and Syr. I kmw.

7:2. μυηϛ — Sept. δὺο δύο; Syr. ḡyrt ḡyrt.

3. μγ — Sept. and Syr. μgw.

8. I kw-Sept. and Syr. I kmw.

20. μυρηη-Sept. τὰ ὄρη ὑψηλά; Syr. amr arwf.

8:7. bwϛw awxy axyw-Sept. καὶ ἐξελθὼν οὐκ ἀνέστρεψε; Syr. ḅh al w qrm qrnw.

17. I k-Sept. and Syr. I kw (id. ver. 19).

22. rqw-Sept. and Syr. rq.

/yqw-Sept. alnd Syr. /yq.

9:2. I kb-Sept. καὶ ἐπι πάντα; Syr. I kl [w.

5. ϛya dym-Sept. ἐκ χειρός; Syr. adya ḡmw.

7. wxrϛ — Sept. καὶ πληρώσατε; Syr. wdl waw.

10. hmhb-Sept. καὶ ἀπὸ κτηνῶν; Syr. ary[b μ[w.

11:27. rwj n ta-Sept. καὶ τὸν Ναχώρ; Syr. rwj nl w.

12:3. I I qmw-Sept. καὶ τοὺς καταρωμένους σε; Syr. ḡnfyl mw.

7. rmayw — Sept. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ; Syr. hl rmax.

13. an — Sept. and Syr. omit (id. 13:8).

13:7. bϛy — Sept. κατ κουν; Syr. ḡbty.

14:1. ḡyra-Sept. and Syr. ḡyraw.

I [rtw-Sept. Θαργάλ; Syr. I y[rt.

2. banϛ — Sept. and Syr. banϛw.

5. μhb, in Ham-Sept. ἄμα αὐτοῖς; Syr. ḡhbd.

6. **μrrhb**-Sept. ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι; Syr. **yrwfbd**.
7. **hdç**, the country-Sept. τοὺς ἄρχοντας; Syr. **ançyr**.
10. **hrm[μds**-Sept. Σοδόμων καὶ βασιλεὺς Γομόρρας; Syr. **arwm[d akl mw μwdsd**.
- 14:20. **dyb** — Sept. ὑποχειρίους σου; Syr. **ydyab**.
- 15:5. **rmayw**-Sept. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ; Syr. **hl rmaw**.
6. **mahw**-Sept. καὶ ἐπίστευσεν Ἄβραμ; Syr. **ymyhw rba**.
- 16:2. **an** — Sept. and Syr. omit.
6. **dyb** — Sept. ἐν ταῖς χερσί σου; Syr. **ykydyab**.
15. **hdl y** — Sept. ἔτεκεν αὐτῷ; Syr. **hl dl ytað**.
- 17:16. **ykl m**-Sept. καὶ βασιλεῖς; Syr. **akl mw**.
19. **myhl a**-Sept. ὁ θεὸς πρὸς Ἀβραάμ; Syr. **mhrrbal** .
- w[rzl** -Sept. καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ; Syr. **h[rzl w**.
- 18:5. **rj a** — Sept. καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο; Syr. **^k rtbw**.
17. **mhrrbam**-Sept. ἀπὸ Ἀβραάμ τοῦ παιδὸς μου; Syr. **hrba ydb[^m**.
20. **hbr yk** — Sept. πεπληθύνονται πρὸς με; Syr. **ymdqtl [** .
29. **hç[a al** -Sept. οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσω; ‘Syr. **al ^al bj a**.
- 19:3. **hpa**-Sept. ἔπεψεν αὐτοῖς; Syr. **^whl apa**.
7. **rmayw**-Sept. εἶπε δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς; Syr. **rmaw ^whl** .
12. **μwqmh ^m**-Sept. ἐκ τοῦ τόπου τούτου; Syr. **^m anh arta**.
- 20:15. **l myba** — Sept. Ἀβιμέλεχ τῷ Ἀβραάμ; Syr. **hrbal** .
- 21:8. **qj xy**-Sept. Ἰσαάκ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ; Syr. **Arb h[wqj sl** .

