THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY

REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL and ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE

B - Baptists

by James Strong & John McClintock

To the Students of the Words, Works and Ways of God:

Welcome to the AGES Digital Library. We trust your experience with this and other volumes in the Library fulfills our motto and vision which is our commitment to you:

MAKING THE WORDS OF THE WISE
AVAILABLE TO ALL — INEXPENSIVELY.

AGES Software Rio, WI USA
Version 1.0 © 2000

B

Baader, Franz Xaver Von

a Roman Catholic philosopher of Germany, was born at Munich in 1765, and died there, May 23, 1811. In early life he devoted himself especially to the study of medicine and natural science, and was rewarded for his services in the mining interests of his country by the title of nobility. He established a greater reputation by his lectures and works on philosophy and theology. Though a layman, he was appointed, in 1827, Professor of Speculative Dogmatics at the University of Munich, which chair he retained until 1838, when a ministerial decree excluded laymen from the delivery of lectures on the philosophy of religion. From early youth he had a great aversion to Rationalism, and a great longing for a deeper understanding of the mysteries of the Christian revelation. He studied with particular interest the mystic and theosophic writers, among whom he took especially Jacob Boehme (q.v.) for his guide. After his example, he built up a system of theology and philosophy, which, as all admit, is full of profound and original ideas, though, on the whole, visionary and paradoxical in the extreme. Baader never separated from the Roman Church, but published several works against the primacy of the Pope. His system of philosophy has still (1860) a number of followers, both among Romanists and Protestants. Among his principal works are: *Vorlesungen uber speculative Dogmatik* (Stuttg. 8 vols. 1828-38); *Revision d. Philostpheme der Hegel'schen Schule* (Stuttg. 1839); *D. morgenlanldische und der abendlandische Katholicismus* (Stuttg. 1841). His complete works have been edited, with explicit introductions, by six of his followers, Fr. Hoffmann, Hamberger, Lutterbeck, Osten-Sacken, Schaden, and Schliter (Baader's *Sdmmttiche Werke,* Leipz. 1850-60, 16 vols.). The sixteenth volume contains a copious general index, and an introduction on the system and the history of the philosophy of Baader, by Dr. Lutterbeck. See also Hoffmann, *Vorhalle zur epeculativen Lehre Franz Baaders* (Aschaffenburg, 1836).

Ba’al

Picture for Ba’al 1

(Hebrews id. לַעַל [Bl; *lord or master)*, a generic term for *god* in many of the Syro-Arabian languages. As the idolatrous nations of that race had several gods, this word, by means of some accessory distinction, became applicable as a name to many different deities. *SEE BAAL-BERITH*, *SEE BAAL-PEOR*; *SEE BAAL-ZEBUB*. There is no evidence, however, that the Israelites ever called Jehovah by the *name* of Baal; for the passage in <28216>Hosea 2:16, which has been cited as such, only contains the word *baal* as the sterner, less affectionate representative of *husband.* It is spoken of the master and owner of a house (<12217>Exodus 22:7; <7922>Judges 19:22); of a landholder (<18839>Job 31:39); of an owner of cattle (<12128>Exodus 21:28; <23001>Isaiah 1:3); of a lender of money, i.e. creditor (<15502>Deuteronomy 15:2); also of the head of a family (<13204>Leviticus 21:4); and even of the Assyrians (or the princes) as conquerors of nations (<23168>Isaiah 16:8). *SEE BAALIM*. It also occurs very frequently as the first part of the names of towns and men, e.g. BAAL-GAD, BAAL-HAMON, BAAL-HANAN, etc., all which see in their alphabetical order, and compare *SEE BAAL*. As a strictly proper name, and in its simple form, Baal stands in the Bible for a deity, and also for two men and one village. *SEE GUR-BAAL*; *SEE KIRJATH-BAAL*; *SEE MERIB-BAAL*.

Picture for Ba’al 2

1. This name (with the article, הַבַּעַל [Bhl; *hab-Ba’al*, <70213>Judges 2:13; Sept. ὁ Βάαλ, but also ἡ Βάαλ, <24195>Jeremiah 19:5; 39:35; <45104>Romans 11:4) is appropriated to the chief *male* divinity of the Phoenicians, the principal seat of whose worship was at Tyre, and thus corresponds with ASHTORETH, their supreme *female* divinity. Both names have the peculiarity of being used in the plural, and it seems that these plurals designate either (as Gesenius, *Thes.* s.v. maintains) statues of the divinities, or different modifications of the divinities themselves. That there were many such modifications of Baal is certain from the fact that his name occurs with numerous adjuncts, both in the O.T. and elsewhere, as we have seen above. The plural BAALIM is found frequently alone (e.g. <70211>Judges 2:11; 10:10; <111818>1 Kings 18:18; <24914>Jeremiah 9:14; <28217>Hosea 2:17), as well as in connection with Ashtoreth (<70706>Judges 10:6; <090704>1 Samuel 7:4), and with Asherah, or, as our version renders it, “the groves” (<70307>Judges 3:7; <143319>2

Chronicles 33:3). There is no difficulty in determining the meaning of the name, since the word is in Hebrew a common noun of frequent occurrence, having the meaning *lord*, not so much, however, in the sense of ruler as of *master*, *owner*, *possessor*. The name of the god, whether singular or plural, is always distinguished from the common noun by the presence of the article (לַבַּעַל, לַבְּעָלִים), except when it stands in connection with some other word which designates a peculiar modification of Baal. In the Chaldaic form the word becomes shortened into לַבַּע, and thence, dropping the guttural, לֶבֶל, BEL, which is the Babylonian name of this god (Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald. et Talin;* so Gesenius, Furst, Movers; the identity of the two words is, however, doubted by Rawlinson, *Herod.* 1, 247).

There can be no doubt of the very high antiquity of the worship of Baal. We find his *cultus* established among the Moabites and their allies the Midianites in the time of Moses (Numbers 22:41), and through these nations the Israelites were seduced to the worship of this god under the particular form of Baal-peor (Numbers 25:3 sq.; Deuteronomy 4:3). Notwithstanding the fearful punishment which their idolatry brought upon them in this instance, the succeeding generation returned to the worship of Baal (Judges 2:10-13), and with the exception of the period during which Gideon was judge (Judges 6:26 sq.; 8:33) this form of idolatry seems to have prevailed among them up to the time of Samuel (Judges 10:10; 1 Samuel 7:4), at whose rebuke the people renounced the worship of Baalim. Two centuries pass over before we hear again of Baal in connection with the people of Israel, though we can scarcely conclude from this silence that his worship was altogether abandoned. We know that in the time of Solomon the service of many gods of the surrounding nations was introduced, and particularly that of Ashtoreth, with which Baal is so frequently connected. However this may be, the worship of Baal spread greatly, and, together with that of Asherah, became the religion of the court and people of the ten tribes under Ahab, king of Israel, who, partly through the influence of his wife Jezebel (q.v.), the daughter of the Sidonian king Ethbaal, appears to have made a systematic attempt to suppress the worship of God altogether, and to substitute that of Baal in its stead (1 Kings 16:31-33; 18:19, 22). And though this idolatry was occasionally put down (2 Kings 3:2; 10:28), it appears never to have been permanently or effectually abolished in that kingdom (2 Kings 17:16). In the kingdom of Judah also Baal-worship extensively prevailed. During the short reign of Ahaziah and the subsequent usurpation of his

mother Athaliah, the sister of Ahab, it appears to have been the religion of the court (<12827>2 Kings 8:27; comp. 11:18), as it was subsequently under Ahaz (<12163>2 Kings 16:3; <14812>2 Chronicles 28:2), and Manasseh (<12203>2 Kings 21:3).

