

conversely, acceptable offerings are the things which are eaten by predilection by that divine animal which in later times became the sacred symbol of the anthropomorphic god, or else victims are to be chosen which are sacred among a hostile tribe. The two principles may often coincide. Fierce mountain tribes who live mainly by harrying their neighbours in the plain will be wolves, lions, bears, while their enemies will naturally worship bulls, sheep, goats, like the Troglodytes on the Red Sea, who "gave the name of parent to no human being but to the bull and the cow, the ram and the ewe, because from them they had their daily nourishment" (Strabo, xvi. 4); and thus in cases like that of Argos the ultimate shape of the ritual may throw important light on the character of the early population. When by conquest or otherwise two such originally hostile nations are fused the opposing animal symbols will ultimately be found in friendly association: e.g., Artemis (in her various forms) is associated both with carnivora and with stags or domestic animals. The former is the original conception, as her sacrifices show. She is therefore, like the wolf-Apollo, originally the deity of a wild hunting tribe, or rather various carnivorous deities of such tribes have coalesced in her.

Human Sacrifices.—From these observations the transition is easy to those human sacrifices which are not piacular. It is perfectly clear in many cases that such sacrifices are associated with cannibalism, a practice which always means eating the flesh of men of alien and hostile kin. The human wolves would no more eat a brother than they would eat a wolf; but to eat an enemy is another matter. Naturally enough traces of cannibalism persist in religion after they have disappeared from ordinary life, and especially in the religion of carnivorous gods.¹ Thus it may be conjectured that the human sacrifices offered to the wolf-Zeus (Lycaeus) in Arcadia were originally cannibal feasts of a wolf tribe. The first participants in the rite were according to later legend changed into wolves (Lycaon and his sons); and in later times, as appears by comparing Plato (*Rep.*, viii. 15) with Pausanias (viii. 2), at least one fragment of the human flesh was placed among the sacrificial portions derived from other victims, and the man who ate it was believed to become a were-wolf. All human sacrifices where the victim is a captive or other foreigner may be presumed to be derived from cannibal feasts; but a quite different explanation is required for the cases, which are by far more numerous among people no longer mere savages, in which a father sacrifices his child or a tribe its fellow-tribesman. This case belongs to the head of piacular sacrifices.

Piacular Sacrifices.—Among all primitive peoples there are certain offences against piety (especially bloodshed within the kin) which are regarded as properly inexpiable; the offender must die or become an outlaw. Where the god of the kin appears as vindicator of this law he demands the life of the culprit; if the kinsmen refuse this they share the guilt. Thus the execution of a criminal assumes the character of a religious action. If now it appears in any way that the god is offended and refuses to help his people, it is concluded that a crime has been committed and not expiated. This neglect must be repaired, and, if the true culprit cannot be found or cannot be spared, the worshippers as a whole bear the guilt until they or the guilty man himself find a substitute. The idea of substitution is widespread through all early religions, and is found in honorific as well as in piacular rites; the Romans, for example, substituted models in wax or dough for victims

¹ In the Roman empire human sacrifice was practised at not a few shrines down to the time of Hadrian; for examples the reader may refer to Porphyry, *De Abst.*, ii. 27, 54 sq., and to Clem. Alex., *Coh. ad Gentes*, p. 27.

that could not be procured according to the ritual, or else feigned that a sheep was a stag (*ceruaria ovis*) and the like. In all such cases the idea is that the substitute shall imitate as closely as is possible or convenient the victim whose place it supplies; and so in piacular ceremonies the god may indeed accept one life for another, or certain select lives to atone for the guilt of a whole community, but these lives ought to be of the guilty kin, just as in blood-revenge the death of any kinsman of the manslayer satisfies justice. Hence such rites as the Semitic sacrifices of children by their fathers (see Moloch), the sacrifice of Iphigenia and similar cases among the Greeks, or the offering up of boys to the goddess Mania at Rome *pro familiarium sospitate* (Macrob., i. 7, 34). In the oldest Semitic cases it is only under extreme manifestations of divine wrath that such offerings are made (comp. Porph., *De Abst.*, ii. 56), and so it was probably among other races also; but under the pressure of long-continued calamity, or other circumstances which made men doubtful of the steady favour of the gods, piacular offerings might easily become more frequent and ultimately assume a stated character, and be made at regular intervals by way of recaution without waiting for an actual outbreak of divine anger. Thus the Carthaginians, as Theophrastus relates, annually sprinkled their altars with "a tribesman's blood" (Porph., *De Abst.*, ii. 28). But in advanced societies the tendency is to modify the horrors of the ritual either by accepting an effusion of blood without actually slaying the victim, e.g., in the flagellation of the Spartan lads at the altar of Artemis Orthia (Paus., iii. 16, 7; comp. Eurip., *Iph. Taur.*, 1470 sq.; 1 Kings xviii. 28), or by a further extension of the doctrine of substitution; the Romans, for example, substituted puppets for the human sacrifices to Mania, and cast rush dolls into the Tiber at the yearly atoning sacrifice on the Sublician bridge. More usually, however, the life of an animal is accepted by the god in place of a human life. This explanation of the origin of piacular animal sacrifices has often been disputed, mainly on dogmatic grounds and in connexion with the Hebrew sin-offerings; but it is quite clearly brought out wherever we have an ancient account of the origin of such a rite (e.g., for the Hebrews, Gen. xxii. 13; the Phœnicians, Porph., *De Abst.*, iv. 15; the Greeks and many others, *ibid.*, ii. 54 sq.; the Romans, Ovid, *Fasti*, vi. 162). Among the Egyptians the victim was marked with a seal bearing the image of a man bound, and kneeling with a sword at his throat (Plut., *Is. et Os.*, chap. xxxi.) And often we find a ceremonial laying of the sin to be expiated on the head of the victim (Herod., ii. 39; Lev. iv. 4 compared with xiv. 21).

In such piacular rites the god demands only the life of the victim, which is sometimes indicated by a special ritual with the blood (as among the Hebrews the blood of the sin-offering was applied to the horns of the altar, or to the mercy-seat within the veil), and there is no sacrificial meal. Thus among the Greeks the carcase of the victim was buried or cast into the sea, and among the Hebrews the most important sin-offerings were burnt not on the altar but outside the camp (city), as was also the case with the children sacrificed to "Moloch." Sometimes, however, the sacrifice is a holocaust on the altar (2 Kings iii. 27), or the flesh is consumed by the priests. The latter was the case with certain Roman piacula, and with those Hebrew sin-offerings in which the blood was not brought within the veil (Lev. vi. 25 sq.). Here the sacrificial flesh is seemingly a gift accepted by the deity and assigned by him to the priests, so that the distinction between a honorific and a piacular sacrifice is partly obliterated. But this is not hard to understand; for just as a blood-rite takes the place of blood-revenge in human justice, so an

offence against the gods may in certain cases be redeemed by a fine (e.g., Herod., ii. 65) or a sacrificial gift. This seems to be the original meaning of the Hebrew *āshām* (trespass-offering), which was a kind of atonement made partly in money (Lev. v. 15 sq.), but accompanied (at least in later times) by a sacrifice which differed from the sin-offering, inasmuch as the ritual did not involve any exceptional use of the blood. The ordinary sin-offerings in which the priests ate the flesh may be a compound of the *āshām* and the properly piacular substitution of life for life. The two kinds of atonement are mixed up also in Micah vi. 6 sq., and ultimately all bloody sacrifices, especially the whole burnt-offering (which in early times was very rare but is prominent in the ritual of the second temple), are held to have an atoning efficacy (Lev. i. 4, xvii. 11). There is, however, another and mystical sense sometimes associated with the eating of sin-offerings, as we shall see presently.