10. μ[(2.)-Sept. and Syr. omit.
13. ywgl — Sept. εἰς ἔθνος μέγα; Syr. abr am[l .
14. μϙ-Sept. καὶ ἐπέθηκεν; Syr. μsw.
33. [fγw-Sept. καὶ ἐφύτευσεν Ἀβραάμ; Syr. bxnw hrba.
- 22:13. rj a — Sept. εις; Syr. dj .
16. byj y ta-Sept. τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ δὲ ἐμέ; Syr. ynm ydyj yl .
- 23:14. wl -Sept. and Syr. omit.
19. ynp l [-Sept. ὃ ἔστιν ἀπέναντι; Syr. mdkd.
- 24:21. ϙrj m-Sept. καὶ παρεσιώπα; Syr. aqbtmw.
25. μwqm μg-Sept. καὶ τόπος; Syr. hrta āaw.
31. rmayw — Sept. και ειπεν αὐτῷ; Syr. hl rmaw.
33. rbd rmayw-Sept. καὶ ειπεν, Λάλησον; Syr. rma hl ḡrmaw.
38. ynb l -Sept. τῷ υἱῷ μου ἐκεῖθεν; Syr. ḡm yrbl ḡmt.
40. j l ϙy-Sept. αὐτὸς ἐξαποστελεῖ; Syr, drj n wh.
54. ynj l ϙ-Sept. ἐκπέμψατέ με ἵνα ἀπέλθω; Syr. l za ynwrdϙ.
55. hyj a rmayw — Sept. ειπαν δὲ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτῆς;
Syr. ḡj a hl wrmaw. rj a-Sept. καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα; Syr. ḡdyhw.
60. hqbr-Sept. ῥεβέκκαν την ἀδελφὴν αὐτῶν; Syr. wwhtj aqbri .
- 25:5. qj Xyl -Sept. Ἰσαὰκ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ; Syr. qj syl hrb.
8. [bϙw- Sept. καὶ πλήρης ἡμερῶν; Syr. [bϙw htmwy.

Without enlarging our collation, it must be seen at once that the agreement between the Sept. and the Syriac version cannot be merely accidental, and the most skeptic must admit that the Sept. has been made use of by the Syriac translators. Is this inference correct, we may go a step farther and

say what holds good for the one must also be good for the other; or, in other words, the Syriac translator made use of the Sept. for the other books too. And, indeed, Gesenius has produced a number of examples from the book of Isaiah to show that the Sept. was followed even in free and arbitrary interpretations (comp. his *Commentar über den Jesaja*, 1, 82 sq.); and, in like manner, Credner, who has minutely examined the minor prophets in his *De Prophetarum Minorum Versioanis Syriacae quam Peschito vocant Indole*, thinks that the Sept. was employed there. A similar result will be achieved in comparing the book:of Jeremiah. Thus,

2:25. צאנן-Sept. ἀνδριοῦμαι; Syr. l yj ta: both derive it from צya, instead of from צay (comp. also 18:12).

34. hl æl kl [yk-Sept. ἐπὶ πάση δρυΐ; Syr. tyj t ^l ya l k: both probably reading hl æl

3:2. ybæ[k; Sept. κορώνη; Syr. ab[n, reading brēk;

8. j bçm — Sept. κατοικία; Syr. atrwm[, deriving from bçy.

8:21. ytrbçh-Sept. and Syr. omit.

15:6. mj nh ytyal n-Sept. καὶ οὐκέτι ἀνήσω αὐτούς; Syr. ^whl qwbça al bwtw: both reading j ~~wh~~ for mj ~~whæ~~

17:16. vlna; mwy-Sept. ἡμέραν ἀνθρώπων; Syr. amwy açnrbd: both reading v/na,

18:14. ydç; rwxm-Sept. ἀπὸ πέτρας μαστοί; Syr. ^m aydt rwf: both reading ydç;

48:2. ymdt ^mdm mj-Sept. καὶ παῦσιν παύσιν παύσεται; Syr. ^yqtçh ^a qtçm ^pa: both regarded ^mdm not as a *proper noun*, but as an Aramaic infinitive of *ymdç*;

1:21. brj idwqp ybçwy l aw. In the Masoretic text the Athnach under dwqp indicates that it belongs to ybçwy. The Sept. connects dwqp with brj, also reading brj, ἐκδίκησον μάχαιρα; in like manner the Syr. connects and translates abry yry[tta.