The worship of Baal among the Jews appears to have been appointed with much pomp and ceremonial. Temples were erected to him (<11632>1 Kings 16:32; <12118>2 Kings 11:18); his images were set up (<12026>2 Kings 10:26); his altars were very numerous (<24113>Jeremiah 11:13), being erected particularly on lofty eminences, *SEE HIGH-PLACE*, (<11820>1 Kings 18:20), and on the roofs of houses (<24329>Jeremiah 32:29); there were priests in great numbers (<11819>1 Kings 18:19), and of various classes (<12019>2 Kings 10:19); the worshippers appear to have been arrayed in appropriate robes (<12022>2 Kings 10:22; comp. Lucian, *De Dez Syra*, 50). His priesthood (the proper term for which seems to be µyrmKi *kemarim'*, so called from their *black* garments) were a very numerous body (<11819>1 Kings 18:19), and were divided into the two classes of prophets and of priests (unless the term "servants," which comes between those words, may denote a third order — a kind of Levites, <12019>2 Kings 10:19). As to the rites by which he was worshipped, there is most frequent mention of incense being offered to him (<12305>2 Kings 23:5), but also of bullocks being sacrificed (<11826>1 Kings 18:26), and even of children, as to Moloch (<24105>Jeremiah 19:5). According to the description in <11801>1 Kings 18, the priests during the sacrifice danced (or, in the sarcastic expression of the original, *linped)* about the altar, and, when their prayers were not answered, cut themselves with knives until the blood flowed, like the priests of Bellona (Lucan. *Pharsal.* 1, 565; Tertull. *Ayologet.* 9; Lactant. *Div. Instit.* 1, 21). We also read of homage paid to him by bowing the knee, and by kissing his image (<11918>1 Kings 19:18; comp. Cicero, *in Verrem*, 4, 43), and that his worshippers used to swear by his name (<24216>Jeremiah 12:16). *SEE CHEMARIM*.

Throughout all the Phoenician colonies we continually find traces of the worship of this god, partly in the names of men, such as Adher-*bal*, Asdru-*bal*, Hanni-*bal*, and still more distinctly in Phoenician inscriptions yet remaining (Gesenius, *Mon. Phan.* passim). Nor need we hesitate to regard the Babylonian *bel* (<23601>Isaiah 46:1) or *Belus* (Herod. 1:181) as essentially identical with Baal, though perhaps under some modified form. Rawlinson distinguishes between the second god of the first triad of the Assyrian pantheon, whom he names provisionally Bel-Nimrod, and the Babylonian Bel, whom he considers identical with Merodach *(Herod.* 1, 510 sq.; 521

sq.). Traces of the idolatry symbolized under it are even found in the British Isles, Baal, Bal, or Beal being, according to many, the name of the principal deity of the ancient Irish; and on the tops of many hills in Scotland there are heaps of stones called by the common people "Bel's cairns," where it is supposed that sacrifices were offered in early times *(Statistical Account of Scotland*, 3, 105; 11:621). *SEE ETHBAAL*.

The same perplexity occurs respecting the connection of this god with the heavenly bodies as we have already noticed in regard to Ashtoreth. Creuzer *(Symb.* 2, 413) and Movers *(Phon.* 1, 180) declare Baal to be the Sun-god; on the other hand, the Babylonian god is identified with Zeus by Herodotus, and there seems to be no doubt that Bel-Merodach is the planet Jupiter (Rawlinson, *Herod.* 1, 512). On the whole, Baal probably represents properly the *sun,* and, in connection with Astarte, or the moon, was very generally worshipped by the idolatrous nations of Western Asia, as representing the great generative powers of nature, the former as a symbol of the active, and the latter of the passive principle. Traces of this tendency to worship the principal luminaries of heaven appear frequently in the history of the Israelites at a very early period, before Sabianism as such was distinctly developed (Exodus 20:4; Deuteronomy 4:19; 17:3; 2 Kings 23:11). Gesenius, however (in his *Thesaur. Heb.),* contends that Baal was not the sun, but the planet *Jupiter,* as the guardian and giver of good fortune; but the view of Mainter (in his *Religion der Babylonier)* seems most tenable, who, while he does not deny the astrological character of this worship, still maintains that, together with and besides that, there existed in very early times a cosmogonical idea of the primitive power of nature, as seen in the two functions of *generation* and *conception* or parturition, and that the sun and moon were the fittest representatives of these two powers. It is quite likely that in the case of Baal, as well as of Ashtoreth, the symbol of the god varied at different times and in different localities. Indeed, the great number of adjuncts with which the name of Baal is found is a sufficient proof of the diversity of characters in which he was regarded, and there must no doubt have existed a corresponding diversity in the worship. It may even be a question whether in the original notion of Baal there was reference to any of the heavenly bodies, since the derivation of the name does not in this instance, as it does in the case of Ashtoreth, point directly to them. If we separate the name Baal from idolatry, we seem, according to its meaning, to obtain simply the notion of lord and proprietor of all. With this the idea of productive power is

naturally associated, and that power is as naturally symbolized by the sun; while, on the other hand, the ideas of providential arrangement and rule, and so of prosperity, are as naturally suggested by the word, and in the astral mythology these ideas are associated with the planet Jupiter. In point of fact, we find adjuncts to the name of Baal answering to all these notions, e.g. Βεελσάμην *Balsamen* (Plaut. *Pen.* v. 2, 67)= ˆymvAl[b, "Lord of the heavens;" ˆmjAl[b, Baal-Hamon (Gesenius, *Mon. Phan.* p. 349), the Sun-Baal (comp. the similar name of a city in <22811>Song of Solomon 8:11); dGAlf2PBj Baal-Gad, the name of a city (<06117>Joshua 11:17), q.d. Baal the Fortune-bringer, which god may be regarded as identical with the planet Jupiter. Many more compounds of Baal in the O.T. occur, and among them a large number of cities, which are given below. There has recently been discovered among the ruins of a temple on Mount Lebanon an inscription containing the name *Bal-marcos,* the first part of which is evidently identical with the Phoenician Baal, who appears to have been worshipped then under the title of "the god of dancing" *(Biblioth. Sacra,* 1843, p. 559 sq.). Dr. Wilson, when at Damascus, obtained the impression of an ancient *scarabeus,* on which was carved an inscription, in the old Phoenician alphabet, containing the title l[bl, "to Baal" *(Lands of Bible,* 2, 769). See BAALIM. 2. (Sept.Βαάλ.) A Benjamite, fourth son of Jehiel, the progenitor of the Gibeonites, by his wife Maachah (<13830>1 Chronicles 8:30; 9:36). B.C. post 1618.

3. (Sept. Βαάλ v. r. Βεήλ) and even Ἰωήλ.) A Reubenite, son of Reia and father of Beerah, which last was among the captives transported to Assyria by Tiglath-Pileser (<13805>1 Chronicles 5:5). B.C. ante 738.

4. (Sept. Βαάλ.) A place in the vicinity of Ain and Ashan, inhabited by the Simeonites (<13043>1 Chronicles 4:33); probably the same elsewhere (<16908>Joshua 19:8) called BAALATH-BEER *SEE BAALATH-BEER* (q.v.). *SEE BAAL*.

Baal- Or -Baal

(Hebrews id. Al[Bi or l[bA, i.e. *Baal),* a geographical word occurring as the prefix or suffix to the names of several places in Palestine (see those following, also *SEE GUR-BAAL,* etc.). Gesenius has expressed his opinion *(Thes. Heb.* p. 225, col. a) that in these cases it has no reference to any worship of the god Baal at the particular spot, but merely expresses that the place "possesses" or contains something special denoted by the other

part of the name, the word Baal bearing in that case a force synonymous with that of BETH *SEE BETH* (q.v.). *SEE BAAL-TAMAR*, etc. Without contradicting this conclusion, some reasons may be mentioned for reconsidering it. *SEE BAALIM*.