The most curious developments of piacular sacrifice take place in the worship of deities of totem type. Here the natural substitute for the death of a criminal of the tribe is an animal of the kind with which the worshippers and their god alike count kindred; an animal, that is, which must not be offered in a sacrificial feast, and which indeed it is impious to kill. Thus Hecate was invoked as a dog (Porph., *De Abst.*, iii. 17), and dogs were her piacular sacrifices (Plut., *Qu. Rom.*, iii.). And in like manner in Egypt the piacular sacrifice of the cow-goddess Isis-Hathor was a bull, and the sacrifice was accompanied by lamentations as at the funeral of a kinsman (Herod., ii. 39, 40). This lamentation at a piacular sacrifice is met with in other cases, e.g., at the Argean festival at Rome (Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsverw.*, iii. 192), and is parallel to the marks of indignation which in various atoning rituals it is proper to display towards the priest who performs the sacrifice. At Tenedos, for example, the priest was attacked with stones who sacrificed to Bacchus a bull-calf, the affinity of which with man was indicated by the mother-cow being treated like a woman in childbed and the victim itself wearing the cothurnus. As the cothurnus was proper to Bacchus, who also was often addressed in worship and represented in images as a bull, the victim here is of the same race with the god (*ÆL. H.N.*, xii. 34; Plut., *Qu. Gr.*, xxxv.) as well as with the worshippers. In such rites a double meaning was suggested: the victim was an animal kindred to the sacrificers, so that his death was strictly speaking a murder, for which, in the Attic Diipolia, the sacrificial axe cast away by the priest was tried and condemned (Paus., i. 24, 4), but it was also a sacred animal sharing the nature of the god, who thus in a sense died for his people. The last point comes out clearly in the annual sacrifice at Thebes, where a ram was slain and the ram-god Amen clothed in his skin. The worshippers then bewailed the ram and buried him in a sacred coffin (Herod., ii. 42). Thus the piacular sacrifice in such cases is merged in the class of offerings which may be called sacramental or mystical.

Mystical or Sacramental Sacrifices.—That the mysteries of races like the Greeks and Egyptians are sprung from the same circle of ideas with the totem mysteries of savage tribes has been suggested in MYTHOLOGY, vol. xvii. p. 151, with which the reader may compare Mr Lang's book on *Custom and Myth*; and examples of sacramental sacrifices have been adduced in the same article (p. 150) and in MEXICO, vol. xvi. p. 212. In Mexico the worshippers ate sacramentally paste idols of the god, or slew and feasted on a human victim who was feigned to be a representative of the deity. The Mexican gods are unquestionably developed out of totems, and these sacraments are on one line with the totem mysteries of the ruder Indian tribes

in which once a year the sacred animal is eaten, body and blood. Now according to Julian (*Orat.*, v. p. 175) the mystical sacrifices of the cities of the Roman empire were in like manner offered once or twice a year and consisted of such victims as the dog of Hecate, which might not be ordinarily eaten or used to furnish forth the tables of the gods. The general agreement with the American mysteries is therefore complete, and in many cases the resemblance extends to details which leave no doubt of the totem origin of the ritual. The mystic sacrifices seem always to have had an atoning efficacy; their special feature is that the victim is not simply slain and burned or cast away but that the worshippers partake of the body and blood of the sacred animal, and that so his life passes as it were into their lives and knits them to the deity in living communion. Thus in the orgiastic cult of the bull-Bacchus the worshippers tore the bull to pieces and devoured the raw flesh. These orgies are connected on the one hand with older practices, in which the victim was human (Orpheus legend, Dionysus *Ἰουδαίος*), and on the other hand with the myth of the murder of the god by his kinsmen the Titans, who made a meal of his flesh (Clem. Al., *Coh. ad Gentes*, p. 12). Similar legends of fratricide occur in connexion with other orgies (the Corybantes; see Clement, *ut supra*); and all these various elements can only be reduced to unity by referring their origin to those totem habits of thought in which the god has not yet been differentiated from the plurality of sacred animals and the tribesmen are of one kin with their totem, so that the sacrifice of a fellow-tribesman and the sacrifice of the totem animal are equally fratricides, and the death of the animal is the death of the mysterious protector of the totem kin. In the Diipolia at Athens we have seen that the slaughter of the sacred bull was viewed as a murder, but "the dead was raised again in the same sacrifice," as the mystic text had it: the skin was sewed up and stuffed and all tasted the sacrificial flesh, so that the life of the victim was renewed in the lives of those who ate of it¹ (Theophr., in Porph., *De Abst.*, ii. 29 sq.).

Mystic sacrifices of this sacramental type prevailed also among the heathen Semites, and are alluded to in Isa. lxxv. 4 sq., lxxvi. 3, 17; Zech. ix. 7; Lev. xix. 26, &c.,² from which passages we gather that the victim was eaten with the blood.³ This feature reappears elsewhere, as in the piacular swine-offerings of the Fratres Arvales at Rome, and possesses a special significance inasmuch as common blood means in antiquity a share in common life. In the Old Testament the heathen mysteries seem to appear as ceremonies of initiation by which a man was introduced into a new worship, i.e., primarily made of one blood with a new religious kinship, and they therefore come into prominence just at the time when in the 7th century B.C. political convulsions had shaken men's faith in their old gods and led them to seek on all sides for new and stronger protectors. The Greek mysteries too create a close bond between the *mystai*, and the chief ethical significance of the Eleusinia was that they were open to all Hellenes and so represented a brotherhood wider than the political limits of individual states. But originally the initiation must have been introduction into a particular social community; Theophrastus's legend of the origin of the Diipolia is expressly connected with the adoption of the house of Socrates into the position of Athenian citizens. From this point of view the sacramental rites of mystical sacrifice are a form of blood-covenant, and serve the same purpose

¹ In the same way the Issedones honoured their parents by eating their dead bodies (Herod., iv. 26). The life was not allowed to go out of the family.

² For details see W. R. Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, p. 309.

as the mixing of blood or tasting of each other's blood by which in ancient times two men or two clans created a sacred covenant bond. In all the forms of blood-covenant, whether a sacrifice is offered or the veins of the parties opened and their own blood used, the idea is the same: the bond created is a bond of kindred, because one blood is now in the veins of all who have shared the ceremony. The details in which this kind of symbolism may be carried out are of course very various, but where there is a covenant sacrifice we usually find that the parties eat and drink together (Gen. xxxi. 54), and that the sacrificial blood, if not actually tasted, is at least touched by both parties (Xen., *Anab.*, ii. 2, 9), or sprinkled on both and on the altar or image of the deity who presides over the contract (Exod., xxiv. 6, 7).¹ A peculiar form which meets us in various places is to cut the animal in twain and make those who swear pass between the parts (Gen. xiii. 9 sq.; Jer. xxxiv. 18 sq.; Plut., *Qu. Rom.*, iii., &c.). This is generally taken as a formula of imprecation, as if the parties prayed that he who proved unfaithful might be similarly cut in twain; but, as the case cited from Plutarch shows that the victim chosen was a mystic one, it is more likely that the original sense was that the worshippers were taken within the mystic life.

Even the highest forms of sacrificial worship present much that is repulsive to modern ideas, and in particular it requires an effort to reconcile our imagination to the bloody ritual which is prominent in almost every religion which has a strong sense of sin. But we must not forget that from the beginning this ritual expressed, however crudely, certain ideas which lie at the very root of true religion, the fellowship of the worshippers with one another in their fellowship with the deity, and the consecration of the bonds of kinship as the type of all right ethical relation between man and man. And the peculiar forms, though these were particularly liable to distortions disgraceful to man and dishonouring to the godhead, yet contained from the first germs of eternal truths, not only expressing the idea of divine justice, but mingling it with a feeling of divine and human pity. The dreadful sacrifice is performed not with savage joy but with awful sorrow, and in the mystic sacrifices the deity himself suffers with and for the sins of his people and lives again in their new life.

(W. R. S.)

The Idea of Sacrifice in the Christian Church.

There can be no doubt that the idea of sacrifice occupied an important place in early Christianity. It had been a fundamental element of both Jewish and Gentile religions, and Christianity tended rather to absorb and modify such elements than to abolish them. To a great extent the idea had been modified already. Among the Jews the preaching of the prophets had been a constant protest against the grosser forms of sacrifice, and there are indications that when Christianity arose bloody sacrifices were already beginning to fall into disuse; a saying which was attributed by the Ebionites to our Lord repeats this protest in a strong form, "I have come to abolish the sacrifices; and if ye do not cease from sacrificing the wrath of God will not cease from you" (Epiph., xxx. 16). Among the Greeks the philosophers had come to use both argument and ridicule against the idea that the offering of material things could be needed by or acceptable to the Maker of them all. Among both Jews and Greeks the earlier forms of the idea had been rationalized into the belief, that the most appropriate offering to God is that of a pure and penitent heart, and among them both was the idea that

¹ In Greek ritual the identity of the covenant sacrifice with mystic-peculiar rites is clearly brought out by the animals chosen and by other features in the ritual. See Schoemann, *Gr. Alt.*, p. 248 sq.

the vocal expression of contrition in prayer or of gratitude in praise is also acceptable. The best instances of these ideas in the Old Testament are in Psalms l. and li., and in Greek literature the striking words which Porphyry quotes from an earlier writer, "We ought, then, having been united and made like to God, to offer our own conduct as a holy sacrifice to Him, the same being also a hymn and our salvation in passionless excellence of soul" (Euseb., *Dem. Ev.*, 3). The ideas are also found both in the New Testament and in early Christian literature: "Let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of lips which make confession to His name" (Heb. xiii. 15); "That prayers and thanksgivings, made by worthy persons, are the only perfect and acceptable sacrifices I also admit" (Just. Mart., *Trypho.*, c. 117); "We honour God in prayer, and offer this as the best and holiest sacrifice with righteousness to the righteous Word" (Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, vii. 6).

But among the Jews two other forms of the idea expressed themselves in usages which have been perpetuated in Christianity, and one of which has had a singular importance for the Christian world. The one form, which probably arose from the conception of Jehovah as in an especial sense the protector of the poor, was that gifts to God may properly be bestowed on the needy, and that consequently alms have the virtue of a sacrifice. Biblical instances of this idea are—"He who doeth alms is offering a sacrifice of praise" (Ecclus. xxxii. 2); "To do good and to communicate forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased" (Heb. xiii. 16); so the offerings sent by the Philippians to Paul when a prisoner at Rome are "an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God" (Phil. iv. 18). The other form, which was probably a relic of the conception of Jehovah as the author of natural fertility, was that part of the fruits of the earth should be offered to God in acknowledgment of His bounty, and that what was so offered was especially blessed and brought a blessing upon both those who offered it and those who afterwards partook of it. The persistence of this form of the idea of sacrifice constitutes so marked a feature of the history of Christianity as to require a detailed account of it.

In the first instance it is probable that among Christians, as among Jews, every meal, and especially every social meal, was regarded as being in some sense a thank-offering. Thanksgiving, blessing, and offering were co-ordinate terms. Hence the Talmudic rule, "A man shall not taste anything before blessing it" (*Tosephta Berachoth*, c. 4), and hence St Paul's words, "He that eateth, eateth unto the Lord, for he giveth God thanks" (Rom. xiv. 6; comp. 1 Tim. iv. 4). But the most important offering was the solemn oblation in the assembly on the Lord's day. A precedent for making such oblations elsewhere than in the temple had been afforded by the Essenes, who had endeavoured in that way to avoid the contact with unclean persons and things which a resort to the temple might have involved (Jos., *Antiq.*, xviii. 1, 5), and a justification for it was found in the prophecy of Malachi, "In every place incense is offered unto My name and a pure offering; for My name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of hosts" (Mal. i. 11, repeatedly quoted in early Christian writings, e.g., *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, c. 14; Just. Mart., *Trypho.*, c. 28, 41, 116; Irenæus, iv. 17, 5).

The points in relation to this offering which are clearly demonstrable from the Christian writers of the first two centuries, but which subsequent theories have tended to confuse, are these. (1) It was regarded as a true offering or sacrifice; for in the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, in Justin Martyr, and in Irenæus it is designated by each of the terms which are used to designate sacrifices in the

Old Testament. (2) It was primarily an offering of the fruits of the earth to the Creator; this is clear from both Justin Martyr and Irenæus, the latter of whom not only explicitly states that such oblations are continued among Christians but also meets the current objection to them by arguing that they are offered to God not as though He needed anything but to show the gratitude of the offerer (Iren., iv. 17, 18). (3) It was offered as a thanksgiving partly for creation and preservation and partly for redemption: the latter is the special purpose mentioned (e.g.) in the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*; the former is that upon which Irenæus chiefly dwells; both are mentioned together in Justin Martyr (*Trypho.*, c. 41). (4) Those who offered it were required to be not only baptized Christians but also "in love and charity one with another"; there is an indication of this latter requirement in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 23, 24, where the word translated "gift" is the usual LXX. word for a sacrificial offering, and is so used elsewhere in the same Gospel, viz., Matt. viii. 4, xxiii. 19), and still more explicitly in the *Teaching*, c. 14, "Let not any one who has a dispute with his fellow come together with you (i.e., on the Lord's day) until they have been reconciled, that your sacrifice be not defiled." This brotherly unity was symbolized by the kiss of peace. (5) It was offered in the assembly by the hands of the president; this is stated by Justin Martyr (*Apol.*, i. 65, 67), and implied by Clement of Rome (*Ep.*, i. 44, 4).

Combined with this sacrifice of the fruits of the earth to the Creator in memory of creation and redemption, and probably always immediately following it, was the sacred meal at which part of the offerings was eaten. Such a sacred meal had always, or almost always, formed part of the rites of sacrifice. There was the idea that what had been solemnly offered to God was especially hallowed by Him, and that the partaking of it united the partakers in a special bond both to Him and to one another. In the case of the bread and wine of the Christian sacrifice, it was believed that, after having been offered and blessed, they became to those who partook of them the body and blood of Christ. This "communion of the body and blood of Christ," which in early writings is clearly distinguished from the thank-offering which preceded it, and which furnished the materials for it, gradually came to supersede the thank-offering in importance, and to exercise a reflex influence upon it. In the time of Cyprian, though not before, we begin to find the idea that the body and blood of Christ were not merely partaken of by the worshippers but also offered in sacrifice, and that the Eucharist was not so much a thank-offering for creation and redemption as a repetition or a showing forth anew of the self-sacrifice of Christ. This idea is repeated in Ambrose and Augustine, and has since been a dominant idea of both Eastern and Western Christendom. But, though dominant, it has not been universal; nor did it become dominant until several centuries after its first promulgation. The history of it has yet to be written. For, in spite of the important controversies to which it has given birth, no one has been at the pains to distinguish between (i.) the theories which have been from time to time put forth by eminent writers, and which, though they have in some cases ultimately won a general acceptance, have for a long period remained as merely individual opinions, and (ii.) the current beliefs of the great body of Christians which are expressed in recognized formularies. A catena of opinions may be produced in favour of almost any theory; but formularies express the collective or average belief of any given period, and changes in them are a sure indication that there has been a general change in ideas.

It is clear from the evidence of the early Western liturgies that, for at least six centuries, the primitive conception

of the nature of the Christian sacrifice remained. There is a clear distinction between the sacrifice and the communion which followed it, and that which is offered consists of the fruits of the earth and not of the body and blood of Christ. Other ideas no doubt attached themselves to the primitive conception, of which there is no certain evidence in primitive times, e.g., the idea of the propitiatory character of the offering, but these ideas rather confirm than disprove the persistence of those primitive conceptions themselves.

All Eastern liturgies, in their present form, are of later date than the surviving fragments of the earlier Western liturgies, and cannot form the basis of so sure an induction; but they entirely confirm the conclusions to which the Western liturgies lead. The main points in which the pre-medieval formularies of both the Eastern and the Western Churches agree in relation to the Christian sacrifice are the following. (1) It was an offering of the fruits of the earth to the Creator, in the belief that a special blessing would descend upon the offerers, and sometimes also in the belief that God would be propitiated by the offerings. The bread and wine are designated by all the names by which sacrifices are designated (*sacrificia*, *hostia*, *libamina*, and at least once *sacrificium placationis*), and the act of offering them by the ordinary term for offering a sacrifice (*immolatio*). (2) The offering of bread and wine was originally brought to the altar by the person who offered it, and placed by him in the hands of the presiding officer. In course of time there were two important changes in this respect: (a) the offerings of bread and wine were commuted for money, with which bread and wine were purchased by the church-officers; (b) the offerings were sometimes handed to the deacons and by them taken to the bishop at the altar, and sometimes, as at Rome, the bishop and deacons went round the church to collect them.¹ (3) In offering the bread and wine the offerer offered, as in the ancient sacrifices, primarily for himself, but inasmuch as the offering was regarded as having a general propitiatory value he mentioned also the names of others in whom he was interested, and especially the departed, that they might rest in peace. Hence, after all the offerings had been collected, and before they were solemnly offered to God, it became a custom to recite the names both of the offerers and of those for whom they offered, the names being arranged in two lists, which were known as diptychs. Almost all the old rituals have prayers to be said "before the names," "after the names." It was a further and perhaps much later development of the same idea that the good works of those who had previously enjoyed the favour of God were invoked to give additional weight to the prayer of the offerer. In the later series of Western rituals, beginning with that which is known as the *Lemine Sacramentary*, this practice is almost universal. (4) The placing of the bread and wine upon the altar was followed by the kiss of peace. (5) Then followed the actual offering of the gifts to God (*immolatio missæ*). It was an act of adoration or thanksgiving, much longer in Eastern than in Western rituals, but in both classes of rituals beginning with the form "Lift up your hearts," and ending with the *Ter Sanctus* or *Trisagion*.² The early MSS. of Western rituals indicate the importance which was attached to this part of the liturgy by the fact of its being written in a much more ornate way than the other parts, e.g., in gold uncial letters

¹ Of this proceeding an elaborate account exists in the very interesting document printed by Mabillon in his *Museum Italicum* as "Ordo Romanus I.," the small phials of wine which were brought were emptied into a large bowl, and the loaves of bread were collected in a bag.

² The elements of the form are preserved exactly in the liturgy of the Church of England.

upon a purple ground, as distinguished from the vermilion cursive letters of the rest of the MS. With this the sacrifice proper was concluded. (6) But, since the divine injunction had been "Do this in remembrance of Me," the sacrifice was immediately followed by a commemoration of the passion of Christ, and that again by an invocation of the Holy Spirit (*epiclesis*) that He would make the bread and wine to become the body and blood of Christ. Of this invocation, which is constant in all Eastern rituals, there are few, though sufficient, surviving traces in Western rituals.¹ Then after a prayer for sanctification, or for worthy reception, followed the Lord's Prayer, and after the Lord's Prayer the communion.

In the course of the 8th and 9th centuries, by the operation of causes which have not yet been fully investigated, the theory which is first found in Cyprian became the dominant belief of Western Christendom. The central point of the sacrificial idea was shifted from the offering of the fruits of the earth to the offering of the body and blood of Christ. The change is marked in the rituals by the duplication of the liturgical forms. The prayers of intercession and oblation, which in earlier times are found only in connexion with the former offering, are repeated in the course of the same service in connexion with the latter. The designations and epithets which are in earlier times applied to the fruits of the earth are applied to the body and blood. From that time until the Reformation the Christian sacrifice was all but universally regarded as the offering of the body and blood of Christ. The innumerable theories which were framed as to the precise nature of the offering and as to the precise change in the elements all implied that conception of it. It still remains as the accepted doctrine of the Church of Rome. For, although the council of Trent recognized fully the distinction which has been mentioned above between the Eucharist and the sacrifice of the mass, and treated of them in separate sessions (the former in Session xiii., the latter in Session xxii.), it continued the mediæval theory of the nature of the latter. The reaction against the mediæval theory at the time of the Reformation took the form of a return to what had no doubt been an early belief,—the idea that the Christian sacrifice consists in the offering of a pure heart and of vocal thanksgiving. Luther at one period (in his treatise *De Captivitate Babylonica*) maintained, though not on historical grounds, that the offering of the oblations of the people was the real origin of the conception of the sacrifice of the mass; but he directed all the force of his vehement polemic against the idea that any other sacrifice could be efficacious besides the sacrifice of Christ. In the majority of Protestant communities the idea of a sacrifice has almost lapsed. That which among Catholics is most commonly regarded in its aspect as an offering and spoken of as the "mass" is usually regarded in its aspect as a participation in the symbols of Christ's death and spoken of as the "communion." But it may be inferred from the considerable progress of the Anglo-Catholic revival in most English-speaking countries that the idea of sacrifice has not yet ceased to be an important element in the general conception of religion. (E. H. A.)

SACRILEGE. The robbery of churches was in Roman law punishable with death. There are early instances of persons having suffered death for this offence in Scotland. In England at common law benefit of clergy was denied to robbers of churches. The tendency of the later law has been to put the offence of sacrilege in the same position as if the offence had not been committed in a sacred build-

¹ It is found, e.g., in the second of Mone's masses from the Reichenau palimpsest, and in Mabillon's *Missale Gothicum*, No. 12; it is expressly mentioned by Isidore of Seville as the sixth element in the Eucharistic service, *De Offic. Eccles.*, i. 15.

ing. Thus breaking into a place of worship at night, says Lord Coke, is burglary, for the church is the mansion-house of Almighty God. The Larceny Act of 1861 punishes the breaking into or out of a place of divine worship in the same way as burglary, and the theft of things sacred in the same way as larceny. The breaking or defacing of an altar, crucifix, or cross in any church, chapel, or church-yard is an offence punishable with three months' imprisonment on conviction before two justices, the imprisonment to be continued unless the offender enter into surety for good behaviour at quarter sessions (1 Mary, sess. 2, c. 3).

SACRO BOSCO, JOHANNES DE, or JOHN HOLYWOOD, astronomical author, died 1244 (or 1256) as professor of mathematics at the university of Paris. Nothing else is known about his life. He wrote a treatise on spherical astronomy, *Tractatus de Sphæra Mundi*, first printed at Ferrara in 1472, and reprinted, generally with copious notes and commentaries, about sixty times until the end of the 17th century. About the year 1232 he wrote *De anni ratione seu ut vocatur vulgo computus ecclesiasticus*, in which he points out the increasing error of the Julian calendar, and suggests a remedy which is nearly the same as that actually used under Gregory XIII. three hundred and fifty years later.

SACY, ANTOINE ISAAC, BARON SILVESTRE² DE (1758-1838), the greatest of French Orientalists and the founder of the modern school of Arabic scholarship, was the second son of a Parisian notary, and was born at Paris on 21st September 1758. From the age of seven years, when he lost his father, he was educated in more than monastic seclusion in the house of his pious and tender mother. Designed for the civil service, he studied jurisprudence, and in 1781 got a place as counsellor in the *cour des monnaies*, in which he continued till, in 1791, he was advanced to be a commissary-general in the same department. De Sacy had a natural turn for business and liked variety of work, while he seems to have had little or no need of absolute repose. He had successively acquired all the Semitic languages while he was following the usual course of school and professional training, and while he was engaged in the civil service he found time to make himself a great name as an Orientalist by a series of publications which, beginning with those Biblical subjects to which his education and sympathies naturally directed his first Semitic studies, gradually extended in range, and already displayed the comprehensive scholar who had chosen the whole Semitic and Iranian East for his domain.³ The works of these early years do not show the full maturity of his powers; his chief triumph was an effective commencement of the decipherment of the Pahlavi inscriptions of the Sasanian kings (1787-91). It was the French Revolution which gained De Sacy wholly for letters. As a good Catholic and a staunch royalist he felt constrained in 1792 to retire from the public service, and lived in close seclusion in a cottage near Paris till in 1795 he was called to be professor of Arabic in the newly founded school of living Eastern languages. The years of retirement had not been fruitless; they were in part devoted to the study of the religion of the Druses, which continued to occupy him throughout life and was the subject of his last and unfinished work, the *Exposé de la Religion des Druses* (2 vols., 1838). Nevertheless, when called to be a

² His father's name was Silvestre, the addition De Sacy he took as a younger son after a fashion then common with the Parisian bourgeoisie.

³ A communication to Eichhorn on the Paris MS. of the Syro-Hexaplar version of IV. Kings formed the basis of a paper in the latter's *Repertorium*, vol. vii. (1780). This was De Sacy's literary début. It was followed by text and translation of the letters of the Samaritans to Jos. Scaliger (*ibid.*, vol. xiii., 1783) and by a series of essays on Arabian and Persian history in the *Recueil* of the Academy of Inscriptions and in the *Notices et Extraits*.

teacher, he felt that he had himself much to learn. Since the death of Reiske Arabic learning had been in a backward state, the standard of philological knowledge was low, and the books for students extremely defective. De Sacy set himself with characteristic thoroughness to complete his own knowledge and supply the lacking helps to others, and he accomplished this task on such a scale, with such width of range, precision of thought, and scrupulous attention to details, that he became the founder of a wholly new school and the father of all subsequent Arabists. His great text-books, the *Grammaire Arabe* (2 vols., 1st ed. 1810, 2d ed. 1831) and the *Chrestomathie* (3 vols., 1st ed. 1806, 2d ed. 1826-31), together with its supplement, the *Anthologie Grammaticale* (1829), are works that can never become obsolete; the luminous exposition of the grammar and the happy choice of the pieces in the chrestomathy—all inedita—with the admirable notes, drawn from an enormous reading in MS. sources, make them altogether different from ordinary text-books. The whole powers of a great teacher, the whole wealth of knowledge of an unrivalled scholar, are spent with absolute singleness of purpose for the benefit of the learner, and the result is that the books are equally delightful and instructive to the student and to the advanced scholar. A comparison of the first and second editions shows how much toil and research it cost the author to raise his own scholarship to the level which, thanks to his work, has become the starting-place for all subsequent ascents of the Arabian Parnassus.

De Sacy's place as a teacher was threatened at the outset by his conscientious refusal to take an oath of hatred to royalty. He tendered his resignation both as professor and as member of the Institute; but he was allowed to continue to teach, and rejoined the Institute on its reorganization in 1803. In 1805 he made the only considerable journey of his life, being sent to Genoa on a vain search for Arabic documents supposed to lie in the archives of that city. In 1806 he added the duties of Persian professor to his old chair, and from this time onwards—as, in spite of his royalist opinions, he was ready to do public service under any stable government—his life, divided between his teaching, his literary work, and a variety of public duties, was one of increasing honour and success, broken only by a brief period of retreat during the Hundred Days. He found time for everything; while his pen was ever at work on subjects of abstruse research, he was one of the most active leaders in all the business which the French system throws on the *savans* of the capital, especially as perpetual secretary of the Academy of Inscriptions (from 1832); in 1808 he entered the *corps législatif*; and in 1832, when quite an old man, he became a peer of France and was regular in the duties of the chamber.¹ In 1815 he became rector of the university of Paris, and after the second restoration he was active on the commission of public instruction. Of the *Société Asiatique* he was one of the founders, and when he was inspector of Oriental types at the royal printing press he thought it his duty to read a proof of every book printed in Arabic and Persian. With this he maintained a vast correspondence and was accessible not only to every one who sought his advice on matters of learning and business but to all the poor of his quarter, who came to him as a member of the *bureau* of charity. Yet he was neither monk nor hermit: he enjoyed society and was happy in forty-eight years of married life and in the care of a large family. Though small and to appearance of delicate frame, De Sacy enjoyed unbroken health and worked on without sign of failing powers till two days before his death (21st February 1838), when he suddenly fell down in the street and never rallied.

¹ The title of baron he received from Napoleon in 1818.

De Sacy wrote so much that a list even of his larger essays, mostly communicated to the Academy or in the *Notices et Extraits*, is impossible in this place, while his lesser papers are reviews in the *Allg. Bib. f. biblische Literatur*, the *Mines de l'Orient*, the *Magasin Encyclopédique*, the *Journal des Savants* (of which he was an editor), and the *Journal Asiatique* are almost innumerable. Among the works which he designed mainly for students may be classed his edition of Hariri (1822, 2d edition by Reinaud, 1847, 1855), with a selected Arabic commentary, and of the *Alfiya* (1833), and his *Calila et Dimna* (1816)—the Arabic version of that famous collection of Buddhist animal tales which has been in various forms one of the most popular books of the world. De Sacy's enquiry into the wonderful history of these tales forms one of his best services to letters and a good example of the way in which he always made his work for the benefit of learners go hand in hand with profound research. Of his continued interest in Biblical subjects he gave evidence in his memoir on the Samaritan Arabic version of the Pentateuch (*Mém. Acad. des Inscri.*, vol. xlix.), and in the Arabic and Syriac New Testaments edited for the British and Foreign Bible Society; among works important for Eastern history, besides that on the Druses already named, may be cited his version of Abd-Allatif, *Relation Arabe sur l'Égypte*, and his essays on the *History of the Law of Property in Egypt* since the Arab conquest (1805-18). And, in conclusion, it must not be forgotten that his oral teaching was not less influential than his writings, and that, except Ewald, almost all Arabists of chief note in the first half of this century, in Germany as well as in France, were his personal pupils. Of the brilliant series of teachers who went out from his lecture-room one or two veterans still survive, and Professor Fleischer's elaborate notes and corrections to the *Grammaire Arabe* (*Kleinere Schriften*, vol. i., 1885), may be regarded as the latest tribute to the memory of the great master by a disciple who is now the patriarch of living Arabists. (W. R. S.)

SACY, ISAAC LOUIS LE MAÎTRE DE (1613-1684), a figure of some prominence in the literary annals of Port Royal (*q.v.*), and after the death of St Cyran (1643) and Singlin (1664) the leading confessor and "director" of the Jansenists in France, was born in Paris on 29th March 1613. He was closely connected with the Arnauld family, his true surname being Le Maître and that of Sacy or Sacy which he afterwards assumed a mere anagram of Isaac, his Christian name. He studied philosophy and bell's letters at the Collège de Calvi-Sorbonne, and afterwards, under the influence of St Cyran (see DUVERGIER DE HAURANNE), his spiritual director, joined his eldest brother Antoine Le Maître at Port Royal des Champs. Here he threw himself heartily into the life of the place, devoting himself specially to teaching and the preparation of school books, his chief productions in this class being expurgated editions of Martial and Terence and a translation of Phædrus. In 1650 he was ordained to the priesthood, and in 1654 he entered the field of theological controversy with a brochure entitled *Entluminures de l'Almanach des Jésuites intitulé la Déroute et la Confusion des Jansénistes*, of which it is enough to say that, if the Jesuit attack was in execrable taste, neither was the reply in keeping with the finer ethical tone of Port Royal. From 1661, after the breaking up of the Petites Écoles, he lived more or less in concealment in Paris until May 1666, when he was thrown into the Bastille, where he remained till November 1668. During his imprisonment he occupied himself with the completion of a new version of the New Testament, known as the *Nouveau Testament de Mons* (1667), and the remainder of his life was largely devoted to a similar translation of the Old Testament, based chiefly on the Vulgate, with *Éclaircissements*. These began to appear in 1672 and were continued down to the end of the minor prophets. As De Sacy knew nothing of Hebrew, this version is of no value as a contribution to scholarship, and in style it is more artificial and laboured than those which had preceded it. From 1668 till his death on 4th January 1684 he lived partly in Paris, partly at Port Royal des Champs, and partly at Pomponne, the seat of his cousin, the marquis de Pomponne. He was buried at Port Royal des Champs.

In addition to the works already mentioned, he published, under

the pseudonym of the "Sieur de Beail," a French translation of the *De Imitatione Christi* (1662). He also translated Chrysostom's *Homilies on Math. v.* See Sainte-Beuve, *Port Royal*, bk. ii. chaps. 17, 18 (ed. 1878).

SADDLERY embraces the industries connected with the harnessing and controlling of all beasts of draught and burden. The materials used in harnessing the various creatures so employed and the modifications of harness necessary to suit their structure, temperament, and duties are, of course, exceedingly varied. In a restricted sense saddlery is principally a leather trade, and has to do with the harnessing of the horse. The craft has been recognized and established in England as a separate trade since the 13th century, when the London Saddlers' Company received its charter of incorporation from Edward I. There is evidence also of its early prosperity at Birmingham, where it grew to an importance which it still retains, the principal seat of the saddlery trade being now at Walsall near Birmingham, which is practically a saddlers' town. The trade divides itself into two branches, brown saddlery and black saddlery. The former is concerned with saddle-making and the cutting and sewing of bridles, reins, and all other uncoloured leather-work. The saddle is the most important article on the brown saddler's list. It consists of the tree or skeleton, on which the leather is stretched, the seat, the skirts, and the flaps. The tree is commonly made of beech strengthened with iron plates. The whole leather-work ought to be of pig-skin, but often the seat alone is of that material, the other parts being imitation, cleverly grained by means of electro-deposit copper casts from the surface of real pig-skin. There are many varieties of saddles, such as racing, military, hunting, and ladies' saddles, &c. A racing saddle may weigh not more than two or three pounds, while a cavalry saddle will be four times heavier. The saddle-maker has to consider the ease and comfort of both horse and rider. The saddle must fit closely and evenly to the curvature of the horse's back without tendency to shift, and it ought to offer as far as possible a soft and elastic seat for the rider. The black saddler is concerned with the harness of carriage, cart, and draught horses generally. The skill of the tradesman in this department is displayed in designing and arranging harness most favourable for the proper distribution of the load, and for bringing into use the muscles of the animal without chafing or fraying the skin. Much of the usefulness and comfort of a horse depends on the accurate and proper fit of its harness. The collar and traces and the saddle are the important features of draught harness, the former being the pieces through which the draught is effected, while dead weight is borne through the saddle. The portions of saddlery by which the horseman controls and guides the horse are the bridle and bit and the reins. Into the many devices connected with these and other parts of harness for curbing horses, for breaking them of evil habits, and for adding to the security of the equestrian and carriage traveller, we cannot here enter (compare *HORSEMANSHIP*, vol. xii. p. 198). Saddler's ironmongery forms an important feature of the trade. It embraces the making of buckles, chains, cart-gearing, stirrups, spurs, bits, hames, &c. The ornamental metal-work of carriage-harness is either electro-plated in silver or of solid polished brass.

SADUCEES (צַדִּיקִים, *i. e.*, Zadokites), the party of the priestly aristocracy under the later Hasmonæans. The Sadducees were essentially a political party opposed to the Pharisees or party of the Scribes, and their position and history have therefore already been discussed in *ISRAEL*, vol. xiii. p. 424 *sq.* The common view that Sadduceism was essentially a philosophico-religious school is due partly to Josephus but mainly to later Jewish tradition, which

never could realize the difference between a nation and a sect, and fancied that the whole history of Israel was made up of such scholastic controversies as engrossed the attention of later times. The theological tenets of the Sadducees as they appear in the New Testament and in Josephus had a purely political basis. They detested the doctrine of the resurrection and the fatalism of the Pharisees because these opinions were used by their adversaries to thwart their political aims. The aristocracy suffered a great loss of position through the subjection of Judæa to a foreign power; but it was useless to urge political schemes of emancipation on those who believed with the Pharisees that Israel's task was to endure in patience till Jehovah redeemed the nation, and the resurrection rewarded those who had lived and died in bondage. In matters of ritual the Sadducees were naturally conservative, and their opposition to the unwritten traditions, from which they appealed to Scripture, is simply one phase of their opposition to Pharisaic innovations; for the traditions were the invention of the Pharisees and the written law represented old practice. When the Sadducees had lost all political importance their opposition to Pharisaism necessarily became more and more an affair of the schools rather than of practical life, but the Sadducees of the schools are only the last survival of what had once been a great political party.

SÁ DE MIRANDA, FRANCISCO DE (1495-1558), Portuguese poet, was born of noble family on 27th October 1495, at Coimbra, where also he received his education. He afterwards travelled in Spain and Italy, and held for some time a post at the court of John III. of Portugal. He died on his own property at Tapada near Ponte do Lima on 15th March 1558. Besides eight eclogues (six in Spanish and two in Portuguese), he wrote two comedies in Portuguese. — *Os Estrangeiros* and *Os Vilhalpandos*. See *PORTUGAL (Literature)*, vol. xix. p. 556, and *SPAIN (Literature)*.

SADÍ, generally called **MUSLÍH-ÜDDÍN**, but more correctly **MUSHARRIF-ÜDDÍN B. MUSLÍH-ÜDDÍN**, the greatest didactic poet and the most popular writer of Persia, was born about 1184 (580 A.H.) in Shíráz, where his father, 'Abdalláh, a man of practical religion and good common sense, who impressed upon his son from early childhood the great maxims of doing good and fearing nobody, was in the service of the Turkoman race of the Salgharides or Atábegs of Fárs. The fifth ruler of this dynasty, Sa'd b. Zengí, who ascended the throne in 1195 (591 A.H.), conceived a great affection for young Musharrif-uddín and enabled him, after the premature death of his father, to pursue his studies in the famous medreseh of Baghdád, the Nizámiyyah, where he remained about thirty years (1196-1224). Strict college discipline and severe theological studies repressed for a long time the inborn cheerfulness and joviality of his nature; but his poetical genius, which rapidly developed, kept alive in him, amid all the privations of an austere life, the elasticity of youth, and some of his "early odes," in which he praises the pleasures of life and the sweetness of love, were no doubt composed during his stay in Baghdád. At any rate his literary fame had already spread about 1210 (606 A.H.) as far as Káshgar in Turkistán, which the young poet (who in honour of his patron had assumed the name of Sa'dí) visited in his twenty-sixth or twenty-seventh year. After mastering all the dogmatic disciplines of the Islamic faith he turned his attention first to practical philosophy, and later on to the more ideal tenets of Súfíc pantheism, under the spiritual guidance of the famous sheikh Shiháb-uddín 'Umar Suhrawardí (died 1234; 632 A.H.). Between 1220 and 1225 he paid a visit to a friend in Ispahán, went from there to Damascus, and returned to Ispahán just at the time of the inroads of the Mongols, when the Atábeg Sa'd had been deposed by the victorious ruler of Kirmán,

Ghiyáth-uddín (1223). Sadly grieved by the misfortune of his generous patron and disgusted with the miserable state to which Persia had been reduced, Sa'dí started in 1224 or 1225 on his way to India, thus entering on the second period of his life—that of his wanderings (1225-1255). He proceeded *via* Balkh, Ghazní, and the Punjab to Gujrá, on the western coast of which he visited the famous shrine of Siwa in Pattan-Sumanát, and met with a remarkable adventure. Having seen the statue of the god lifting up its hands to heaven every morning at sunrise, he discovered that a priest, hidden behind the image, wrought the miracle by means of a cord; but, being caught in the very act of watching the performance, he had no alternative but to hurl his pursuer into a deep well and to escape at full speed,—not, however, until he had smashed the detested statue. After a prolonged stay in Delhi, where he acquired the knowledge of Hindústáni which he afterwards turned to account in several of his poems—just as a number of excellent Arabic *kasidas* bear witness to his fluency in that idiom which he had learnt in Baghdád—he sailed for Yemen. In San'á, the capital of Yemen, the loss of a beloved child (when he had married is not known) threw him into deep melancholy, from which only a new adventurous expedition into Abyssinia on the opposite African shore and a pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina could again rouse him. Thence he directed his steps towards Syria and lived as a renowned sheikh for a considerable time in Damascus, which he had once already visited. There and in Baalbec he added to his literary renown that of a first-rate pulpit orator. Specimens of his spiritual addresses are preserved in the five homilies (on the fugitiveness of human life, on faith and fear of God, on love towards God, on rest in God, and on the search for God) which usually form the second risálah or prose treatise in Sa'dí's complete works. At last weary of Damascus he withdrew into the desert near Jerusalem and led a solitary wandering life, till one day he was taken captive by a troop of Frankish soldiers, brought to Tripoli, and condemned to forced labour in the trenches of the fortress. After enduring countless hardships, he was eventually rescued by a rich friend in Aleppo, who paid his ransom, and moreover gave him his daughter in marriage. But Sa'dí, unable to live with his quarrelsome wife, set out on new travels, first to North Africa and then through the length and breadth of Asia Minor and the adjoining countries. Not until he had passed his seventieth year did he return to Shíráz (about 1255; 653 A.H.). Finding the place of his birth tranquil and prosperous under the wise rule of Abúbakr b. Sa'd, the son of his old patron (1226-1260; 623-658 A.H.), the aged poet took up his permanent abode, interrupted only by repeated pilgrimages to Mecca, in a little hermitage outside the town, in the midst of a charming garden, and devoted the remainder of his life to Súfíc contemplation and poetical composition. Sa'dí died at Shíráz in 1292 (691 A.H.) according to Hamdalláh Mustaufí (who wrote only forty years later), or in December 1291 (690 A.H.), at the age of 110 lunar years.

The experience of the world gained during his travels, his intimate acquaintance with the various countries he had visited, his insight into human character, its grandeur and its littleness, which a thirty years' intercourse with men of all ranks and of many nationalities had fully matured, together with an inborn loftiness of thought and the purest moral standard, made it easy for Sa'dí to compose in the short space of three years his two masterpieces, which have immortalized his name, the *Bústán* or "Fruit-garden" (1257) and the *Gulistán* or "Rose-garden" (1258), both dedicated to the reigning Atábeg Abúbakr. The former, also called *Sa'dinama*, is a kind of didactic epic in ten chapters and double-rhymed verses, which passes in review the highest philosophical and religious questions, not seldom in the very spirit of Christianity, and abounds with sound ethical maxims and matchless gems of transcendental speculation. The latter is a prose work of a similar tendency in eight

chapters, interspersed with numerous verses and illustrated, like the *Bústán*, by a rich store of clever tales and charming anecdotes; it discusses more or less the same topics as the larger work, but has acquired a much greater popularity in both the East and the West, owing to its easier and more varied style, its attractive lessons of practical wisdom, and its numerous bon-mots. But Sa'dí's *Díván*, or collection of lyrical poetry, far surpasses the *Bústán* and *Gulistán*, at any rate in quantity, whether in quality also is a matter of taste. Other minor works are the Arabic *kasidas*, the first of which laments the destruction of the Arabian caliphate by the Mongols in 1258 (656 A.H.), the Persian *kasidas*, partly panegyric, partly didactic; the *maráthi*, or elegies, beginning with one on the death of Abúbakr and ending with one on the defeat and demise of the last caliph, Musta'sim; the *mulammá'át*, or poems with alternate Persian and Arabic verses, of a rather artificial character; the *tarjilat*, or refrain-poems; the *ghazals*, or odes; the *sáhibiyyah* and *mufatta'át*, or moral aphorisms and epigrams; the *rubá'iyát*, or quatrains; and the *mufradá't*, or distichs. Sa'dí's lyrical poems possess neither the easy grace and melodious charm of Háfiz's songs nor the overpowering grandeur of Jelál-uddín Rúmí's divine hymns, but they are nevertheless full of deep pathos and show such a fearless love of truth as is seldom met with in Eastern poetry. Even his panegyrics, although addressed in turn to almost all the rulers who in those days of continually changing dynasties presided over the fate of Persia, are free from that cringing servility so common in the effusions of Oriental encomiasts.

The first who collected and arranged his works was 'Alí b. Ahmad b. Bisutún (1326-1334; 726-734 A.H.). The most exact information about Sa'dí's life and works is found in the introduction to Dr W. Bacher's *Sa'dí's Aphorisms and Singedichte*, Strasburg, 1879 (a complete metrical translation of the epigrammatic poems), and in the same author's "Sa'dí Studien," in *Z.D.M.G.*, xxx. pp. 81-106. Sa'dí's *Kulliyát* or complete works have been edited by Harington, Calcutta, 1791-95 (with an English translation of some of the prose treatises and of Daulat Shah's notice on the poet, of which a German version is found in Graf's *Rosengarten*, Leipzig, 1846, p. 229 *sq.*); for the numerous lithographed editions, see *Rieu's Pers. Cat. of the Brit. Mus.*, ii. p. 526. The *Bústán* has been printed in Calcutta (1810 and 1828), as well as in Lahore, Cawnpore, Tabriz, &c.; a critical edition with Persian commentary was published by K. H. Graf at Vienna in 1850 (German metrical translations by the same, Jena, 1850, and by Schlechta-Wasserd, Vienna, 1852; English translation by W. Clarke, London, 1879; French translation by Barbier de Meynard, Paris, 1880). The best editions of the *Gulistán* are by A. Sprenger (Calcutta, 1851) and by Platts (London, 1874); the best translations into English by Baszwick (1852) and by Platts (1873); into French by Deffémery (1858); into German by Graf (1846); see also S. Robinson's *Persian Poetry for English Readers*, 1865, pp. 245-366. Select *kasidas*, *ghazals*, elegies, quatrains, and distichs have been edited, with a German metrical translation, by Graf, in the *Z.D.M.G.*, ix. p. 62 *sq.*, xii. p. 82 *sq.*, xiii. p. 445 *sq.*, xv. p. 541 *sq.*, and xviii. p. 570 *sq.* On the Súfíc character of Sa'dí in contrast to Háfiz and Jelál-uddín Rúmí, comp. Ethé, "Der Súfismus und seine drei Hauptvertreter," in *Morgenländische Studien*, Leipzig, 1870, pp. 95-124. (G. E.)

SADLER, SIR RALPH (1507-1587), English statesman, was the son of Henry Sadler, steward to the proprietor of the manor of Gillney, near Great Hadham, Hertfordshire, and was born at Hackney in Middlesex in 1507. While a mere child he obtained a situation in the family of Thomas Cromwell, earl of Essex. Through him he was introduced to Henry VIII., who conferred on him various appointments and employed him in connexion with the dissolution of the monasteries, in the rich spoils of which he was a large sharer. So much was the king impressed by Sadler's ability and address that he made choice of him for his subsequent important negotiations with Scotland. In 1537 he was sent thither to strengthen the English interest; in 1539-40 he was commissioned to persuade the Scottish king James V. to cast off the supremacy of the pope; in 1541 he went back to enforce the same counsel; and in 1542 he was appointed to settle the proposed match between Edward prince of Wales and Mary the infant queen of Scots. Although not successful in any of these missions, he continued to retain the full confidence of the king, who, in recognition of his zealous services, conferred on him in 1543 the honour of knighthood. On Henry's death in 1547 Sadler's name was found in the royal will as one of the councillors to the sixteen nobles who were entrusted with the guardianship of the young king. In the same year he was appointed treasurer to the army sent against Scotland, and for his great services in rallying the repulsed cavalry he was created a knight-banneret on the battlefield of Pinkie. During the reign of Mary he lived in retirement on his estate near Hackney; but on the accession of Elizabeth in 1558 he came once more into a sphere of active employment. He immediately became a member of parliament for the county of Hertford and a privy councillor.