It would be useless to adduce more examples for our supposition, since we do not write a dissertation, but for a cyclopaedia which, so far as the point in question is concerned, has treated that subject in such a full way as neither the introductions to the Old Test. nor cyclopaedias and dictionaries of the Bible have done before, if they ever touched this point fully.

There is yet another matter which we should not pass over, and to which, as it, seems little, attention has been paid. We mean the titles of the Syriac psalms, which are found neither in the Hebrew nor in the editions of the Sept. The titles are partly historical, partly dogmatical; the former speak of David or the Jewish people, the latter of Christ and his Church. Now the question arises, if the Syriac translators really perused the Sept., as our supposition is, how is it that the titles found in the Syriac psalms are not to be met with in the Sept.? But the question is easily answered, when we consider the fact that these titles are not only found in the commentary of Eusebius, but also in the *Codex Alexandrinus*. From the latter they were reprinted in Walton's *Polyglot* (vol. 6 pt. 6 p. 137 sq.), and again by Grabe, in the fourth volume of his edition of the Sept. A comparison of the titles as found in the Alex. Codex with those in the Peshito shows that the dogmatical part of these titles are a later addition, otherwise we could not account for the omission in the Greek, if really the latter had copied the Peshito. Deducting these additions, the titles otherwise agree with each other. Thus the title of Psalm 2 reads: **προφητεία περὶ Χριστοῦ καὶ κλήσεως ἔθνων**; Syr. **ammad atyrq l fm aj yçmd hj ç l fm atwybn zmr** Psalm 3, **προφητεία γενησομένων ἀγαθῶν τῷ Δαυίδ**; Syr. **dywdl ryma `dyt[d atbf l]**: Psalm 4 **προφητεία τῷ Δαυίδ περὶ ὧν πέπονθεν**; Syr. **j çd `yl h l fm dywdl** .

II. Relation to the Chaldee. — That there is a tolerable likeness between the Syriac and Chaldee in many places cannot be denied. Gesenius has produced a number of examples from Isaiah to show that the Targum was used there (*Comment.* 1, 83 sq.). Credner is of the same opinion in regard to the minor prophets (*De Prophetarum, etc.*, p. 107). Havernick and Herbst are of an opposite opinion, and yet the original traces of a use of a Targum are too distinct to be denied, as the following examples in Genesis must show:

Picture for Syriac Version1

We could thus go on with the other books of the Pentateuch, but our examples are sufficient to show that the priority belongs to the Chaldee of Onkelos, and not to the Peshito. Our supposition being correct, the assertions of those must fall to the ground who would put Onkelos in the 2nd or 3rd century. On the contrary, we believe that the Targum of Onkelos belongs to the time of Christ — provided the Syriac version of the Pentateuch belongs to the 1st century of the Christian era — and thus the notices concerning Onkelos which we find in the Talmud are confirmed anew. Our examples from the book of Genesis leaving it beyond a shadow of doubt as to the dependence of the Syriac version upon the Chaldee, the Chaldee of the book of Proverbs will prove this more fully. Thus we read:

Picture for Syriac Version2

We will not increase the quotations, but let the student examine passages like 1:6, 8, 10, 13, 15, 18, 21-23, 25, 30, 33; 2:1, 4, 10, 14, 17, 21; 3:2, 4, 6-8, 12, 15, 19, 21, 25, 29; 4:2,3,10, 11, 14, 18, 21-23, 25-27; 5:2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 13, 16, 18, 21, 23; 6:1, 2, 4-6, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 26, 28, 34; 7:2-4,10, 16-18, 23-25; 8:4, 8, 10, 12, 13, 20, 23, 26, 32; 9:4, 5, 11, 14; 10:3-5, 7, 9, 16, 22, 30, 31; 11:7, 13, 14, 18, 21, 22, 26, 27, etc. — altogether more than 300 passages where he will find a striking similarity between these two versions.