1. Though employed in the Hebrew Scriptures to a certain extent metaphorically, and there certainly with the force of "possession" or "ownership," as a "lord of hair" (<120108>2 Kings 1:8), "lord of dreams" (<013719>Genesis 37:19), etc., Baal never seems to have become a naturalized Hebrew word, but frequently occurs so as to betray its Canaanite origin and relationship. Thus it is several times employed to designate the inhabitants of towns either certainly or probably heathen, but rarely, if ever, those of one undoubtedly Hebrew. It is applied to the men of Jericho before the conquest (<062411>Joshua 24:11); to the men of Shechem, the ancient city of Hamor the Hivite, who rose to recover the rights of Hamor's descendants long after the conquest ,of the land (<070902>Judges 9:2-51, with Ewald's commentary, *Gesch.* 2, 445-447), and in the account of which struggle the distinction between the "lords" (µyl{B) of Shechem and the "men" (µyvna}— Hebrew relations) of Abimelech is carefully maintained. It is used for 'the men of Keilah, a place on the western confines of Judah, exposed to all the attacks and the influences of the surrounding heathen (<092311>1 Samuel 23:11, 12), for Uriah the Hittite (<101126>2 Samuel 11:26), and for others (<231608>Isaiah 16:8, etc.). Add to this the consideration that if Baal forms part of the name of a person, we are sure to find the name mentioned with some Hebrew alteration, as Jerubbesheth for Jerub-baal; Mephibosheth for Merib-baal; Ishbosheth for Esh-baal, and others. In <280216>Hosea 2:16, a remarkable instance is preserved of the distinction, noticed above in connection with the record of the revolt at Shechem, between the heathen *Baal* and the Hebrew *Ish:* "At that day, saith Jehovah, men shall call me ' Ishi,' and shall call me no more 'Baali,'" both words having the sense of "my husband."

2. Such places called by this name, or its compounds, as can be identified, and several of which existed at the time of the conquest, were either near Phoenicia,, as Baal-gad, Baal-hermon, Belmarkos (of later times), or in proximity to some other acknowledged seat of heathen worship, as Baal-meon and Bamoth-Baal, near Baal-peor; or Kirjath-Baal and Baal: — tamlar, connected with Gibeon and Bethel (see Dems, "Der Baal in d. Helr.

Eigennamen," in the *Zeitschr. d. deutsch. morgenl. Gesellsch.* 1862, 4:728).

3. On more than one occasion Baal forms part of the names of places which we elsewhere discover to have been elevated spots, spots in which the worship of the Canaanites delighted. Thus Baal-hermon is elsewhere called '" Mount Baal," and Baal-Perazim is (very probably) "Mount Perazim." Baalath-beer, too, is called in the parallel lists Ramath (i.e. "height"). Compare the Vulgate rendering of Baalah in <13616>1 Chronicles 13:6, "ad *collem* Cariathiarim;" also Mount Baalah (<06511>Joshua 15:11).

4. There is the consideration of the very deep significance with which the name of Baal must always have been invested, both for the Israelites and for their predecessors in the country-for those who venerated and those who were commanded to hate him. Surely this significance must have been sufficient to prevent that portentous name from becoming a mere alternative for a term which, like BETH *SEE BETH* (q.v.), was in the commonest daily use.

5. The most significant form in which this compound word occurs is its use as an element (in a manner common to all the Shemitic languages) in proper names, like *d-* (לא) and *Jah (*יה*)* of the Hebrew; sometimes at the end, e.g. *Eth-baal* (לאבעת*)*, *Meri-baal(*לאבירם*)*, *Esh-baal (*לאבשׁ*)*, *Jerub-baal (*לאבירי*)*, etc. (which see severally); at other times at the beginning, e.g. *Baal-hasnon* (ן֣וֹנ֔חַבַּעַל), *Bali-yah (*יָהּ֖בַּעַל), and in some instances the heathenish "Baal" has supplanted the corresponding Jewish sacred name, e.g. *El-iada* (דַּ֣יְעַלְיָדַע, <10516>2 Samuel 5:16) =*Beel-iada* (דַּ֣יְעַלְבְּעַלְיָדַע, <13407>1 Chronicles 14:7). This was a frequent method of formation in Phoenician proper names, as appears from those occurring in classical and Biblical history, and still more clearly in inscriptions on coins, e.g. *lttobaal* (לאבתנא "with Baal," Gerb. 1:2), *Bathbaal (*לאבתבת, "daughter of Baal," Carth. 8), *Hikkembaal (*לאבמכחא "sage of Baal," Numid. 1:2), *Hikkebbaal (*לאבכחא the same by assimilation of the 7, *ib.* 2, 3), *Hikkemshcbbaal* (לאבשׁמכחא the same with the insertion of the relative prefix ש, *ib.* 2, 2), *Jeubaal (*לאבוי, "desire of Baal," Cit. 26), *Jaasherbaal* (לאבאשׁריעי, "enriched by Baal," Numid. 7:1), *Maalkibaal (*לאבכלמ, "ruled T-y Baal," Malt. 3, 1), *Mezethbaal (*לאבתזמ"kindled by Baal," Numid. 1:4), *Mosibacl* (לאבבצמ for לאבעצמ, "made by

Baal," *ib.* 1, 3), *Mcttanbaai* (לַ [בִּ]תַּנְמִ; "given by Baal," *ib.* 7, 1), etc. (see Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 224, b). *SEE NAME*.

Ba'alah

(Hebrews *Btalah',* הָלַ;[בַּ, *mistress, civitas),* the name of two cities and of one mountain. *SEE BAALATH*.

1. (Sept. Βααλάθ v. r. Βαλά.) A city in the southern part of Judah, mentioned in connection with Beersheba and lim (<061529>Joshua 15:29), apparently the same elsewhere called BALAH (<061903>Joshua 19:3), also BILHAH, and assigned to Simeon (<130429>1 Chronicles 4:29). In the firstnamed passage it forms part of the preceding name Bizjothjah-Bnalah. *SEE BIZJOTHJAH*.

2. (Sept. Βααλάθ v. r. Βαάλ, but omits in 1 Chronicles) A city on the northern border of Judah (<061510>Joshua 15:10), better known as KIRJATH-JEARIM (q.v.) (<061509>Joshua 15:9; <130606>1 Chronicles 13:6), otherwise called BAALE OF JUDAH (<101602>2 Samuel 6:2). In <061560>Joshua 15:60, and 18:14, it is called KIRJATH-BAAL. From the expression "Baalah, which is Kirjath-jearim" (comp. "Jebusi, which is Jerusalem," 18:28), it would seem as if Baalah were the earlier or Canaanite appellation of the place.

3. (Sept. γῆ Βααλάθ v. r. ἐπὶ λίβα, etc.) A mountain (רַהַ) on the N.W. boundary of Judah, between Shicron and Jabneel (<061511>Joshua 15:11), usually regarded as the same with Mount Jearim (ver. 10), from the neighboring Kirjath-baal; but erroneously (see Keil, *Comment.* in loc.), for the direction in the text requires a location more westerly, apparently at the modern *Tell Hermes* (Van de Velde, *Map). SEE TRIBE*.

Ba'alath

(Hebrews *Baalath',* תַלַעְבַּ; another form of the name *Baalah;* Sept. Βαλάθ [v. r. Γεβεελάν in Josh.], but Βαλαάθ v. r. Βαλαάς in 2 Chronicles), a town in the tribe of Dan, named with Gibbethon, Gathrimmon, and other Philistine places (<061944>Joshua 19:44), apparently the same that was afterward rebuilt by Solomon (<110918>1 Kings 9:18; <140806>2 Chronicles 8:6). Many have conjectured this Baalath to be the same as Baalbek (so Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 62); but in that case it must have lain in northernmost Dan, whereas the possession of it is ascribed to that tribe when its territory was wholly in the south near Judah, and many years

before the migration (recorded in Judges 18) which gave Dan a northern territory. Correspondingly, Josephus places the Baalath of Solomon (which he calls *Baleth,* Βαλέθ*)* in the southern part of Palestine, near Gazara or Gezer *(Ant.* 8, 6, 1), within the territory which would have belonged to Dan had it acquired possession of the lands originally assigned to it. The Jerusalem Talmud *(Sinhedr.* 1) affirms that Baalath lay so near the line of separation between Dan and Judah that the fields only were in the former tribe, the buildings being in the latter. Schwarz, however *(Palest.* p. 138 note), disputes this position; the statement seems to have reference to the postexilian distribution of Palestine, by which Judah gave name (Judaea) to the entire neighborhood, including Benjamin as well as Dan and Simeon, an arrangement evidently growing out of the earlier division into the two rival kingdoms of Judah and Israel. Van de Velde is probably correct in identifying the site with that of *Deir Balut,* on the high southern brow of Wady Kerama, about half way between Jaffa and Nablous; but he distinguishes this from the Baalath of Solomon, assigning only the insufficient reason that this locality is not situated near a highway where a fortified place would be required *(Memoir,* p. 291).

Ba’ilath-be’er

(Hebrews *Badlath’ Beer’,* tl i[Bi r aB] *Baalah of* [or having] *a well;* Sept. Βαλάθ v. r. Βαλέκ), probably the same as the BAAL of 1 Chronicles 4:33, a city of Simeon; mentioned in connection with RAMATH — *Negeb,* or *Southern Ramah* (Joshua 19:8; comp. 1 Samuel 30:27), in such a manner as to make them identical (so the Sept. B. πορευομένων Βηῤῥαμώθ*;* Vulg. *Baalath-Beerramoth). SEE RAMATH.* It is also the same with the BEALOTH *SEE BEALOTH* (q.v.) of Judah (Joshua 15:24). Other sacred wells in this parched region were the Beer-lahai-roi, the “well of the vision of God;” and Beer-sheba, the “well of the oath.” *SEE BEER.*

Baalbek

Picture for Baalbek 1

a city of Coele-Syria, celebrated for its superb ruins yet extant of an ancient temple of the sun, and supposed by many to be the site designated by Solomon’s famous “House of the Forest of Lebanon” (1 Kings 7:2; 10:17; 2 Chronicles 9:16). We are also informed that among those parts

of Palestine which were unsubdued by the Hebrews at the death of Joshua was "all Lebanon toward the sun-rising, from Baal-gad, under Mount Hermon, unto the entering into Hamath" (<06B105>Joshua 13:5). This position of Baal-gad is not unfavorable to the conclusion which some have reached, that it is no other than the place which, from a temple consecrated to the sun that stood there, was called by the Greeks *Heliopolis,* i.e. city of the sun; and which the natives called and still call Baalbek, a word apparently of the same meaning. The honor of being identified with Baalbek has also been claimed for the Baalath which Solomon built or fortified; but this claim has already been disposed of *SEE BAALATH*; and no weight is to be attached to the local traditions which claim Solomon as the founder of Baalbek, seeing that it is the practice of the natives to ascribe to that great king every grand ancient work of unknown date which the country contains. It is also to be observed that those who contend for Baalath admit its possible identity with Baal-gad, and hence there are no conflicting claims to adjust. Even those who suppose the Baal-hamon of the <220811>Canticles (8:11) to be Baalbek, conceive that to be a later name for Baal-gad, and hence the only question that remains is whether Baal-gad be not the more ancient name of the place afterward known as Heliopolis and Baalbek. Baalbek, in the Syrian language, signifies *the city of Baal,* or of the sun; and, as the Syrians never borrowed names from the Greeks, or translated Greek names, it is certain that when the Greeks came. into Syria they found the place bearing this name, or some other signifying "city of the sun," since they termed it Heliopolis, which is doubtless a translation of the native designation. Now the question is whether this word has the same meaning as Baal-gad, and, if not, whether any circumstances can be pointed out as likely to occasion the change of name. If we take Baal for the name of the idol, then, as in the case of Baalbek, the last member of the word must be taken as a modifying appellation, not as in itself a proper name; and as Gad means *a troop, a multitude,* or *a press of people,* Baal-gad will mean *Baal's crowd,* whether applied to the inhabitants, or to the place as a resort of pilgrims. The syllable *bek* has precisely the same meaning in the Arabic. If this should not seem satisfactory, we may conclude that *Baal* was so common an element in the composition of proper names that it is not sufficiently distinctive to bear the stress of such an interpretation, and may rather take it to signify (as Gesenius says it always does in geographical combinations) the place where a thing is found. *SEE BAAL*-. According to this view, Baal-gad would mean *the place of Gad.* Now Gad was an idol (<236511>Isaiah 65:11), supposed to have

been the god or goddess of good fortune (comp. Sept. Τύχη; Vulg. *Fortuna),* and identified by the Jewish commentators with the planet *Jupiter. SEE GAD*. But it is well known that Baal was identified with Jupiter as well as with the sun; and it is not difficult to connect Baalbek with the worship of Jupiter. John of Antioch affirms that the great temple at Baalbek was dedicated to Jupiter; and in the celebrated passage of Macrobius *(Saturn.* 1, 23), in which he reports that the worship of the sun was brought by Egyptian priests to Heliopolis in Syria, he expressly states that they introduced it under the name of Jupiter (sub-nomine *Jovis).* This implies that the worship of Jupiter was already established and popular at the place, and that heliolatry previously was not; and therefore we should rather expect the town to have borne some name referring to Jupiter than to the sun, and may be sure that a name indicative of heliolatry must have been posterior to the introduction of that worship by the Egyptians; and, as we have no ground for supposing that this took place before or till long after the age of Joshua, it could not then be called by any name corresponding to Heliopolis. But *SEE BAAL-GAD*.

Picture for Baalbek 2

Baalbek is pleasantly situated on the lowest declivity of Anti-Libanus, at the opening of a small valley into the plain El-Bekaa. Through this valley runs a small stream, divided into numberless rills for irrigation. The place, according to the determination of Maj. Rennell *(Geogr. of W. Asia,* 1, 75), is in N. lat. 34° 1’ 30”, and E. long. 36° 11’, distant 109 geog. miles from Palmyra, and 38.75 from Tripoli. Its origin appears to be lost in the most remote antiquity, and the historical notices of it are very scanty; the silence of the classical writers respecting it would alone seem to imply that it had previously existed under another name. In the absence of more positive information, we can only conjecture that its situation on the highroad of commerce between Tyre, Palmyra, and the farther East, must have contributed largely to the wealth and magnificence which it manifestly attained. It is mentioned under the name of *Heliopolis* by Josephus *(Ant.* 14, 3, 4), and also by Pliny *(Hist. Nat.* v. 22). Two Roman inscriptions of the time of Antoninus Pius give sanction to the statement of John of Antioch, who alleges that this emperor built a great temple to Jupiter at Heliopolis, which was one of the wonders of the world *(Hist. Chron.* lib. 11). From the reverses of Roman coins we learn that Heliopolis was constituted a colony by Julius Caesar; that it was the seat of a Roman garrison in the time of Augustus, and obtained the *Jus Italicum* from

Severus (Ulpian, *De Censibus*, 9). Some of the coins of later date contain curious representations of the temple (Akerman, *Romans Coins*, 1, 339). After the age of Constantine the splendid temples of Baalbek were probably consigned to neglect and decay, unless, indeed, as some appearances indicate, they were then consecrated to Christian worship (see *Chron. Pasch.* p. 303, ed. Bohn; comp. Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* 5, 10; Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* 3, 7; 4:22). From the accounts of Oriental writers Baalbek seems to have continued a place of importance down to the time of the Moslem invasion of Syria (see Ammian. Marcell. 14:8). . They describe it as one of the most splendid of Syrian cities, enriched with stately palaces, adorned with monuments of ancient times, and abounding with trees, fountains, and whatever contributes to luxurious enjoyment (D'Herbelot, *Biblioth. Or.* s.v.). On the advance of the Moslems, it was reported to the Emperor Heraclius as protected by a citadel of great strength, and well able to sustain a siege. After the capture of Damascus it was regularly invested by the Moslems, and, containing an overflowing population, amply supplied with provisions and military stores, it made a courageous defense, but at length capitulated. Its importance at that period is attested by the ransom exacted by the conquerors, consisting of 2000 ounces of gold, 4000 ounces of silver, 2000 silk vests, and 1000 swords, together with the arms of the garrison. It afterward became the mart for the rich pillage of Syria; but its prosperity soon received a fatal blow from the caliph of Damascus, by whom it was sacked and dismantled, and the principal inhabitants put to the sword (A.D. 748). During the Crusades, being incapable of making any resistance, it seems to have quietly submitted to the strongest. In the year 1400 it was pillaged by Timour Beg, in his progress to Damascus, after he had taken Aleppo. Afterward it fell into the hands of the Metaweli — a barbarous predatory tribe, who were nearly exterminated when Djezzar Pasha permanently subjected the whole district to Turkish supremacy. In 1759 an earthquake completed the devastation already begun by Mohammedan vandalism.

Picture for Baalbek 3

The ruins of Heliopolis lie on an eastern branch of the mountain, and are called, by way of eminence, the Castle. The most prominent objects visible from the plain are a lofty portico of six columns, part of the great temple, and the walls and columns of another smaller temple a little below, surrounded by green trees. There is also a singular temple of nearly circular form. These, with a curious column on the highest point within the walls

(which may possibly have been a clepsydra, or water-dial), form the only erect portions of the ruins. These ruins have been so often and so minutely described by scores of travelers, as well as in many works of general reference, that, since their identification as a Scriptural site is uncertain, a few additional observations only may suffice. The ruins of Baalbek in the mass are apparently of three successive eras: first, the gigantic hewn stones, in the face of the platform or basement on which the temple stands, and which appear to be remains of older buildings, perhaps of the more ancient temple which occupied the site. Among these are at least twenty standing upon a basement of rough stones, which would be called enormous anywhere but here. These celebrated blocks, which in fact form the great wonder of the place, vary from 30 to 40 feet in length; but there are three, forming an upper course 20 feet from the ground, which together measure 190 feet, being severally of the enormous dimensions of 63 and 64 feet in length, by 12 in breadth and thickness (Addison's *Damascus and Palmyra*, 2, 55). "They are," says Richter (*Wallfahrten*, p. 281), "the largest stones I have ever seen, and might of themselves have easily given rise to the popular opinion that Baalbek was built by angels at the command of Solomon. The whole wall, indeed, is composed of immense stones, and its resemblance to the remains of the Temple of Solomon, which are still shown in the foundations of the mosque Es-Sakkara on Mount Moriah, cannot fail to be observed." This was also pointed out by Dr. Richardson. In the neighboring quarries (q.v.) from which they were cut, one stone, hewn out but not carried away, is of much larger dimensions than any of those which have been mentioned. To the second and third eras belong the Roman temples, which, being of and about the time of Antoninus Pius, present some of the finest specimens of Corinthian architecture in existence, and possess a wonderful grandeur and majesty from their lofty and imposing situation (Addison, 2:57). Among the ornaments of these buildings Richter finds confirmation of the following statement of Macrobius: "Isis and Horus often unequivocally appear. The winged globes surrounded with serpents show that the priests of Baalbek received their ideas of divinity from On, the Heliopolis of Egypt." Speaking generally of these remains, Burckhardt says, "The entire view of the ruins of Palmyra, when seen at a certain distance, is infinitely more striking than those of Baalbek, but there is not any one spot in the ruins of Tadmor so imposing as the interior view of the temple of Baalbek" *(Syria*, p. 13). He adds that the architecture of Baalbek is richer than that of Tadmor. Mr. Addison remarks that "the ruins, though so striking and magnificent, are,

nevertheless, quite second-rate when compared with the Athenian ruins, and display in their decoration none of the bold conceptions and the genius which characterize the Athenian architecture." The present Baalbek is a small village to the east of the ruins, in a sad state of wretchedness and decay. It is little more than a heap of rubbish, the houses being built of mud and sun-dried bricks. The population of 5000 which the place is said to have contained in 1751 is now reduced to barely 2000 persons; the two handsome mosques and fine serai of the emir, mentioned by Burckhardt, are no longer distinguishable; and travelers may now inquire in vain for the grapes, the pomegranates, and the fruits which were formerly so abundant (Iken, *Dissert. de Baal-Hamon et Baal-Gad,* in *Dissertt. Phlologico-Theolog.* 1, 136; Wood and Dawkins, *Ruins of Baalbec,* Lond. 1757; Pococke, *Description of the East,* 2, 106-113; Maundrell, *Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem,* p. 134, 139; Volney, *Voyage en Syrie,* 2, 215-230; Thevet, *Cosmographie,* bk. 6, ch. 14; Schubert, *Reise in das Morgenland,* Erlangen, 1841; see also Rosenmüller, *Biblical Geography,* 2, 252-257; Thomson, *Land and Book,* 1, 350-361; Kelly's *Syria,* p. 256-266; Smith's *Diet. of Class. Geog.* s.v. Heliopolis Syriae). BAAL-GAD.

Ba'ail-be'rith

(Hebrews *Ba'al Berith',* tyrIB] l [B *covenant-lord;* Sept. Βααλβερίθ v. r. Βάαλ διαθήκης Judges 9:4)is the name of a god worshipped by the people of Shechem (Judges 8:33), who, on account of the signification of the name, has been compared to the Ζεὺς Ὅρκιος of the Greeks, and the Latin *Deus Fidius.* Bochart and Creuzer think that this name means "God of Berytus;" but, whether or not the name of that town is to be recognized in the Berothah of Ezekiel 47:16, there is hardly any ground for their opinion. Movers *(Phinizer,* 1, 169) considers the name equivalent to "Baal in covenant with the idolaters of Israel." The meaning, however, does not seem to be the god who presides over covenants, but the god who comes into covenant with the worshippers. In Judges 9:46, he is called simply "the god Berith" (tyrIB] la;). We know nothing of the particular form of worship paid to this god. *SEE BAALIM.*

Ba'ale

OF JUDAH (Hebrews *Badley' Yehud h',* hdWhy ylE[B; *lords* or *cities of Judah;* Sept. and Vulg. translate οἱ ἄρχοντες Ἰουδά, *vii Juda),* a city in the tribe of Judah, from which David brought the ark into Jerusalem (2

Samuel 6:2). It is elsewhere called BAALAH *SEE BAALAH* (q.v.), and was still better known as KIRJATH-JEARIM (1 Chronicles 13:6).

Ba'al-gad

(Heb. id., dG; l [B; *lord of fortune:* Sept. Βααλγάδ v. r. Βαλαγάδ, once [Joshua 13:5] Γαλγάλ), a city of the Canaanites, perhaps in the valley of Lebanon, at the source of the Jordan and foot of Mount Hermon, whose kings were taken and put to death by Joshua, but the city itself remained unsubdued in his day (Joshua 11:17; 12:7; 13:5). It was a place evidently well known at the time of the conquest of Palestine, and, as such, used to denote the most northern (Joshua 11:17, 12:7), or perhaps northwestern (Joshua 13:5, Hamath being to the extreme northeast) point to which Joshua's victories extended. It was in all probability a Phoenician or Canaanite sanctuary of Baal under the aspect of Gad or Fortune, *SEE GAD*, from whose worship it appears to have derived its name. *SEE BAALIM*. The words "the plain (h [qB;) of Lebanon" would lead to the supposition that it lay between the two ranges of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon which is still known by the same name *el-Buka'a*, and it has accordingly been identified by Iken and others (including Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1:353) with *Baalbek* (Ritter, *Erdkunde*, 17:230). *SEE BAALBEK*. But against this are the too great distance of Baalbek to the north, and the precise expression of the text "under Mount Hermon." The conjecture of Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 60), supported by Robinson *(Researches*, new ed. 3, 519), is, that the modern representative of Baal-gad is *Banias*, a place which long maintained a great reputation as the sanctuary of Pan. *SEE CAESAREA PHILIPPI*. From its association with Mount Hermon, it would seem to be the same with BAAL-HERMON (Judges 3:3; 1 Chronicles 5:23). — Smith.

Baal-gur

SEE GUR-BAAL.

Ba'al-ha'mon

(Hebrews *Ba il Hamon'*, ^/mh; l [B. *place of multitude;* Sept. Βεελαμών), a place where Solomon is said to have had an extensive vineyard (Song of Solomon 8:11). Rosenmüller *(Alterth.* I, 2:281) conceives that if this Baal-hamon was the name of a place that actually

existed, it may be reasonably supposed identical with *Baal-gad* or *Heliopolis;* for Hamon was a chief Phoenician god (Davis, *Carthage,* p. 256, 262), perhaps the *Ammon* of the Eyptians (see <340308>Nahum 3:8), whom the Greeks identialed with Jupiter *(Bib. Geog.* 2, 253). We are not inclined to lay much stress on this conjecture (see Iken, *Dissert. philo.* in loc.), which, however, is adopted by Schwarz *(Palest.* p. 61). *SEE BAAL-GAD*. There was a place called *Hammoan,* in the tribe of Asher (<061918>Joshua 19:28), which Ewald *(Comment.* in loc.) thinks was the same as Baal-hamon; but there is little probability in this conjecture. The book of Judith (8:3) places a *Balamon (*Βαλαμών*)* or *Belamon (*Βελαμών*)* in central Palestine, near Dothaim, and therefore in the mountains of Ephraim, not far north of Samaria. *SEE BALAMO*. If it be the same place (see Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 225), this vineyard may have been in one of the "fat valleys" of the "drunkards of Ephraim, who are overcome with wine," to which allusion is made in <230801>Isaiah 28:1. It appears to have been situated among the eminences south-east of Jenin. *SEE BETH-HAGGAN*; *SEE BAALIM*

Bai'l-ha'nan

(Hebrews *Ba'al Chanan',* ˆn;j ; l [Bi*lord of grace,* or *Baal* is *gracious),* the name of two men.

1. (Sept. Βαλλαενών and Βαλαεννών v. r. Βαλλενών and Βαλαεννώρ.*)* An early king of Edom, son of Achbor, successor of Saul, and succeeded by Hadar (<013638>Genesis 36:38, 39; <130149>1 Chronicles 1:49, 50). B.C. prob. ante 1619.

2. (Sept. Βαλλανάν v. r. Βαλλανά.*)* A Gederite, royal overseer of "the olive-trees and sycamore-trees in the low plains" under David (<132728>1 Chronicles 27:28). B.C. 1014. From his name we may conjecture that he was of Canaanitish extraction.

Ba'al-ha'zor

(Hebrews *Baa'l Chatsor',* r/x j ; l [Bi *having a village:* Sept. Βααλασώρ v. r. Βελασώρ), the place where Absalom kept his flocks; and held the sheep-shearing feast at which Amnon was assassinated (<102323>2 Samuel 13:23). The Targum makes it "the plain of Hazor," and so Ewald *(Isr. Gesch.* 2, 639); but this locality would be far fron that of the above passage, where it is said to have been "beside (µ [ ) Ephraim;" not in the tribe of that name, but near the city called Ephraim, which was in the tribe

of Benjamin, and is mentioned in <14139>2 Chronicles 13:19; <43154>John 11:54. This Ephraim is placed by Eusebius eight miles from Jerusalem on the road to Jericho, and is supposed by Reland to have been between Bethel and Jericho *(Palestine,* 1, 377). Perhaps Baal-hazor is the same with HAZOR *SEE HAZOR* (q.v.) in the tribe of Benjamin (<16133>Nehemiah 11:33), now *Asur* in the vicinity indicated (see Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 133).

Baal-her'mon

(Hebrews *Ba'al Chermon',* lm[Bi^/mrj, *lord of Hermon),* the name of a city and a hill adjoining.

1. (Sept. makes two names, Βαὰλ Ἑρμών.*)* A to- n not far from Mount Hermon, mentioned as inhabited by the Ephraimites in connection with Bashan and Senir (<13523>1 Chronicles 5:23). It was probably the same with the BAAL-GAD *SEE BAAL-GAD* (q.v.) of <61117>Joshua 11:17 (Robinson, *Researches,* new ed. 3, 409).

2. (Sept. translates ὄρος τοῦ Ἀερμών, *Mount Hermon.)* A mountain (rh) east of Lebanon, from which the Israelites were unable to expel the Hivites (<70303>Judges 3:3). This is usually considered as a distinct place from Mount Hermon; but the only apparent ground for doing so is the statement in <13523>1 Chronicles 5:23, "unto Baal-hermon, and Senir, and [unto] Mount Hermon;" but it is quite possible that the conjunction "and" may be here, as elsewhere, used as an expletive — "unto Baal-hermon, even Senir, even Mount Hermen." Perhaps this derives some color from the fact, which we know, that this mountain had at least three names (<50309>Deuteronomy 3:9). May not Baal-hermon have been a fourth, in use among the Phoenician worshippers of Baal, one of whose sanctuaries, Baal-gad, was at the foot of this very mountain? *SEE BAALIM*.

Ba'ali

(Hebrews *Badli',* yl[B, *my lord,* Sept. Βααλείμ*),* a colder and more distant title for *husband,* which the prophet reproaches the Jewish Church for hitherto applying to Jehovah, instead of the more endearing term *Ishi (my man,* i.e. *husband),* which he predicts she would be emboldened to employ when freed from her idolatries (<28216>Hosea 2:16). Some have supposed from this that the Jews had even borrowed the term *Baal* from the surrounding nations as expressive of sovereign deity, and so applied it to Jehovah; but this is not likely. *SEE BAAL*.

Ba’alim

Picture for Ba’alim

(Hebrews *hab-bealim’*, µyl;[eB]h;, plural of *Baal*, with the def. article prefixed; Sept. Βααλίμ,), according to most, images of the god Baal set up in temples and worshipped, usually in connection with those of Astarte (<070211>Judges 2:11; <090704>1 Samuel 7:4, etc.); according to others, various forms of Baal (Ort, *Dienst des B. in Israel*, Leyden, 1864). *SEE ASHTORETH*.

Baal seems to have been the general name for the deity among the Phoenicians and Carthaginians (Serviuas, *ad AEn.* 1, 729; “lingua Punica Deus *B l* dicitur,” Isidor. *Orig.* 8, 11), but with the article (l[;B;h;, *hab-Baal, “the Baal”)* BAAL distinctively, the chief male divinity (on the fem. ἡ Βαάλ, <451104>Romans 11:4, and often in the Sept., see Winer, *New Test. Gr.* § 205) of the Phoenician (i.e. proper Sidonian, Syrian, Carthaginian, and colonial Punic) race (hence the syllable βαλος or *-bal* so often found at the end of their proper names, e.g. Ἰθόβαλος or Ethbaal (q.v.), Ἄγβαλος [Herod. 7:78], Ἐκνίβαλος and Μέρβαλος [Joseph. *Ap.* 1, 21]; also Hannibal, Ahibal, Adherbal, Hasdrubal, Maharbal, etc. [comp. Fromann, *De cultu deor. ex* ὀνομαθεσίᾳ *illustri*, Altdorf, 1744-45, p. 17 sq.]; yet that the suffix in these names is not expressive of deity in general, but only of Baal specifically, appears from a similar use of the titles Melkart, Astarte, etc., in other personal appellations [see generally Minter, *Re.ig. d. Karthager*, 2d ed. Kopenh. 1821]), like *Bel* among the Babylonians (for the contraction l[B; Bal, for l[Bi Baal, see Gesenius, *Monum. Phoen.* p. 452), and the tutelary *Belus* of Cyprus (“Citium of Bel,” Steph. Byz. p. 510). The apostate Israelites worshipped him (in connection with Astarte) in the period of the judges (<070211>Judges 2:11, 13; 3:7; 6:25 sq.), and the later kings, especially Ahaz (<141602>2 Chronicles 28:2) and Manasseh (<122103>2 Kings 21:3) of Judah, and Ahab and Hoshea of Israel (<111631>1 Kings 16:31 sq.; 18:19 sq.; <121716>2 Kings 17:16 sq.; comp. also <240208>Jeremiah 2:8; 7:9; 32:29. etc.), with but little interruption (<120301>2 Kings 3:2; 10:28; 11:18). They had temples to him (<111632>1 Kings 16:32; <121021>2 Kings 10:21 sq.), and altars (<241113>Jeremiah 11:13) erected especially on eminences and roofs (<241905>Jeremiah 19:5; 32:29), as well as images set up in his honor (<120301>2 Kings 3:2). Respecting the form of his worship we have very few distinct notices. His priests and prophets were very numerous (<111822>1 Kings 18:22; <121019>2 Kings 10:19 sq.), and divided into various classes (<121019>2 Kings 10:19).

They offered incense to this god (<24709>Jeremiah 7:9; 11:13; 32:29, etc.), and, clothed in a peculiar costume (<12202>2 Kings 10:22), presented to him bloody offerings, including children (<24905>Jeremiah 19:5). In connection with these, the priests danced (derisively, "leaped," I Kings 18:26) around the altar, and gashed themselves with knives (<11828>1 Kings 18:28) when they did not speedily gain their suit (Propert. 2:18, 15; Tibull. 1:6, 47 sq.; Lucan. 1:565; Lucian, *Dea Syra*, 50 [Ling. 1723]; Movers, *Phoniz.* 1:682). On the adoration (q.v.) by kissing (<11918>1 Kings 19:18), see Kiss. That this Baal worshipped by the Israelites was the same as the widely famed *Tyrian* Baal, whom the Greeks called *Hercules*, admits of scarcely a doubt (Movers, 1:178 sq.), and thus Baal is identified with *Maelkart* also. The ancients in general compare Baal with the Greek *Zeus* or *Jove* (Sanchoniathon, p. 14, ed. Orelli; Augustine, *Quest. in Jud.* 16; Dio Cass. 78. 8), as they still more frequently do the *Belus* of the Babylonians [see BEL], but sometimes identify him with *Chronus* or *Saturn* (Ctes. *ap. Phot.* p. 343). Most investigators recognize in him the *sun* as the fructifying principle of nature (Creuzer, *Symbol.* 2, 266 sq.; comp. Vatke, *Bibl. Theol.* p. 366 sq.); while Gesenius *(Comment. zu Jes.* 2, 335, and *Thesaur*. p. 224) interprets the Babylonian Bel and the Phoenician Baal as the principal lucky star of the Asiatic astrolatry, i.e. the planet *Jupiter.* The latter view has the following considerations in its favor:

(1.) In the sacred writings of the Sabaeans, the usual title of this planet (in Syriac) is *Beil;*

(2.) A star of good fortune, GAD, was evidently esteemed'a deity in Western Asia (comp. <23511>Isaiah 65:11), and from this the city BAAL-GAD doubtless had its name;

(3.) In <12305>2 Kings 23:5, Baal (לבעל) would seem to be distinguished from the sun as an object of worship;

(4.) On Phoenician coins likewise the sun-god is constantly named distinctively "Lord of Heaven" (בעל שמים), "Lord of Heat" (בעל חמן), "Lord of the Sun" (בעל שמש). But that Baal originally represented the sun, which with its light and warmth controls and vitalizes all nature, is clearly indicated by Sanchoniathon *(ut sup.)* in the statement that the Phoenicians had designated the sun as the "sole lord of heaven, *Beesamen"* (μόνον οὐρανοῦ κύριον, Βεελσαμήν, 1, c. בעל שמים; comp. also Augustine, *in Jud.* 16). The same name *(Balsamen)* occurs in Plautus *(Pan.*

v. 2, 67). For other reasons for the identification of the Babylonian, Syrian, and Phoenician Baal with the solar deity, see Movers, *Phon.* p. 180 sq., who has extensively investigated (p. 185 sq.) the relations of this divinity to the other ancient Asiatic deification of the powers of nature, some of which appear in the names Tammuz, Moloch, and Chiun (q.v. severally). Without tracing these out minutely, it is appropriate in this connection to specify some of the functions and spheres of activity which Baal, like Zeus among the Greeks, appears to have fulfilled among the Phoenicians, especially inasmuch as the plural form *Baalim* is thought by many to be expressive of this multiform development. The following are referred to in the Bible.

1. BAAL-BERITH (תירבַּ לַעְבַּ, *Covenant-Baal),* corresponding to the Ζεὺς ὅρκιος, *Deus Fidius,* of the Greek and Roman mythology. He was worshipped in this capacity in a special temple by the Shechemites (Judges 8:33; 9:4, 46), among whom Canaanites were also resident (Judges 9:28). Bochart *(Canaan,* 17, p. 859), whom Creuzer *(Symbol.* 2, 87) follows, renders the name "Baal of Berytus" (comp. also Steph. Byz. s.v. Βέρυτος*),* like the titles Baal of Syrus (רעְ לַעְבַּ*),* Baal of Tarsus (זרְט לַעְבַּ), found in inscriptions. As the Hebrews name of Berytus (q.v.) accords with this title (תוּרְבּ or יתוּרְבּ), and a deity of alliance or contracts might well be requisite to the polity of the Phoenicians (in whose territory this city was included), q.d. a *guardian of compacts;* the interpretation of Movers (p. 171), with which Bertheau (on *Judges* 9, 4) accords, namely "Baal with whom the league is formed" (comp. Genesis 14:3; Exodus 23:32; 34:12 sq.), gives a signification not altogether inapposite. *SEE BAAL-BERITH*.

2. BAAL-ZEBUB (בוּבְזַ לַעְבַּ, *Fly-Baal;* the Sept. construes the latter part of the name differently, ἐπιζητεῖν ἐν τῷ Βάαλ μυῖαν θεὸν Ἀκκαρών*;* but Josephus has the usual interpretation, *Ant.* 9, 2, 1), an oracular deity of the Philistines at Ekron (2 Kings 1:2, 3, 16), corresponding to the Ζεὺς ἀπόμυιος μυίαγρος (Pausan. v. 14, 2; 8:26, 4) and *Deus Myiagrus* or *Miyiodes* (Plin. 10:40; 29:24) of the Greeks and Romans (Salmas. *Exerc.* p. 9 sq.; Creuzer, *Symbol.* 2, 487; 4:392; Hitzig, *Philist.* p. 313), and to the *Hercules Myiagrus (*μυίαγρος*)* of other notices (Solin. c. 2; Clem. Alex. *Protrept.* p. 11, ed. Sylb.). Flies (and gnats) are in the East a much greater annoyance than with us (comp. Bochart, *Hieroz. 3,* 346 sq.). *SEE FLY*. From this explanation of Baal-Zebub only Hug has of late dissented *(Freiburg. Zeitschr.* 7, 104 sq.); his assertion, however, that this Philistine

divinity is the dung-beetle *(scarabceuspillularius),* worshipped also in Egypt (as a symbol of the world-god), rests on many uncertain assumptions, and is therefore improbable. (For other interpretations, see the *Exeg. Handb. d. A. T.* 9, 2 sq.) *SEE BEEL-ZEBUB.*

3. BAAL-PEOR (רְעוֹר בַּעַל, *Priapism-Baal),* or simply PEOR (רְעוֹר), was the name of a god of the Moabites (Numbers 25:1 sq.; 31:16; Joshua 22:17), apparently worshipped by the prostitution (perhaps proceeds of the hire) of young girls (whence, according to the rabbins, the name, from רָעַר, *paar',* to *fracture,* l. q. to deprive of virginity, comp. Jonathan, *Targ.* on Numbers 25:1), probably corresponding to the Roman *Priapus* (see Jerome, *ad Hosea* 4, 14) and *Mutunus* (Creuzer, *Symbol.* 2, 976). -If the above rabbinical significance of the title be correct, he would seem to have given name to Matthew Peor, *SEE BETH-PEOR,* where was the seat of his worship; but it is more likely that the title was borrowed from the hill (q.d. "ravine") as a distinctive epithet (Movers, p. 667) for his form of worship in that locality (see Creuzer, *Symbol.* 2, 85). Jerome *(in Jovin.* 1:12) considers this deity to be *Chemosh* (q.v.). *SEE BAAL-PEOR.*

4. The deity styled emphatically THE BAAL (הַבַּעַל, q.d. "*the* great *lord"),* whose worship was introduced nto Israel by Jezebel (1 Kings 16:32 sq.), was apparently the god with whom the Greeks compared their *Hercules* (2 Maccabees 4:18, 20). His Phoenician appellation was *Melkart* ("king of the city," i.e. Tyre), or *Harokel* ("merchant," he being supposed to be a great navigator), which the Greeks corrupted into *a* resemblance to their own Ἡράκλης, and under the name of the "Tyrian Hercules" he was much celebrated (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 36, 5; Arrian, *Eoped. Alex.* 2, 16). When Herodotus was in Egypt he learned that Hercules was there regarded as one of the primeval gods of that country, and being anxious to obtain more explicit information on the subject, he undertook a voyage to Tyre. The priests there informed him that the foundation of the temple was coeval with that of the city, which they said was founded 2300 years before that time. It was in honor of this god that the Carthaginians for a long time annually sent the tenth of their income to Tyre (Herod. 2:44). The account of the Baai of Jezebel and Athaliah agrees with this Hercules, since the representation of Scripture (1 Kings 19:18) is the same with that of Diodorus Siculus (2. 10), that the fire was always burning on his altar, the priests officiated barefooted, and kissing was among the acts of worship (Cicero, *in Verrem,* 4, 43). Many representations of the Tyrian Hercules

are extant on coins, of which there are two specimens in the British Museum. The first was found in the island of Cossyra (now Pantellaria), which belonged to the Tyrians; the other is a Tyrian coin of silver, weighing 2141 grains, and exhibits a very striking head of the same idol in a more modern and perfect style of art. One of the figures of the date is obliterated, but it is thought that the complete date may have given 84 B.C. *SEE HERCULES*.

5. In addition to the above, First *(Hebrews Handu'orterbuch,* s.v.) enumerates the following as local or special attributes of Baal.

(a) BAAL-GAD (dG; l [Biq.d. *Luck-Baal),* the epithet of Baal as bringing good fortune, like the luck-dispensing star Jupiter; and thence given as the name of a city (<061117>Joshua 11:17; 12:7; 13:5) at the foot of Mount Hermon (Jebel eshSheik), in which neighborhood was also situated the city Baal-Hermon (<130523>1 Chronicles 5:23). *SEE BAAL-GAD*.

(b) BAAL-HAMON (ˆ/mh; l [Biq.d. *Heat-Baal),* the title of the Phoenician Baal, 'as representing the vivifying warmth of nature, like the Egyptian *Ammon* (Sun-god), *SEE AMON*; and thence given to a city in Samaria (<220811>Song of Solomon 8:11), where his worship may have been practiced. *SEE BAAL-HAMON*.

(c) BAAL-CHATSOR (r/xj; l [Bi, q.d. *village-protecting Baal),* the epithet of Baal as the tutelary deity of Hazor (q. v); then the name of a city in the vicinity of Ephraim or Ephron (<100323>2 Samuel 13:23; <141319>2 Chronicles 13:19). *SEE BAAL-HAZOR*. Baal is repeatedly named among the Phoenicians as the guardian divinity of towns, e.g. 'Baal-Tyre" (rxol [Bi, Malt. 1:1), "Baal-Tarsus" (zr,T, l [Bi, on coins of that city), "Baal-Lybia" (l [BiyBæbi, Ζεὺς Λίβυς, Numid. 4:1), etc. *SEE BAAL*.

(d) BAAL-CHERMON (ˆ/mr]j, l [Bi, q.d. *Hil-Baal),* i.e. Baal as the protector of Mount Hermon, in a city near which his worship was instituted; thence applied to the city itself (<130523>1 Chronicles 5:23), near Baal-gad (q.v.). That part of Hermon (q.v.) on which this town lay is called (<070303>Judges 3:3) Mount Baal-Hermon (q.v.). *SEE BAAL-HERMON*.

(e) BAAL-MEON (ˆ/[mæb [Bi, q.d. *heaven-dwelling Baal),* i.e. Baal as associated with the hill of Baal or Saturn, supposed to be in the seventh heaven, as the term divine "habitation" *(*ˆ/[m*)* often signifies

(Deuteronomy 26:15; Psalm 68:6), and thus equivalent to the later *Baal-Zebul (*לבז בעל, *lord of* the celestial *dwelling*, i.e. "prince of the power of the air"), and the Phoenician *Beelsamen (*Βεελσάμην, i.e. מים בעל; בעל, *lord of heaven*, as interpreted by Sanchoniathon [p. 14, Κύριος οὐρανοῦ and Augustine [in loc. Judg., *dominus coeli])';* whence the name of the place *Beth-Baal-Meon* (q.v.), in Joshua 13:17, or simply *Baal-Maecn* (Numbers 32:38; 1 Chronicles 5:8), or, even abridged into *Beon* (Numbers 32:3). *SEE BAALMEON*; *SEE BEELZEBUB.*

(f) BAAL-PERATSIM (בעל פרצים q.d. *ravine-Baal),* so called apparently as the presiding deity of the mountain *Perazim* (q.v.), an eminence famous for an ancient victory (Isaiah 28:21), and probably a seat of his worship; and hence applied in this form to the place itself (2 Samuel 5:20; 1 Chronicles 14:11), in the same way as Hermon and Peor above, and at length Lebanon itself, as mountains representing great natural features. *SEE BAAL-PERAZIM.*

(g) BAAL-TSEPHON (בעל צפון i.e. *Typhon Baal),* the name of Baal as the opposing genius of cosmical order (comp. צפון; the *north,* i.e. the dark, cold quarter), or the ruling spirit of winter. This was an Egyptian phasis of the divinity, and the name was transferred to the city or locality of *Baal-Zephon,* on the route of the Israelites to Canaan (Exodus 14:2). *SEE BAAL-ZEPHON.*

(h) BAAL -SHALISHAH (בעל שלשה q.d. *Baal of the third* or *trinal* district), the tutelary deity of the region *Shalisha* (q.v.), to a city of which (1 Samuel 9:4) his name was thus transferred (1 Kings 4:20), situated (according to the *Onomasticon)* 15 Roman miles north of Diospolis, and called by the Sept. and Eusebius *Beth-Shalisha* (by a frequent interchange of prefixes). *SEE BAAL-SHALISHA.*

(i) BAAL-TAMAR (תמר בעל q.d. *palm*-stick-*Baal,* comp. Jeremiah 10:5), is Baal the *phallus* of Bacchus, or the scarecrow Priapus in the melon-patches (see the apocryphal explanation in Baruch 6:70), and thence assigned to a city in the fertile meadow near Gibeah (Judges 20:33), called in the *Onomast. Beth-Tamar. SEE BAAL-TAMAR.*

On the subject generally, see (in addition to the works above referred to) Selden, *De Diis Syris;* Perizonius, *Oriqines Babyl.;* Bullmann, *Ueb. Kronos,* in the *Abhandl. d. Berl. Akad.* 1814, 1815; Buttmann, *Mythol.;*

Gesenius, in Ersch's *Encycl.* 8; Stuhr, *Relig. d. heidn. Vslker d. Orients;* Metzger, in Pauli's *Real-Encykl. d. klassischen Wissenschaft,* s.v. Hercules; Mover's, in Ersch's *Encycl.* 24, *SEE BAAL*.

Ba'alis

(Hebrews *Baalis',* sy|al{B, prob. for sy|al{B^, *son of exultation;* Sept. Βελισά v. r. Βελεισσά, and even Βασίλισσα*;* Vulg. *Baalis),* king of the Ammonites about the time of the Babylonian captivity, whom Johanan and his fellow-generals reported to Gedaliah, the viceroy, as having sent Ishmael to assassinate him (Jeremiah xl, 14). B.C. 587. Some MSS. have *Baalim* (µy|al{B), and so Josephus (Βααλείμ, *Ant.* 10:9, 3).

Ba'al-me'on

(Hebrews *Ba'al Miieon/,*^/[m]|[B, *lord of dwelling;* