

S

S represents the hard open (or fricative) sound produced by bringing the blade of the tongue close to the front palate, immediately behind the gums, or rather, this is the normal position for S, as slight varieties can be produced by bringing the tongue farther back. By the "blade" is meant the pointed end of the tongue, not the mere point, which at the same part of the palate produces R. This position differs little from that for TH, into which S passes in a lisping pronunciation; a larger part of the surface of the tongue is brought near to the palate for TH than for S. The symbol which represents the soft open sound corresponding to S is Z, though in practice S often stands for both.

The history of our symbol S is easy up to a certain point. It is the rounded form of ζ , rounded at a very early period for convenience of writing, for the change is apparent in the old Italian alphabet of Cære, and still more on the recently discovered vase of Formello; and even in the scribbling of the Greeks at Abu Simbel—the oldest, or nearly the oldest, bit of Greek epigraphy—perfectly rounded forms stand side by side with the angular ones. The common Greek form Σ was obtained by adding a fourth stroke, and gradually making the top and bottom ones horizontal. When, however, we wish to identify the Greek symbol of three strokes with its Phœnician counterpart, the difficulty begins. The Phœnicians had four symbols for sibilants, known in Hebrew as Zayin, Samekh, Šade, and Shin; the last of these at a very early date represented two sounds, the English *sh*, and another sound which resembled that of Samekh and ultimately became indistinguishable from it, both being pronounced as the English *s*. The Greeks did not want all these symbols, consequently in different parts of Greece one or other—not the same—Phœnician symbol fell into disuse. One of these, M or μ called San, though lost in Ionic, appears in old Doric inscriptions, as those of Thera, Melos, and Crete, Argos, Corinth, and Corcyra; but the later Doric form is the usual Sigma; probably San was too like the nasal M. There is no doubt that in form Zeta represents Zayin, and that Xi represents Samekh. Moreover, Zeta and Zayin stand seventh in the Greek and Phœnician alphabets respectively, and Xi and Samekh each fifteenth. Again, the form of San with three strokes corresponds fairly with Šade, and Sigma is moderately like Shin; but here the evidence of position comes in again to strengthen a somewhat weak case, for in the old Italian alphabets San has the place of Šade, the simpler form occurring in the Cære alphabet, the fuller in that of the Formello vase; in both Sigma (rounded in form) has the place of Shin. These identifications would be certain if the names corresponded as well as the forms; but they clearly do not: Zeta and Šade (not Zayin) seem to hold together in sound, and Sigma (as has often been suggested) looks like a "popular etymology" for Samekh. But the objection from difference of names is not fatal. All names which are thought of habitually in rows or sets tend to be modified under the influence of analogy; and analogy has certainly been at work here, for Xi, which is a purely Greek name, is, like Psi, and like Chi and Phi, due to the older Pi. Similarly Eta and Theta have probably made Zeta; but it must be allowed that the metamorphosis of Šade is more intelligible (as a matter of sound-change) than that of Zayin. Probably we must have recourse to a different principle to explain at least some part of our difficulty. We may suppose that in some part of Greece the sounds

denoted originally by Šade and Zayin became indistinguishable; there would then exist for a time one sound but two names. It would be a matter of little moment which name should survive; thus Šade (or Zeta) might supersede Zayin, or one name might survive in one district—as San in the Doric, but Sigma in the rest of Greece. This suggestion is made by Dr Taylor (*The Alphabet*, ii. 100). The history of the sounds, as well as of the forms, of the Greek sibilants is difficult. Probably Sigma was generally hard—our *s* in *sign*. But Zeta did not originally denote the corresponding *z*: rather it was *dz*; some say *dj*, as in "John," but this is not likely. Xi was probably a strong sibilant with a weak guttural, as X was in Latin. If the sound *z* existed in Greek, as is probable, it was denoted by Sigma. In Italy, also, we must infer that the soft sibilant was heard too little to need a special symbol, because *z*, which exists in the old alphabets of Cære and Formello, was lost early enough to leave a place for the newly-made Italian symbol G. When Z was restored, it was placed at the end of the alphabet and doubtless with the value of Greek Z in the Greek words in which alone it was used. One Latin *s*—probably *z*—became the trilled *r* between two vowels,—e.g., in "Papius" for "Papisius," "arboris" for "arboris."

In English the symbol *s* alone existed till *z* was introduced from France with words of French origin, as "zeal," "zone." An attempt was made to employ it at the end of plural nouns, where the sound is regularly heard except when the last sound of the noun is hard, e.g., "bedz" (beds), but "hops"; but this was not maintained, nor even consistently done, for the symbol was used even when the sound must have been *s*. We regularly write *s* for both sounds,—e.g., in "lose" and "loose," "curs" and "curse," "hers" and "hearse." When there is a distinction in spelling the *s* commonly has the value of *z*—e.g., "vies" and "vice," "pays" and "pace," "his" and "hiss." S has the sound of *sh* in "sure," "sugar," and some other words; this is due to the palatal sound heard before the *u*. *Sh*, in spite of its spelling, is a single sound, the position of which differs from that for *s* only in a slight retraction of the point of the tongue; it is commonly found in English words which originally had *sk*,—e.g., "shall," O.E. *seal*; "shabby," a doublet of "scabby"; "fish," O.E. *fisk*. The sound is the same as that of French *ch* in "château," "chef," "sécher," where it is due to assimilation of original *k*.

SAADI. See SA'DI.

SAADIA, or SAADIAS (Heb. *Se'adyah*, Arab. *Sa'id*), was the most accomplished, learned, and noble gaon (head of the academy) of Sūrā (see RAB). Mar Rab Se'adyah b. Yoseph² was born in the Fayyūm, Upper Egypt, in 892 and died at Sūrā in 942. Of his teachers only the Jew Abū Kethir is positively known by name,³ but he must have had at least three more teachers of considerable learning, one a Karaites,⁴ one a Mohammedan, and one a Christian, as his acquaintance with the literature of these four religious bodies testifies. His pre-eminence over his

¹ He signs himself סאדי acrostically in his *Asharoth* (*Kobez*, pp. 52, 53; see note 4 on next page).

² Mas'ūdī, a contemporary, calls the father Ya'aqob; but see Fürst, *Literaturblatt d. Orients*, vi. col. 140.

³ Mas'ūdī (De Sacy, *Chrest. Ar.*, 2d ed., i. 350, 351).

⁴ The late learned and ingenious Rabbi S. L. Rapoport rolled here, as in many other places, the stone of Sisyphus ("Toledoth Rabbanū Se'adyah Gaon," in *Bikkure Ha'ittim*, Vienna, 1828, note 31). Perhaps, after all, the Karaites may be right in asserting that Salmon b. Yeruham was Rab Se'adyah's teacher.

contemporaries is indicated in the fact that he was the only gaon who had not been educated and then advanced by degrees in the academy, to the highest dignity of which he was called from a far-off country, but best appears in the excellence of his many works, which extend over most branches of learning known in his time. And his learning was exceeded by his manifold virtues. His love of truth and justice was made more conspicuous by the darkness of the corruption amid which he lived. When the rēsh galuthā ("prince of the captivity," the highest dignitary of the Jews in Babylonia, and to some extent of those of the whole world) attempted to wrest judgment in a certain case, and first asked, then requested, and finally demanded the signature¹ of the gaon of Sūrā in a threatening manner, Se'adyah refused it, fearless of consequences. David b. Zakkai, the rēsh galuthā, deposed him and chose another gaon in his stead. A reconciliation took place some years afterwards, and Se'adyah was reinstated in his old dignity. And, although his health had been fatally undermined by the behaviour of the rēsh galuthā and his son, Se'adyah, when his former opponent died, was indefatigable in his endeavours to have this very son of his once mortal enemy placed on the throne of his fathers. But the new prince of the captivity enjoyed his dignity for little more than half a year. He left behind him a boy, twelve years of age, whom Se'adyah took into his own house and treated in every respect as his own child. This learning and these virtues endeared Se'adyah not merely to his contemporaries but also to the best men of succeeding ages. Behayye b. Yoseph (the author of the *Hoboth Halleboth*), Rashi, Se'adyah (the author of the commentary on Daniel in the Rabbinic Bible), David Kimhi, Behayye b. Asher (the author of *Kad Hakkemah*), all appeal to him as an authority not to be questioned. Even Ibn 'Ezra defers more to him than to any other authority. To this day Jewish and Christian scholars alike express for him the highest admiration.

The numerous works which are ascribed to him may be conveniently divided into four classes.

I. *Genuine and still extant Works*.—(1) Arabic translations of, and in part commentaries² on, books of the Bible: (a) the Pentateuch (printed in Hebrew characters, Constantinople, 1546, fol., and in Arabic characters in the Paris and London polyglots); (b) Isaiah (printed in Arabic characters from Hebrew letters of the Bodleian MS. Uri 156;³ by Paulus, Jena, 1790-91, 8vo); (c) Psalms (Ewald, *Ueber die arabisch geschriebenen Werke jüdischer Sprachgelehrten*, Stuttgart, 1844, 8vo); (d) Proverbs (Bodleian MS. Uri 15); (e) Job (Uri 45); (f) Canticles (Merx, *Die Saadjanische Uebersetzung des Hohen Liedes ins Arabische*, Heidelberg, 1882, 8vo). (2) Hebrew Lexicography: Seventy (90 or 91) *šraš* *nešveta* to be found in the Bible, published from the Bodl. MS. Hunt. 573, by Dukes (*Z. K. M.*, v. 6) and by Benjacob (*Debarim Atikim*, i., Leipsic, 1844). (3) Talmudic Literature: (a) Decisions (incorporated in *Itur*, Venice, 1608, fol.; and in the book of *Responsa*, *Sha'are Sedek*, Salonica, 1792, 4to); (b) On the laws of inheritance (Bodl. MS. Hunt. 630). (4) Liturgy, both in prose and poetry: (a) *Siddur* (Bodleian MS. Uri 261);⁴ (b) *Arabischer Midrasch* (!)

¹ To make the legal decisions of the rēsh galuthā more respected, the signatures of the gaonim of Sūrā and Pumbedithā were desirable. A specimen of a legal decision by David b. Zakkai signed on the authority of Rab Se'adyah Gaon is to be found in Frankel-Grätz, *Monatsschrift*, xxxi. pp. 167-170.

² If we may argue from the known to the unknown, Se'adyah's translations, whether they were called *tašvir* or *sharh*, contained more than a mere translation. From Ibn 'Ezra's preface to his commentary on the Pentateuch and from the Arabic comm. on the Psalms published in excerpt by Ewald we see that Rab Se'adyah was in the habit of explaining in addition to translating. Compare also Munk, "Notice sur Saadia," in Cahen, *La Bible* (Isaïe), Paris, 1838, 8vo, p. 77, note 1.

³ In the copyist's subscription to this MS. the actual reading is not עבריה (Rapoport), but עבריה, as Munk prints it ("Notice," p. 108). The Bodleian MSS. are referred to in this article from personal inspection.

⁴ The original codex on brownish paper, in square characters of Babylonian handwriting (14th cent.), is defective at beginning and end. The supplement at the beginning, containing also later matter.

zu den Zehn Geboten, in Hebrew letters (MS. Jellinek of Vienna, with Hebrew and German translation by W. Eisenstädter, Vienna, 1868, 8vo). (5) Religious Philosophy: (a) Commentary on the *Sepher Yesirah*, MS. Uri 370 (*Opp. Add.*, 4to, 89), contains the earlier part of a Heb. trans. in a modern hand; (b) *Kitāb al-Amānāt wa'l-Itiqādāt* (Landaner, Leyden, 1880, 8vo), translated into Hebrew by Yehudah Ibn Tibbon (*editio princeps*, Constantinople, 1562, 4to), and by R. Berekyah Hannakdan, author of the *Mishle Shu'alim* (printed only in part; see Dukes, *Beiträge*, pp. 20, 22); nine chapters have been translated into German (Fürst, Leipsic, 1845, 12mo), and parts into English (*Two Treatises*, by P. Allix, London, 1707, 8vo).

II. *Works now lost, but the existence of which is testified to by contemporary and later authors*.—(1) An Arabic translation of, and in part commentary on, most, if not all, the other books of the Bible.⁵ (2) Lexical Treatises: Book of Interpretations (*Sepher Pitronim*, or *Collection Ityeron*).⁶ (3) Grammatical Treatises: (a) Elegancy of the Hebrew Tongue—(a) Treatise on the Changes, (b) Treatise on the Combinations, (c) Treatise on *Dagesh* and *Isaphch*, (d) Treatise on the Letters ד, ה, ו, נ ; (b) Treatise on Punctuation⁷; (c) Treatise on Right Reading⁸;—it is not impossible that the first four constituted one work and the last two another work. (4) Talmudic Literature: (a) Translation of the *Mishnah*⁹; (b) Methodology of the (Babylonian) Talmud¹⁰; (c) Treatise on Bills¹¹; (d) Treatise on Deposits¹²; (e) Treatise on Oaths¹³; (f) Treatise on Prohibited Degrees¹⁴; (g) Treatise on *Impura et Pura*, including *Hilchoth Niddah*¹⁵;—it is very possible that those marked *c* to *f* constituted one book, just as the treatise marked *g* constituted one book. (5) Calendaric Literature: *Sepher Ha'ibbur* (Treatise on Intercalation).¹⁷ (6) Apologetics: Treatise on Investigations.¹⁸ (7) Polemics: (a) against Karaism—(a) 'Anan,¹⁹ (b) Ibn Sakkawiyah,²⁰ (c) Ibn Zitta (or Zutta)²¹; (b) against the Rabbanite Hivvi al-Balkhi²²; (c) against the Karaites Ben Asher (the completer of the *Massoroth*; see *L.-B. d. Or.*, x. 684). (8) The nature of the *Sepher Haggai* cited by Rabad II. and Ab. b. Hivva in his *Sepher Ha'ibbur* is not clear.

III. *Works ascribed to Se'adyah the authorship of which is not sufficiently proven*.—(1) The commentary on Canticles edited by Yishak Ibn 'Akriah (Constantinople, 1577, 4to), and that published by L. Margaliyyoth at Frankfort-on-Oder, 1777.²³ (2) The well-known piece of didactic poetry which gives account of all the letters of the Bible, how many times they occur, &c. (*editio princeps*, Venice, 1593, at the end of Elias Levita's *Massoroth Hammas*).

IV. *Works ascribed to Se'adyah by mistake*.—(1) The Commentary on Daniel commonly found in the Rabbinic Bibles belongs to another Rab Se'adyah, who lived at least two hundred years later, and was a native either of France or the south of Germany. (2) The Commentary on the *Sepher Yesirah*, printed with the text and three other commentaries at Mantua in 1562, 4to. (3) The Book on Lots (*Sepher Haggavoloth*), often printed separately and in conjunction with similar works. (4) *Eben Huppilosophim* (*Lapis Philosophorum*), ascribed to him by R. Mosheh Butrial (Mantua edition of the *Sepher Yesirah* as above). (S. M. S.-S.)

is in S. Arabian handwriting. The well-known "Ten reasons for Sounding the Trumpet on the Day of Memorial" are not found in this *Siddur* (against Rapoport, *ut supra*, note 21). The three poetical pieces published as five by Rosenberg (*Kobez*, ii., Berlin, 1856) form an integral part of the *Siddur*, but bear on the surface marks of having been taken from a second-hand, if not a third-hand, copy, as the editor admits with regard to the "second petition." The "Two Petitions" must have served Ibn Gebirol (AVICEBRON) as a model for the latter or liturgical part of his *Me'orot*, just as he and others after him silently utilized Se'adyah's philosophy.

⁵ See *Hoboth Halleboth* (preface) and *Sibbub* (Travels) of R. Peth-ahyah of Ratisbon (London, 1861, 8vo, p. 22).

⁶ *L.-B. d. Orients*, x. coll. 516, 541, 684.

⁷ *Ibid.*, coll. 516, 518.

⁸ *L.-B. d. Or.*, x. 518.

⁹ See *Shem Haggadolim* (Vilna, 1852, 8vo), ii. leaf 16a, col. 2.

¹⁰ See *Sha'are Sedek* (*ut supra*), leaf 17b.

¹¹ See R. Menahem b. Shalomoh lebeth Meir (commonly called Meiri) on *Aboth* (Vienna, 1854, 8vo, Introduction, p. 17).

¹² See Rapoport, *l.c.*, note 20.

¹³ See Pinsker, *Likutei Kadmoniyoth* (Vienna, 1860, p. 174, note 1, in *Nispahim*).

¹⁴ See *L.-B. d. Or.*, xii. coll. 101, 102.

¹⁵ See *Sion* (Frankfort-on-Main, 1842-43, 8vo), ii. p. 137.

¹⁶ See Pinsker (*ut supra*), p. 103.

¹⁷ See *Sion* (as before).

¹⁸ On this commentator see Ibn 'Ezra on Exodus xxi. 24. From this passage we learn that Se'adyah and Ben Zitta were contemporaries, and even had oral controversies with one another.

¹⁹ See *Hilchoth Kedem*, Amsterdam, 1846, p. 71. Hivvi al-Balkhi had raised strong objections against the truth of Scripture in his *Two Hundred Questions, or Objections to the Bible*.

²⁰ The editions "Prag", 1782 (Steinschneider), and Nowydwor, 1783 (Zedner), are probably the same as that of Frankfort with different titles.

SAALFELD, a busy little town of Germany, in the eastern horn of the crescent-shaped duchy of Saxe-Meiningen, is picturesquely situated on the left bank of the Saale (here spanned by a bridge), 24 miles south of Weimar and 77 miles south-west of Leipsic. One of the most ancient towns in Thuringia, Saalfeld was the capital of the now extinct duchy of Saxe-Saalfeld, and contains some interesting old buildings. Among these are the former residential palace, built in 1679 on the site of the Benedictine monastery of St Peter, destroyed during the Peasants' War; the Gothic church of St John, dating from the 13th century; the quaint town house, built in 1533-37; and the Kitzenstein, a shooting lodge said to have been originally erected by the emperor Henry L, though the present building is not older than the 16th century. But perhaps the most interesting relic of the past in Saalfeld is the striking ruin of the Sorbenburg or Hoher Schwarm, a strong castle said to have been built by Charlemagne to protect his borders from the Slavonic hordes. Its destruction took place in 1290, under Rudolf of Hapsburg. Saalfeld is situated in one of the busiest parts of Meiningen, and carries on a number of brisk industries, including the manufacture of sewing-machines, colours, wax-cloth and wire-cloth, brewing, and iron-founding. It has an active trade in iron, slate, wood, and wooden goods, and there are ochre and iron mines in the neighbourhood. The population in 1880 was 7458.

Springing up under the wing of the Sorbenburg, Saalfeld early became an imperial demesne, and received various benefits at the hands of successive emperors. After a somewhat chequered career, the town became the capital of the duchy of Saxe-Saalfeld, founded in 1680 by the youngest son of the duke of Gotha; but in 1735, when the succession to the duchy of Coburg was assigned to the dukes of Saalfeld, their residence was removed to Coburg. In 1826 the united duchies merged by inheritance in the duchy of Saxe-Meiningen.

SAARBRÜCKEN, an important industrial and commercial town in Prussia, on the left bank of the Saar, a navigable tributary of the Moselle, is situated 49 miles east of Metz, at the south end of one of the most extensive coal-fields in Europe, to which it has given its name. With the town of St Johann, immediately opposite on the right bank of the river, here spanned by two bridges, Saarbrücken forms in reality a single community, with a united population of nearly 22,000. St Johann, though now the larger, is the more recent town, being in fact the creation of the important railways whose junction is fixed there. Saarbrücken itself is not directly on any main line. The industries of St Johann-Saarbrücken include wool-spinning, brewing, and the manufacture of tobacco, chemicals, tin, and stoneware. The trade is chiefly connected with the produce of the neighbouring coal-mines and that of the numerous important iron and glass works of the district. The Saarbrücken coal-field extends over 70 square miles; and its annual output is about 6 million tons. Of this total the Prussian state mines yield about 5,200,000 tons, Prussian private mines 100,000 tons, the mines in Lorraine 500,000 tons, and mines in Rhenish Bavaria 200,000 tons. In 1880 the population of Saarbrücken alone was 9514, and of St Johann 12,346.

Till 1238 Saarbrücken was in the possession of the old counts of Ardennes; from 1381 till 1793 it was the residence of the princes of Nassau-Saarbrücken; from 1793 till 1815 it was in the possession of the French; and since 1815 it has been Prussian. St Johann is said to have been founded as an outwork to Saarbrücken in 1046, and to have received town-rights in 1321. In the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71 Saarbrücken was seized by the French on 2d August 1870, but the first German victory, on the heights of Spicheren, 3 miles to the south, relieved it four days later.

SAARDAM. See **ZAANDAM**.

SAARGEMÜND (Fr. *Sarrequeumines*), an industrial town and railway junction of Germany, in the imperial province of Alsace-Lorraine, is situated at the confluence

of the Blies and the Saar, 40 miles east of Metz. It carries on considerable manufactures of silk, plush, porcelain, and earthenware, and is a chief depôt for the papier-mâché boxes (mostly snuff-boxes) which are made in great quantity in the neighbourhood. To the south lies the district lunatic asylum of Steinbacherhof. The town, which is garrisoned by four squadrons of cavalry, in 1880 had a population of 9573, chiefly Roman Catholics.

SAAVEDRA, ANGEL DE, DUKE OF RIVAS (1791-1865), Spanish poet and politician, was born at Cordova in 1791, and fought with bravery in the Spanish War of Independence. From 1813 to 1820 he lived in retirement in Andalusia, but in the latter year he sided actively with the revolutionary party, and in consequence had to go into exile in 1823. He lived successively in England, Malta, and France until 1834, when he received permission to return to Spain, shortly afterwards succeeding his brother as duke of Rivas. In 1836 he became minister of the interior under Isturiz, and along with his chief had again to leave the country. Having returned with Maria Christina in 1844, he again held a portfolio for a short time in 1854; and during the last two decades of his life he was ambassador at Naples, Paris, and Florence for considerable periods. He died in 1865.

In 1813 he published *Ensayos poéticos*, and between that date and his first exile several tragedies of his composition (*Alfatar*, 1814; *El Duque d'Aquitania*, 1814; *Lanusa*, 1822) were put upon the stage. *Tanto vales quanto tienes*, a comedy, appeared in 1834, *Don Alvaro*, a tragedy, in 1835, and two other dramatic compositions in 1842. Saavedra was also the author of *El Moro Exposito*, a narrative poem in ballad metre (two volumes), and *Florinda*, an epic romance.

SAAVEDRA, MIGUEL DE CERVANTES. See **CERVANTES**.

SAAVEDRA FAXARDO, DIEGO DE (1584-1648), diplomatist and man of letters, was born of a noble family at Algezares in the Spanish province of Murcia in 1584. Having been educated for the church at Salamanca, and admitted to the priesthood, he accompanied Cardinal Borgia, the Spanish ambassador, to Rome in the capacity of secretary. Ultimately he rose to high rank in the diplomatic service, and was Spanish plenipotentiary at Ratisbon in 1636 and at Münster in 1645. He was nominated to the supreme council of the Indies in 1646, but not long afterwards retired to a monastery, where he died in 1648.

In 1640 he published a treatise entitled *Empresas políticas, ó idea de un príncipe político cristiano representado en cien empresas*, a hundred short essays, in which he discusses the education of a prince, his relation and duties to those around him, and so forth, primarily intended for and dedicated to the son of Philip IV. It is sententious in style and characterized by the curious learning of the time, and is still read and admired in Spain. It passed through a number of editions and was translated into several languages, the English version being by Astry (2 vols., 8vo, London, 1700). An unfinished historical work entitled *Corona Gotica, Castellana, y Austríaca políticamente ilustrada*, appeared in 1646. Another work by Saavedra, only second in popularity to the *Empresas*, his *Republica Literaria*, was published posthumously in 1670; it discusses in a somewhat mocking tone some of the leading characters in the ancient and modern world of letters. Collected editions of his works appeared at Antwerp in 1677-78, and again at Madrid in 1789-90; see also vol. xxv. of the *Bibl. de Aut. Esp.* (1853).

SAAZ (Bohemian *Zatec*), a manufacturing and commercial town in the north of Bohemia, is situated on the right bank of the Eger, 42 miles north-west of Prague. The suspension bridge, 210 feet long, which here spans the river was constructed in 1826 and is one of the oldest of the kind in Bohemia. Saz, which claims to have existed as early as the 8th century, contains a number of ancient churches, of which one is said to date from 1206, and five others from before the close of the 14th century. The town-house was built in 1559. A technical school was added in 1878 to the already fairly numerous educational institutions. Nails, leather, beetroot-sugar, and pasteboard are among the chief manufactures of Saz,

which, however, owes its main importance to being the centre of the extensive hop-trade of the neighbourhood. The hops of Saz are said to have been renowned for the last five hundred years; and nearly 800 tons are annually raised in the district to which the town gives its name. The population of Saz was 12,425 in 1880.

SABEA. See **YEMEN**.
SABAH, or **BRITISH NORTH BORNEO**, is all that portion of the island of BORNEO (*q.v.*) which was formally recognized by the charter of incorporation granted in November 1881 as the territory of the British North Borneo Company. It has a coast-line of over 600 miles, and its area, still to a great extent unexplored,¹ is estimated at 30,000 square miles. Leaving out of account the deep indentations of the coast-line, it may be said to form a pentagon, of which three sides, the north-west, north-east, and south-east, are washed by the sea, while the remaining two sides are purely conventional lines drawn from Gura Peak (3° 50' N. lat., 116° 10' E. long.), the one almost due east to the Sibuco river, the other north-north-west to the mouth of the Sipitong on Brunei Bay. The latter separates the Company's territory from the independent sultanate of Brunei; the former is the frontier towards the Dutch possessions.

The great central feature of Sabah is the magnificent mountain of Kinabalu (compare BORNEO) or Nabal, built up of porphyritic granite and igneous rocks to a height of 13,698 feet, and dominating the whole northern part of the island, with all its profusion of lesser mountains and hills. Kinabalu, which has the appearance of two mountains, unites towards the east by a low ridge with "Nonohan t'agaiah (the great Nonohan) and the terminal cone Tumboyonkon (Tamboyukon)." These two summits are respectively 8000 and 7000 feet high, and there are others of considerable elevation in the same neighbourhood. At some 15 or 20 miles to the north rises Mount Madalon (5000 feet), separated from Kinabalu and the other igneous and metamorphic hills by a wide valley, and consisting of those aqueous rocks, limestones, sandstones, and clays which appear to occupy the whole country to the north. Westward from Kinabalu are hills between 1000 and 2000 feet in height, and about 40 or 50 miles south-east is an important group on the north side of the Labuk valley known as the Mentapok Mountains (3000-8000 feet). The whole surface of the country is channelled by countless streams whose precipitous ravines, boulder-strewn rapids, and enormous beds of rolled pebbles bespeak the denuding energy of tropical rains. The coasts are generally low and flat, and to a great extent lined with casuarina trees, with here and there a stretch of mangrove, a low sandstone or limestone cliff, or a patch of that great forest which in the interior still covers so large a portion of the territory. In the low grounds along the coast and also inland among the hills are vast swamps and watery plains, which in the rainy season, when the rivers rise 20 or 30 feet above their usual level, are transformed into lakes. On the west side of Sabah the principal rivers are the Padas and the Klías, debouching opposite Labuan, but quite unexplored in their upper courses; the Papar (Pappar or Pappal), which passes the village of that name and enters the sea at Papar Point; the Tampassuk, one of the first to be explored (see St John's *Life in the Forests of the Far East*) and remarkable for the waterfall of Pandassan or Tampassuk (1500 feet high, and thus one of the highest in the world), formed by its headwater the Kalupis. The Sekwati, a comparatively small river

farther north, is well known for its oil-springs. At the northern extremity of the island the deep inlet of Marudu Bay receives the waters of the Marudu or Maludu river, which rises on the west side of Mount Madalon. On the east coast are the Sugut, which has its headwaters in the hills to the east of Kinabalu, and forms its delta in the neighbourhood of Torongohok or Purpura Island; the Labuk, debouching in Labuk Bay, and having its sources in the highlands about 70 miles inland; the Kinabatangan, with a longer course than any yet mentioned, rising probably between 116° and 117° E. long., and forming at its mouth a very extensive delta to the south of Sandakan Harbour; and finally the Segama, the scene of Frank Hatton's death (1883). Farther south, and inland from Darvel Bay and Sibuco (or St Lucia) Bay, there are no doubt other rivers of equal, it may be superior, importance; such, to judge by its delta, is the Kalabakong, debouching opposite Sebattik Island. Most of the rivers mentioned are navigable for steam launches of light draught, but their value is frequently impaired by a bar near the mouth. Several of the natural harbours of North Borneo, on the other hand, are at once accessible, safe, and commodious. Sandakan Harbour, on the north-east coast (5° 40' N. lat. and 118° 10' E. long.), runs inland some 17 miles, with a very irregular outline broken by the mouths of numerous creeks and streams. The mouth, only 2½ miles across, is split into two channels by the little island of Balhalla. The depth in the main entrance varies from 10 to 17 fathoms, and vessels drawing 20 feet can advance half-way up the bay. Just within the mouth, on the north side, lies Elopura (see below). At Silam, on Darvel Bay, farther south, there is good anchorage. Kudat (discovered by Commander Johnstone, of H.M.S. "Egeria," in 1881) is a small but valuable harbour in Marudu Bay running inland for 2 or 3 miles, but rapidly shoaling after the first mile to 1 and 2 fathoms. It affords anchorage for vessels of any draught, but the frontage available for wharves is limited to some 1500 feet. In Gaya Bay, on the west coast, any number of vessels may lie in safety during either monsoon, the depths varying from 6 to 16 and 17 fathoms.

The climate of North Borneo is of course tropical, with a very equable temperature. The lowest minimum of the thermometer recorded in 1883 at Sandakan was 68°·5 in December. The greatest interval without rain was eight days in March. The rainfall was 34½ inches (157 in 1880) at Sandakan, 129 at Papar, and 120 at Kudat. In the interior it must often be much above these figures.

That North Borneo should prove rich in minerals was supposed probable from the character of some other parts of the island; but hitherto investigations have not in this matter proved very successful. Coal or lignite exists, but most frequently in thin seams and insignificant pockets; the petroleum springs cannot come into any true competition with those worked elsewhere; gold has been discovered (1885) in the Segama river and may prove a stimulus to immigration; iron-ores appear both abundant and at times productive; and there are indications of the existence of copper, antimony, tin, and zinc ores. As yet the wealth of the country lies in its timber and jungle products (camphor and gutta-percha in great quantities), and in its edible nuts, guano, sago, sugar, tobacco, coffee, pepper, and gambier. Tobacco is most successfully grown by the natives in the inland districts of Mansalut, Kandassang, Kaporinagan, Gena-Gana, Tomborongo, Karnahan, Penusak, Tiang-Tuhan, &c.; and its cultivation has been taken up by several foreign companies. The birds'-nest caves of Gomanton (Gormanton) near the village of Malape on the Kinabatangan yield the Government a revenue of from \$6000 to \$7000; and other caves of the same kind are still unworked. As the natives (Dusuns, Tagaas-Bajaus, Idaan, &c.) are scattered, mostly in small villages, throughout the unexplored as well as the explored districts, their number can only be guessed, but it is usually stated at 150,000. Since the formation of the company there has been a steady immigration, especially of Chinese from Singapore. At Elopura, the capital of the territory and of its East Coast residency, the inhabitants in 1883 numbered 3770 (1500 being Chinese and 1085 Sulus). Hong-Kong and Singapore steamers now call regularly at Sandakan, Gaya, and Kudat. In 1885 the territory was divided into Alcock province (in the north), Keppel province (along the west coast as far north as

¹ But the officers of the company are very active in exploration. L. B. von Donop, F. W. H. ti (killed 1882), W. B. Fryer, Frank Hatton (killed 1883), and Henry Walker are or have been among the more energetic.

Kimanis Bay), the East Coast residency (to the south-east of Alcock and Keppel provinces), and Dent province (to the south-west of the East Coast residency with the coast from Kimanis Bay to Brunei Bay).

In 1865 an American company started by Mr Torrey obtained from the sultan of Brunei certain concessions of territory in North Borneo; but this enterprise proved a financial failure and the settlement formed on the Kimanis river broke up. The rights of the American company were bought up by the Austrian Baron von Overbeck and the English merchant Mr Alfred Dent, who further obtained from the sultan of Brunei and the sultan of Sulu a series of charters conferring on them the sovereign authority in North Borneo under the titles of maharajah of Sabah, rajah of Gaya and Sandakan and Data Bandahara. In spite of the opposition of Spain, which claimed that the sultan of Sulu being a Spanish vassal could not dispose of his territory without her consent, the English company organized by Mr Dent succeeded in obtaining a charter of incorporation under Act of Parliament, 1st November 1881, as the "British North Borneo Company," with right to acquire other interests in, over, or affecting the territories or property comprised in the several grants.

The text of the charter will be found in the *London Gazette*, 8th November 1881, and in the appendix to Mr Joseph Hatton's *New Ceylon* (1881); see also Frank Hatton, *North Borneo*, 1885; the *Century Magazine*, 1885; the *Edinburgh Review*, 1882; and the *English Illustrated Magazine*, 1883.

SABAS, or SABBAS, ST (SYR. *Mār Sabhā*), one of the early leaders of monasticism in Palestine, was a native of Cappadocia, born about 439. While still a child he accompanied his parents to Alexandria, whence in his eighteenth year, having made choice of the ascetic life, he removed to Palestine, settling at the desolate spot now occupied by the convent called by his name, about two hours from the north-west shore of the Dead Sea. As his reputation for holiness increased he was joined by others, who ultimately constituted a "laura" under the rule of St Basil. He took some part in the doctrinal controversies of the day, being a zealous defender of the decrees of Chalcedon. He died about 532 and is commemorated on 5th December. Another saint of this name, surnamed "the Goth," suffered martyrdom at the hands of Athanaric, the Visigothic king, in the reign of Valentinian; he is commemorated on 15th (or 18th) April. See also Hoffmann, *Syr. Acten Persischer Märtyrer* (1880), Nos. iv. and xii., for lives of two martyrs named Sabhā.

SABBATH (שַׁבָּת), the day of sacred rest which among the Hebrews followed six days of labour and closed the week.

1. *Observance of the Sabbath.*—The later Jewish Sabbath, observed in accordance with the rules of the Scribes, was a very peculiar institution, and formed one of the most marked distinctions between the Hebrews and other nations, as appears in a striking way from the fact that on this account alone the Romans found themselves compelled to exempt the Jews from all military service. The rules of the Scribes enumerated thirty-nine main kinds of work forbidden on the Sabbath, and each of these prohibitions gave rise to new subtleties. Jesus's disciples, for example, who plucked ears of corn in passing through a field on the holy day, had, according to Rabbinical casuistry, violated the third of the thirty-nine rules, which forbade harvesting; and in healing the sick Jesus Himself broke the rule that a sick man should not receive medical aid on the Sabbath unless his life was in danger. In fact, as our Lord puts it, the Rabbinical theory seemed to be that the Sabbath was not made for man but man for the Sabbath, the observance of which was so much an end in itself that the rules prescribed for it did not require to be justified by appeal to any larger principle of religion or humanity. The precepts of the law were valuable in the eyes of the Scribes because they were the seal of Jewish particularism, the barrier erected between the world at large and the exclusive community of Jehovah's grace. For this purpose the most arbitrary precepts were the most effective, and none were more so than the complicated rules of Sabbath observance. The ideal of the Sabbath which all these rules aimed at realizing was absolute rest

from everything that could be called work; and even the exercise of those offices of humanity which the strictest Christian Sabbatarian regard as a service to God, and therefore as specially appropriate to His day, was looked on as work. To save life was allowed, but only because danger to life "superseded the Sabbath." In like manner the special ritual at the temple prescribed for the Sabbath by the Pentateuchal law was not regarded as any part of the hallowing of the sacred day; on the contrary, the rule was that, in this regard, "Sabbath was not kept in the sanctuary." Strictly speaking, therefore, the Sabbath was neither a day of relief to toiling humanity nor a day appointed for public worship; the positive duties of its observance were to wear one's best clothes, eat, drink, and be glad (justified from Isa. lviii. 13). A more directly religious element, it is true, was introduced by the practice of attending the synagogue service; but it is to be remembered that this service was primarily regarded not as an act of worship but as a meeting for instruction in the law. So far, therefore, as the Sabbath existed for any end outside itself it was an institution to help every Jew to learn the law, and from this point of view it is regarded by Philo and Josephus, who are accustomed to seek a philosophical justification for the peculiar institutions of their religion. But this certainly was not the leading point of view with the mass of the Rabbins;¹ and at any rate it is quite certain that the synagogue is a post-exilic institution, and therefore that the Sabbath in old Israel must either have been entirely different from the Sabbath of the Scribes, or else must have been a mere day of idleness and feasting, not accompanied by any properly religious observances or having any properly religious meaning. The second of these alternatives may be dismissed as quite inconceivable, for, though many of the religious ideas of the old Hebrews were crude, their institutions were never arbitrary and meaningless, and when they spoke of consecrating the Sabbath they must have had in view some religious exercise of an intelligible kind by which they paid worship to Jehovah.

Indeed, that the old Hebrew Sabbath was quite different from the Rabbinical Sabbath is demonstrated in the trenchant criticism which Jesus directed against the latter (Matt. xii. 1-14; Mark ii. 27). The general position which He takes up, that "the Sabbath is made for man and not man for the Sabbath," is only a special application of the wider principle that the law is not an end in itself but a help towards the realization in life of the great ideal of love to God and man, which is the sum of all true religion. But Jesus further maintains that this view of the law as a whole, and the interpretation of the Sabbath law which it involves, can be historically justified from the Old Testament. And in this connexion He introduces two of the main methods to which historical criticism of the Old Testament has resorted in modern times: He appeals to the oldest history rather than to the Pentateuchal code as proving that the later conception of the law was unknown in ancient times (Matt. xii. 3, 4), and to the exceptions to the Sabbath law which the Scribes themselves allowed in the interests of worship (ver. 5) or humanity (ver. 11), as showing that the Sabbath must originally have been devoted to purposes of worship and humanity, and was not always the purposeless arbitrary thing which the schoolmen made it to be. Modern criticism of the history of Sabbath observance among the Hebrews has done nothing more than follow out these arguments in detail, and show that the result is in agreement with what is known as to the dates of the several component parts of the Pentateuch.

¹ See the Mishnah, tr. "Shabbath," and *B. of Jubilees*, ch. I.; and compare Schurer, *Geoch. d. jud. Volkes*, ii. 357, 376, 393 *sq.*, where the Rabbinical Sabbath is well explained and illustrated in detail.

Of the legal passages that speak of the Sabbath all those which show affinity with the doctrine of the Scribes—regarding the Sabbath as an arbitrary sign between Jehovah and Israel, entering into details as to particular acts that are forbidden, and enforcing the observance by severe penalties, so that it no longer has any religious value, but appears as a mere legal constraint—are post-exilic (Exod. xvi. 23-30, xxxi. 12-17, xxxv. 1-3; Num. xv. 32-36); while the older laws only demand such cessation from daily toil, and especially from agricultural labour, as among all ancient peoples naturally accompanied a day set apart as a religious festival, and in particular lay weight on the fact that the Sabbath is a humane institution, a holiday for the labouring classes (Exod. xxiii. 12; Deut. v. 13-15). As it stands in these ancient laws, the Sabbath is not at all the unique thing which it was made to be by the Scribes. "The Greeks and the barbarians," says Strabo (x. 3, 9), "have this in common, that they accompany their sacred rites by a festal remission of labour." So it was in old Israel: the Sabbath was one of the stated religious feasts, like the new moon and the three great agricultural sacrificial celebrations (Hosea ii. 11); the new moons and the Sabbaths alike called men to the sanctuary to do sacrifice (Isa. i. 14); the remission of ordinary business belonged to both alike (Amos viii. 5), and for precisely the same reason. Hosea even takes it for granted that in captivity the Sabbath will be suspended, like all the other feasts, because in his day a feast implied a sanctuary.

This conception of the Sabbath, however, necessarily underwent an important modification in the 7th century B.C., when the local sanctuaries were abolished, and those sacrificial rites and feasts which in Hosea's time formed the essence of every act of religion were limited to the central altar, which most men could visit only at rare intervals. From this time forward the new moons, which till then had been at least as important as the Sabbath and were celebrated by sacrificial feasts as occasions of religious gladness, fall into insignificance, except in the conservative temple ritual. The Sabbath did not share the same fate, but with the abolition of local sacrifices it became for most Israelites an institution of humanity divorced from ritual. So it appears in the Deuteronomic decalogue, and presumably also in Jer. xvii. 19 *sq.* In this form the institution was able to survive the fall of the state and the temple, and the seventh day's rest was clung to in exile as one of the few outward ordinances by which the Israelite could still show his fidelity to Jehovah and mark his separation from the heathen. Hence we understand the importance attached to it in the exilic literature (Isa. lvi. 2 *sq.*, lviii. 13), and the character of a sign between Jehovah and Israel ascribed to it in the post-exilic law. This attachment to the Sabbath, beautiful and touching so long as it was a spontaneous expression of continual devotion to Jehovah, acquired a less pleasing character when, after the exile, it came to be enforced by the civil arm (Neh. xiii.), and when the later law even declared Sabbath-breaking a capital offence. But it is just to remember that without the stern discipline of the law the community of the second temple could hardly have escaped dissolution, and that Judaism alone preserved for Christianity the hard-won achievements of the prophets.

The Sabbath exercised a twofold influence on the early Christian church. On the one hand, the weekly celebration of the resurrection on the Lord's day could not have arisen except in a circle that already knew the week as a sacred division of time; and, moreover, the manner in which the Lord's day was observed was directly influenced by the synagogue service. On the other hand, the Jewish Christians continued to keep the Sabbath, like other points of the old law. Eusebius (*H.E.*, iii. 27) remarks that the

Ebionites observed both the Sabbath and the Lord's day; and this practice obtained to some extent in much wider circles, for the *Apostolical Constitutions* recommend that the Sabbath shall be kept as a memorial feast of the creation as well as the Lord's day as a memorial of the resurrection. The festal character of the Sabbath was long recognized in a modified form in the Eastern Church by a prohibition of fasting on that day, which was also a point in the Jewish Sabbath law (comp. Judith viii. 6).

On the other hand, Paul had quite distinctly laid down from the first days of Gentile Christianity that the Jewish Sabbath was not binding on Christians (Rom. xiv. 5 *sq.*; Gal. iv. 10; Col. ii. 16), and controversy with Judaizers led in process of time to direct condemnation of those who still kept the Jewish day (*e.g.*, Co. of Laodicea, 363 A.D.). Nay, in the Roman Church a practice of fasting on Saturday as well as on Friday was current before the time of Tertullian. The steps by which the practice of resting from labour on the Lord's day instead of on the Sabbath was established in Christendom and received civil as well as ecclesiastical sanction will be spoken of in SUNDAY; it is enough to observe here that this practice is naturally and even necessarily connected with the religious observance of the Lord's day as a day of worship and religious gladness, and is in full accordance with the principles laid down by Jesus in His criticism of the Sabbath of the Scribes. But of course the complete observance of Sunday rest was not generally possible to the early Christians before Christendom obtained civil recognition. For the theological discussions whether and in what sense the fourth commandment is binding on Christians, see DECALOGUE, vol. vii. p. 17.

2. *Origin of the Sabbath.*—As the Sabbath was originally a religious feast, the question of the origin of the Sabbath resolves itself into an inquiry why and in what circle a festal cycle of seven days was first established. In Gen. ii. 1-3 and in Exod. xx. 11 the Sabbath is declared to be a memorial of the completion of the work of creation in six days. But it appears certain that the decalogue as it lay before the Deuteronomist did not contain any allusion to the creation (see DECALOGUE, vol. vii. p. 16), and it is generally believed that this reference was added by the same post-exilic hand that wrote Gen. i. 1-ii. 4a. The older account of the creation in Gen. ii. 4b *sq.* does not recognize the hexaemeron, and it is even doubtful whether the original sketch of Gen. i. distributed creation over six days. The connexion, therefore, between the seven days' week and the work of creation is now generally recognized as secondary. The week and the Sabbath were already known to the writer of Gen. i., and he used them to give the framework for his picture of the creation, which in the nature of things could not be literal and required some framework. At the same time, there was a peculiar appropriateness in associating the Sabbath with the doctrine that Jehovah is the Creator of all things; for we see from Isa. xl.-lxvi. that this doctrine was a mainstay of Jewish faith in those very days of exile which gave the Sabbath a new importance for the faithful.

But, if the week as a religious cycle is older than the idea of the week of creation, we cannot hope to find more than probable evidence of the origin of the Sabbath. At the time of the exile the Sabbath was already an institution peculiarly Jewish, otherwise it could not have served as a mark of distinction from heathenism. This, however, does not necessarily imply that in its origin it was specifically Hebrew, but only that it had acquired distinguishing features of a marked kind. What is certain is that the origin of the Sabbath must be sought within a circle that used the week as a division of time. Here again we must distinguish between the week as

such and the astrological week, *i.e.*, the week in which the seven days are named each after the planet which is held to preside over its first hour. If the day is divided into twenty-four hours and the planets preside in turn over each hour of the week in the order of their periodic times (Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, Sun, Venus, Mercury, Moon), we get the order of days of the week with which we are familiar. For, if the Sun presides over the first hour of Sunday, and therefore also over the eighth, the fifteenth, and the twenty-second, Venus will have the twenty-third hour, Mercury the twenty-fourth, and the Moon, as the third in order from the sun, will preside over the first hour of Monday. Mars, again, as third from the Moon, will preside over Tuesday (*Dies Martis*, *Mardi*), and so forth. This astrological week became very current in the Roman empire, but was still a novelty in the time of Dio Cassius (xxxvii. 18). This writer believed that it came from Egypt; but the old Egyptians had a week of ten, not of seven days, and the original home of astrology and of the division of the day into twenty-four hours is Chaldaea. It is plain, however, that there is a long step between the astrological assignation of each hour of the week to a planet and the recognition of the week as an ordinary division of time by people at large. Astrology is in its nature an occult science, and there is not the slightest trace of a day of twenty-four hours among the ancient Hebrews, who had the week and the Sabbath long before they had any acquaintance with the planetary science of the Babylonian priests. Moreover, it is quite clear from extant remains of Assyrian calendars that our astrological week did not prevail in civil life even among the Babylonians and Assyrians: they did not dedicate each day in turn to its astrological planet. These facts make it safe to reject one often-repeated explanation of the Sabbath, *viz.*, that it was in its origin what it is in the astrological week, the day sacred to Saturn, and that its observance is to be derived from an ancient Hebrew worship of that planet. In truth there is no evidence of the worship of Saturn among the oldest Hebrews; Amos v. 26, where Chiun (*Kaiwan*) is taken by many to mean Saturn, is of uncertain interpretation, and, when the tenses are rightly rendered, refers not to idolatry of the Israelites in the wilderness but to the time of the prophet.

The week, however, is found in various parts of the world in a form that has nothing to do with astrology or the seven planets, and with such a distribution as to make it pretty certain that it had no artificial origin, but suggested itself independently, and for natural reasons, to different races. In fact the four quarters of the moon supply an obvious division of the month; and, wherever new moon and full moon are religious occasions, we get in the most natural way a sacred cycle of fourteen or fifteen days, of which the week of seven or eight days (determined by half moon) is the half. Thus the old Hindus chose the new and the full moon as days of sacrifice; the eve of the sacrifice was called *upavasatha*, and in Buddhism the same word (*uposatha*) has come to denote a Sabbath observed on the full moon, on the day when there is no moon, and on the two days which are eighth from the full and the new moon respectively, with fasting and other religious exercises.¹

From this point of view it is most significant that in the older parts of the Hebrew Scriptures the new moon and the Sabbath are almost invariably mentioned together. The month is beyond question an old sacred division of time common to all the Semites; even the Arabs, who received the week at quite a late period from the Syrians

¹ Childers, *Pali Dict.*, p. 535; Kern, *Buddhismus* (Ger. tr.), p. 8; *Mahabodgga*, ii. 1, 1 (Eng. tr., i. 239, 291).

(Birdni, *Chronology*, Eng. tr., p. 58), greeted the new moon with religious acclamations. And this must have been an old Semitic usage, for the word which properly means "to greet the new moon" (*ahalla*) is, as Lagarde (*Orientalia*, ii. 19) has shown, etymologically connected with the Hebrew words used of any festal joy. Among the Hebrews, or rather perhaps among the Canaanites, whose speech they borrowed, the joy at the new moon became the type of religious festivity in general. Nor are other traces wanting of the connexion of sacrificial occasions—*i.e.*, religious feasts—with the phases of the moon among the Semites. The Harranians had four sacrificial days in every month, and of these two at least were determined by the conjunction and opposition of the moon.²

That full moon as well as new moon had a religious significance among the ancient Hebrews seems to follow from the fact that, when the great agricultural feasts were fixed to set days, the full moon was chosen. In older times these feast-days appear to have been Sabbaths (Lev. xxiii. 11; comp. *PASSOVER*, vol. xviii. p. 344).

A week determined by the phases of the moon has an average length of $29\frac{1}{2} \div 4 = 7\frac{3}{8}$ days, *i.e.*, three weeks out of eight would have eight days. But there seems to be in 1 Sam. xx. 27, compared with vv. 18, 24, an indication that in old times the feast of the new moon lasted two days—a very natural institution, since it appears that the feast was fixed in advance, while the Hebrews of Saul's time cannot have been good enough astronomers to know beforehand on which of two successive days the new moon would actually be observed.³ In that case a week of seven working days would occur only once in two months. We cannot tell when the Sabbath became dissociated from the month; but the change seems to have been made before the Book of the Covenant, which already regards the Sabbath simply as an institution of humanity and ignores the new moon. In both points it is followed by Deuteronomy.

The Babylonian and Assyrian Sabbath.—The word "Sabbath" (*sabbattu*), with the explanation "day of rest of the heart," is claimed as Assyrian on the basis of a textual emendation made by F. Delitzsch in *H. Rawl.*, 32, 16. The value of this isolated and uncertain testimony cannot be placed very high, and it seems to prove too much, for it is practically certain that the Babylonians at the time of the Hebrew exile cannot have had a Sabbath exactly corresponding in conception to what the Hebrew Sabbath had become under very special historical circumstances. What we do know from a calendar of the intercalary month Elul II. is that in that month the 7th, 14th, 19th, 21st, and 25th days had a peculiar character, and that certain acts were forbidden on them to the king and others. There is the greatest uncertainty as to the details (compare the very divergent renderings in *Records of the Past*, vii. 160 sq.; Schrader, *K.A.T.*, 2d ed., p. 19; Lotz, *Qu. de historia Sabbati*, 39 sq.); but these days, which are taken to be Assyrian Sabbaths, are certainly not "days of rest of the heart," and to all appearance are unlucky days, and expressly designated as such.⁴ If, therefore, they are "Assyrian Sabbaths" at all, they are exactly opposite in character to the Hebrew Sabbath, which Hosea describes as a day of gladness, and which never ceased to be a day of feasting and good cheer.

Etymology of the word "Sabbath."—The grammatical inflexions of the word "Sabbath" show that it is a feminine form, properly *shabbat* for *shabbat*, from שבת II. The root has nothing to do with resting in the sense of enjoying repose; in transitive forms and applications it means to "sever," to "put an end to," and intransitively it means to "desist," to "come to an end." The grammatical form of *shabbath* suggests a transitive sense, "the divider," and apparently indicates the Sabbath as dividing the month. It may mean the day which puts a stop to the week's work, but this is less likely. It certainly cannot be translated "the day of rest."

Sabbatical Year.—The Jews under the second temple observed every seventh year as a Sabbath according to the (post-exilic) law of Lev. xxv. 1-7. It was a year in which all agriculture was re-

² The others—according to the *Fihrist*, 319, 14—are the 17th and the 28th.

³ It appears from Judith viii. 6 that even in later times there were two days at the new moon on which it was improper to fast.

⁴ Lotz says they are lucky days; but the expression which he renders "*dies faustus*" is applied to every day in the calendar. The rest of his book does not rise above this example of acumen.

mitted, in which the fields lay unsown, the vines grew unpruned, and even the natural produce was not gathered in. That this law was not observed before the captivity we learn from Lev. xxvi. 34 sq.; indeed so long as the Hebrews were an agricultural people with little trade, in a land often ravaged by severe famines, such a law could not have been observed. Even in later times it was occasionally productive of great distress (1 Mac. vi. 49, 53; Jos., *Ant.*, xiv. 16, 2). In the older legislation, however, we already meet with a seven years' period in more than one connexion. The release of a Hebrew servant after six years' labour (Exod. xxi. 2 sq.; Deut. xv. 12 sq.) has only a remote analogy to the Sabbatical year. But in Exod. xxiii. 10, 11 it is prescribed that the crop of every seventh year (apparently the self-sown crop) shall be left for the poor, and after them for the beasts. The difference between this and the later law is that the seventh year is not called a Sabbath, and that there is no indication that all land was to lie fallow on the same year. In this form a law prescribing one year's fallow in seven may have been anciently observed. It is extended in ver. 11 to the vineyard and the olive oil, but here the culture necessary to keep the vines and olive trees in order is not forbidden; the precept is only that the produce is to be left to the poor. In Deuteronomy this law is not repeated, but a fixed seven years' period is ordained for the benefit of poor debtors, apparently in the sense that in the seventh year no interest is to be exacted by the creditor from a Hebrew, or that no proceedings are to be taken against the debtor in that year (Deut. xv. 1 sq.). (W. R. S.)

SABELLIUS. Even after the elimination of Gnosticism the church remained without any uniform Christology; the Trinitarians and the Unitarians continued to confront each other, the latter at the beginning of the 3d century still forming the large majority. These in turn split into two principal groups—the Adoptianists and the Modalists—the former holding Christ to be the man chosen of God, on whom the Holy Spirit rested in a quite unique sense, and who after toil and suffering, through His oneness of will with God, became divine, the latter maintaining Christ to be a manifestation of God Himself. Both groups had their scientific theologians who sought to vindicate their characteristic doctrines, the Adoptianist divines holding by the Aristotelian philosophy, and the Modalists by that of the Stoics; while the Trinitarians (Tertullian, Hippolytus, Origen, Novatian), on the other hand, appealed to Plato.

In Rome Modalism was the doctrine which prevailed from Victor to Calixtus (*c.* 190-220). The bishops just named protected within the city the schools of Epigonus and Cleomenes where it was taught that the Son is identical with the Father. But the presbyter Hippolytus was successful in convincing the leaders of that church that the Modalistic doctrine taken in its strictness was contrary to Scripture. Bishop Calixtus saw himself under the necessity of abandoning his friends and setting up a mediating formula designed to harmonize the Trinitarian and the Modalistic positions. But, while excommunicating the strict Unitarians (Monarchians), he also took the same course with Hippolytus and his followers, declaring their teaching to be ditheism. The mediation formula, however, proposed by Calixtus became the bridge by which, in the course of the decades immediately following, the doctrine of the Trinity made its way into the Roman Church. In the year 250, when the Roman presbyter Novatian wrote his book *De Trinitate*, the doctrine of Hippolytus, once discredited as ditheism, had already become official there. At the same time Rome and most of the other churches of the West still retained a certain leaning towards Modalistic monarchianism. This appears, on the one hand, in the use of expressions having a Modalistic ring about them—see especially the poems of Commodian, written about the time of Valerian—and, on the other hand, in the rejection of the doctrine that the Son is subordinate to the Father and is a creature (witness the controversy between Dionysius of Alexandria and Dionysius of Rome), as well as in the readiness of the West to accept the formula of Athanasius, that the Father and the Son are one and the same in substance (*ὁμοούσιος*).

The strict Modalists, whom Calixtus had excommunicated along with their most zealous opponent Hippolytus, were led by Sabellius, who was perhaps a Libyan by birth. His party continued to subsist in Rome for a considerable time afterwards,¹ and withstood Calixtus as an unscrupulous apostate. In the West, however, the influence of Sabellius seems never to have been important; in the East, on the other hand, after the middle of the 3d century his doctrine found much acceptance, first in the Pentapolis and afterwards in other provinces.² It was violently controverted by the bishops, notably by Dionysius of Alexandria, and the development in the East of the philosophical doctrine of the Trinity after Origen (from 260 to 320) was very powerfully influenced by the opposition to Sabellianism. Thus, for example, at the great synod held in Antioch in 268 the word *ὁμοούσιος* was rejected, as seeming to favour Unitarianism. The Sabellian doctrine itself, however, during the decades above mentioned underwent many changes in the East and received a philosophical dress. In the 4th century this and the allied doctrine of Marcellus of Ancyra were frequently confounded, so that it is exceedingly difficult to arrive at a clear account of it in its genuine form. Sabellianism, in fact, became a collective name for all those Unitarian doctrines in which the divine nature of Christ was acknowledged. The teaching of Sabellius himself was indubitably very closely allied to the older Modalism ("Patripassianism") of Noetus and Praxeas, but was distinguished from it by its more careful theological elaboration and by the account it took of the Holy Spirit. His central proposition was to the effect that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are the same person, three names thus being attached to one and the same being. What weighed most with Sabellius was the monotheistic interest. The One Being was also named by him *ὁμοπάτωρ*,—an expression purposely chosen to obviate ambiguity. To explain how one and the same being could have various forms of manifestation, he pointed to the tripartite nature of man (body, soul, spirit), and to the sun, which manifests itself as a heavenly body, as a source of light, and also as a source of warmth. He further maintained that God is not, at one and the same time Father, Son, and Spirit, but, on the contrary, has been active in three consecutive energies,—first in the prosopeon of the Father as Creator, then in the prosopeon of the Son as Redeemer, and lastly in the prosopeon of the Spirit as the Giver of Life. It is by this doctrine of the succession of the prosope that Sabellius is essentially distinguished from the older Modalists. In particular it is significant, in conjunction with the reference to the Holy Spirit, that Sabellius regards the Father also as merely a form of manifestation of the one God,—in other words, has formally put Him in a position of complete equality with the other Persons. This view prepares the way for Augustine's doctrine of the Trinity. Sabellius himself appears to have made use of Stoical formulas (*πλάτνεσθαι, συντέλλεσθαι*), but he chiefly relied upon Scripture, especially such passages as Deut. vi. 4, Exod. xx. 3, Isa. xlv. 6, John x. 38. Of his later history nothing is known; his followers died out in the course of the 4th century.

The sources of our knowledge of Sabellianism are Hippolytus (*Philos.*, bk. ix.), Epiphanius (*Her.*, lxi.), and Dionys. Alex. (*Epp.*); also various passages in Athanasius and the other fathers of the 4th century. For modern discussions of the subject see Schleiermacher (*Theol. Ztschr.*, 1822, hft. 3), Lange (*Ztschr. f. hist. Theol.*, 1832, ii. 2), Döllinger (*Hippolyt u. Kallist*, 1853), Zahn (*Marcell. v. Ancyra*, 1867), and Harnack (*s.v.* "Monarchianismus," in Herzog-Plitt, *Encykl. f. Prot. Theol.*, x. 199 sq.). (A. HA.)

¹ In the 18th century there was discovered in one of the catacombs of Rome an inscription containing the words "qui et Filius diceris et Pater inveniris." This can only have come from a Sabellian.

² Whether Sabellius himself ever visited the East is unknown.