Besides this similarity, there are a great many passages in which the Chaldee and Syriac deviate from the Hebrew, and the inner connection of both versions with each other can no longer be doubted. Thus ^{<1007>}Proverbs 1:7, the Hebrew reads, **j [d tyçar hwby tary** — i.e., “The fear of God is the beginning of wisdom;” but the Chaldee reads, **yyd at l j d atmkj çyr** — i.e. “The beginning of wisdom is the fear of God;” and so also the Syr. **ayrmd at l j d atmqj çyr**: or 16:4, **l [p l k whn[ml hwby**— “The Lord has made all things for himself;” the Chaldee paraphrases, **ÿdwb[ðwhl k hyl ÿ[mtçmd ÿl yal ahl ad** — i.e. “All works of God are for those who obey him;” and thus also the Syr. **hl ÿ[mtçmd ÿl yal ayrmd yhwdb[ðwhl k**. Without increasing the number of such passages, we will adduce some in which both versions entirely give up the Masoretic text and follow another reading: thus ^{<1023>}Proverbs 1:24, for **wnamtw** the Chaldee reads **wnymat al w**, for the translation is **ÿwtmnyh**

al w, and so also the Syriac, al w ^ˆwtnmyh:5,9, the Chaldee reads hwh instead of bwh, for the translation is l yj , and so in the Syriac, l yj : 9,-11, for ybyk: the Chaldee reads hbyk, for the translation is hbd l wfm, and in the Syriac hbd l fm. These examples, which could be increased greatly (comp. 3:27; 5:4, 9, 19, 21; 7:2,23 3; 9:11; 10:4; 11:26; 12:4, 19, 21, 28; 13:15, 19; 14:14; 15:4; 19:19, 23; 20:4, 14, 20; 21:4, 30; 22:11, 16; 24:5, 22; 25:20,27; 26:5,7, 10; 28:5, 11; 29:18, 21; 30:31; 31:6), leave no doubt that the Chaldee and Syriac stand in a relation of dependence to each other.

But in speaking of a relation of these versions, it must not be understood as if they relate to each other as the original and copy, but this relation consists in that the author of the one version, in preparing the same, followed mostly the other without giving up his independence entirely. This we can see from the eighty-two passages in which the Chaldee follows the Masoretic text, while the Syriac deviates from it, as 2:16; 3:30; 4:3,11, 22, 25, 32; 7:7, 8, 10,22; 8:7,11,35; 9:12, 18; 10:10, 12, 19, 24, 26; 11:9, 10, 16, 19, 24, 29; 12:17, 23; 13:1,10,23; 14:7,17, 22,23, 33,35; 15:10,14,16, 17, 22, 30; 16:7, 26; 17:4, 9, 15; 18:1, 3, 6, 15; 19:1, 4, 22, 29; 21:14; 22:3, 19; 23:2, 6, 30, 34; 24:10, 26, 32, 33; 25:4,11, 10, 13, 21, 22; 26:2, 11-13, 17-19, 26; 30:15, 19; or from those passages in which the Syriac agrees with, the Masoretic text against the Chaldee, as.6:35; 7:15; 8:29; 10:29; 11:4; 14:24; 15:32; 16:5, 17:5, 16; 18:17; 19:2, 13; 23:28; 24:9, 14; 25:9; 28:1; 31:3.

To these examples from the book of Proverbs we could also add a number from other books. Future investigations based upon these must show the tenability or otherwise of our assertion. See also Schohnfelder, *Onkelos und Peshito* (München, 1869); Maya haum, *Ueber die Sprache des Taryunm zuden Sprilchen u 2nd dessen Verhdltniss zum Syrer*, inm Merx, *Archiv für wissenschaftliche Erforschulg des Alten Testaments*, 2, 66 sq.; Dathe, *Opuscula*, p. 106 sq.; Fralnkl *Studien iib eri die Septuagiutat und Peschito u Jeremiah*, in Frankel-Gratz, *Moatsschift*, 1872, p.444 sq. (B.P.)

Syr'ia-ma'achah

(^{<1396>}1 Chronicles 19:6). *SEE MAACHAH.*

Syr'ian

(**yMæa**) *Arummi*, ^{<1230>}Genesis 25:20; 28:5; 31:20,24; ^{<1215>}Deuteronomy 26:5, 2 Kings 5,20; fem. **hYMæa**) *Arammiydh*, ^{<1374>}1 Chronicles 7:14, “Aramitess;” plur. masc. **yMæa**) *Arammim*, ^{<1388>}2 Kings 8:28,29; 16:6 [where the text has **μymwra**, which the marg. corrects to **ymæa**] *Edomites*]; ^{<1425>}2 Chronicles 22:5; but “Syrians” is elsewhere the rendering of **μῤῥᾶ**) *Aranz*; **Σύρος**, [^{<1427>}Luke 4:27), an inhabitant either of Western Syria, i.e. on the Mediterranean (2 Kings.5, 20), or of Eastern, i.e. Mesopotamia (Genesis *loc. cit.*). **SEE SYRIA.**

Syrian Churches

a general name for that portion of the Oriental Church which had its seat in Syria, and which was anciently comprehended in the patriarchate of Antioch and (after that of Jerusalem obtained a distinct jurisdiction) in the :patriarchate of Jerusalem. The Syrian Church of the early centuries was exceedingly flourishing. Before the end of the 4th century it numbered 119 distinct sees, with a Christian population of several millions. The first blow to the prosperity of the Syrian Church was the fatal division which arose from the controversies on the incarnation. **SEE EUTYCEES; SEE JACOBITES; SEE MONOPHYSITE; SEE NESTORIANS.** The Eutychian heresy, in one or other of its forms, obtained wide extension in Syria; and the usual results of division ensued in the corruption and decay of true religion. The Moslem conquest accelerated the ruin thus begun; and from the 7th century downwards, this once flourishing Church declined into a weak and spiritless community, whose chief seat was in the mountains, and whose best security from oppression lay in the belief on the part of the conquerors of their utterly fallen and contemptible condition. Under the head MARONITES **SEE MARONITES** has been detailed the most remarkable incident in the later history of the Syrian Church. This branch of the Eastern Christianity, although for the most part divided from the orthodox Greek Church by the profession of Monophysitism, took part with the Greeks in their separation from the West, under Michael Cerularius; and the reunion of the Maronites to Rome had the remarkable result of establishing side by side, within the narrow limits occupied by the Christians under the Moslem rule in Syria, two distinct communities, speaking the same language, using the same liturgy, and following the same rites, and yet subject to two different patriarchs, and mutually regarding

each other as heretics and apostates from the ancient creed of their country. The chief peculiarity of the Syrian rite, as contradistinguished from the Greek, consists in its liturgy, and the language of that liturgy, which is Syriac, and with which the people, and, in many cases, the priests, are entirely unacquainted. The liturgy is known as the Liturgy of St. James. The Syrians agree with the Greeks in the use of unleavened bread, in administering communion under both heads, in permitting the marriage of priests (provided they marry before ordination), and in administering the unction of confirmation at the same time with baptism, even to infants.

The Christian community of Syria may at present be divided into four classes: the Maronites, the Greeks (who are also called Melchites), the Monophysites, who are called Jacobites, and the primitive Syrian Christians (not Maronites) who are in communion with Rome. This last-named community forms the small remnant of the ancient Syrian Church which remained orthodox during the controversy on the incarnation, at the time of the general lapse into Monophysitism. To these are to be added the Christians of the Latin rite. The Maronites number about 150,000; the Greeks are said to be about 50,000; the Jacobites of Syria and of Armenia Proper are said to reckon together about 40,000 families, of whom, however, but a small proportion (probably scarcely 10,000 in all) can be set down to the account of the Syrian Church. The non-Maronite Syrians who follow their national rite, but are in communion with Rome, are supposed to amount to about 4000. The resident Latins are chiefly members of the religious orders who from immemorial time have possessed convents in the Holy Land, and European Catholics who have settled permanently or for a time at Jerusalem, Beirut, and Damascus. None of these can in any way be regarded as belonging to the Syrian Church. It may be well to add that the belief, and, in most particulars the disciplinary practice, of these several classes coincide substantially with those respectively of the same communities in the other churches of the East. All (with the exception of the Maronites and the few United Syrians) reject the supremacy of the Roman see. The Syrians of the Greek communion reject the double procession of the Holy Ghost; and the Jacobites firmly maintain their old tenet of Eutychianism. Among them all are to be found monks and religious females. All enforce celibacy on their bishops, and refuse to priests the privilege of contracting a second marriage, or of marrying after ordination. The practice of fasting prevails among all alike. They receive and practice the invocation of saints and prayers for the dead, and the use

of painted, although not of graven, images. Many particulars regarding them are to be gleaned from the memoirs of recent missionaries of the several denominations, among which the letters published from time to time by the French Society for the Propagation of the Faith, although naturally tinged with some sectarian coloring, are particularly full and interesting. — *Chambers's Encyclop. s.v.* See Etheridge, *Hist., Liturgy, etc., of Syrian Churches* (Lond. 1846); Benin, *Traditions of Syr. Churches* (ibid. 1871).

Syrinx

in Greek mythology, was a daughter of the river-god Lado, who, when pursued on account of her beauty by Pan, prayed to her father for relief, and was changed into a *reed*. Pan cut some stalks from it, joined them together with wax, and used it, in the form known to us as Pan's pipe, in remembrance of her (Ovid, *Metam.* 1, 690).

Syrna

in Greek mythology, was a daughter of the Carian king Dameethus. She fell from the roof of her house, and was restored by the art of Podalirius, who then married her, and built the city named after her in Caria.

Sy'ro-Phoeni'cian

(*Συροφοίνισσα* v.r. *Συροφοινίκισσα*), a general name (^{<41076>}Mark 7:26) of a (female) inhabitant of the northern portion of Phoenicia, which was popularly called *Syro-Phoenicia*, by reason of its proximity to Syria and its absorption by conquest into that kingdom. **SEE PHOENICIA**. The name is made especially interesting to the scriptural student on account of the woman who besought our Lord in behalf of her afflicted daughter, and the miraculous cure wrought by him on the latter. Matthew calls the woman a woman of Canaan (^{<41152>}Mark 15:22), being in respect to her nationality, in common with the Phoenicians, a descendant of Canaan; Mark describes her as "a Greek, a Syro-phoenician by nation" (^{<41076>}Mark 7:26), but Rosenmüller rightly observes that the Jews called all Gentiles Greeks (*Ἕλληνας*), just as the Greeks called all strangers barbarians. She was therefore a Greek, or Gentile, and a native of that part of Syria which belonged to Phoenicia. We have a curious instance of the interchange made in respect to the term's Canaanites and Phoenicians, of an earlier kind, in the case of Shaul, the son of Simeon, who is said in Genesis (^{<01460>}Genesis

46:10), according to the Sept., to be the son of a Phoenician woman, and in Exodus (^{<0185>}Exodus 6:15), to be the son of a Canaanitish woman. The case of the Syro-phoenician woman was a very singular one, both on account of the strong faith manifested on her part, and the exercise of divine grace and power in miraculous working by Christ beyond the proper sphere of his personal ministrations. In the latter respect it stands in a sort of affinity to the cases in Old Test. history referred to by our Lord in ^{<0185>}Luke 4:26, 27.

The invention of the words “Syro-Phoenicia” and “Syro-Phoenicians” seems to have been the work of the Romans, though it is difficult to say exactly what they intended by the expressions. It has generally been supposed that they wished to distinguish the Phoenicians of Syria from those of Africa (the Carthaginians); and the term “Syrophoenix” has been regarded as the exact converse to “Libyphoenix” (Alford, *ad loc.*). But the Libyphoenices are not the Phoenicians of Africa generally they are a peculiar race half-African and half Phoenician (“mixtum Punicum Afris genaus,” Livy, 21:22). The Syro-Phoenicians, therefore, should, on this analogy, be a mixed race, half Phoenicians and half Syrians. This is probably the sense of the word in the satirists Lucilius (ap. Non. Marc. *De Proprietat. Serin.* 4:431) and Juvenal (*Sat.* 8:159), who would regard a mongrel Oriental as peculiarly contemptible. In later times a geographic sense of the terms superseded the ethnic one. The emperor Hadrian divided Syria into three parts- Syria Proper, Syro-Phoenica, and Syro-Palaestina, and henceforth a Syro-Phoenician meant a native of this sub-province (Lucian, *De Conc. Der.* § 4), which included Phoenicia Proper, Damascus, and Palmyrene (see Rawlinson, *Herod.* 4:243 sq.).

Syropilus

(also SGUROPULTUS, *Σγουρόπουλος, Σγουῦρος*), SYLVESTER, a writer on the history of the Council of Ferrara and Florence (1438 sq.), who himself participated in its business, and was one of the most determined opponents of the union between the churches of the East, and West upon which the emperor, John Palaeologus, had set his heart. So far did he carry his opposition that he found it advisable to resign his place as one of the six debaters in the council, and came into violent antagonism with both, the patriarch and the emperor... He yielded to the emperor's commands and threats, however, so far as to sign the decree of union, which had been adopted, but afterwards deplored the weakness of his

action. He was a legal officer (δικαιόφυλαξ) and a chief sacristan (μέγας ἑκκλησιάρχης) at Constantinople, and also one of the five dignitaries about the patriarch who were allowed to wear the badge of the cross upon their robes; but his want of firmness in the matter of the treaty of union with the Latin Church rendered him unpopular at home and thus caused him to retire from public life. He devoted his leisure to the composition of a “true history of the untrue union between the Greeks and the Latins,” thereby exciting against himself the anger of the Latins and their friends in turn, so that Romish writers like Labbe and Allatius class him unqualifiedly with Grecian liars and the worst sort of schismatics.

The work of Syropuluis has important and undeniable value as a source for the history of the Synod of Ferrara. It presents a credible view of events personally engaged in by the author, and defends a position actually represented in the council, besides revealing to view a series of connected and involved incidents which, but for its narration, could not have been known at this day. The later criticism of Allatius may, nevertheless, have corrected some minor particulars of the narrative. The object of the book was to show that a real unions was impossible, though the leaders on both sides, the pope, Bessarion, the patriarch, the emperor, etc., steadily drew nearer to each other, until the necessities of the Greeks decided the result, which Syropillus justly characterizes as a compromise (μεσότης) rather than a union. The final drafting of the terms of union involved extraordinary difficulties (sect. 8:14). Book 12 relates the disagreements of the Greeks while returning from the synod, and their discouraging reception at home.

The work is extant in a single edition based on a codex of the Bibliotheca Regia (N. 1247), from which Serrarius caused it to be copied in 1642 and sent to Isaac Vossius for publication; but Sir Edward Hyde, the English ambassador, caused the manuscript to be placed at the disposal of Robert Creyghton, chaplain at the court of Charles II and, later, bishop of Bath. The latter issued the book in the original Greek and accompanied it with a Latin translation under the title *Vera Hist. — Unionis non Verce inter Graecos et Latinos*, etc. (Hagee Comitibus, 1660), besides prefixing to it a eulogy of Syropulus and of the Grecian theology and Church as compared with the papal, which rendered the work still more unpalatable to Romish readers. Allatius accordingly prepared a refutation, directed more especially at Creyghton, entitled *In R. Creyghtoni Apparatus, Versionem et Not. ad Hist. Concec. Florentini*, etc. (Rom. 1665), pt. 1 Creyghton’s

edition and also the Paris codex are incomplete, as the whole of the first book is wanting; but several other manuscript copies of Syropulus exist, so that the deficiency may perhaps be met. See Creyghton's preface, *ubi sup.*; Oudini *Comment.* 3, 2418; Cave, *Hist. Liter.* Append.; Schröckh's, 34:411. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*

Syrtis

(Σύρτις, "quicksands," ~~Acts~~ Acts 28:17). There were two quicksands on the coast of North Africa,; between Cyrene and Carthage, whose shoals and eddies the ancient mariners greatly feared (Horace, *Odes*, 1, 22, 5; Ovid, *Fast.* 4:499; Tibull. 2, 4, 91). The greater of these was named *Syrtis Major*, or *Magna* and the lesser *Syrtis Minor*; and old geographers used to tell many marvels respecting them (Strabo, 2,:123; 17:834; Ptolemy, 4:3; Pliny, 5, 4;. Solin. 27; Mela, 1, 7 4; Sallust, *Jug.* 78). Modern explorations find both of them to be highly dangerous bays, where the treacherous sandy shore is barely covered with water, and where terrific clouds of sand are suddenly raised by the wind, obscuring then sight and overwhelming men and even ships, The Greater Syrtis is now called the *Gulf of Sidra*, between Tripoli and Barea; and the Lesser the *Gulf of Cabes*. The former is specially intended in the account of Paul's shipwreck (q.v.). See Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v.* **SEE QUICKSAND**. Syrus, in Greek mythology, was a son of Apollo and Sinope, who is said to have given name to the Syrians.

Systatlae

(Συστατικάί) were letters of license granted by a bishop for a clergyman to' remove from his diocese to another, called by the old canons *Dismissory Letters*.

Syzygus

SEE YOKE-FELLOW.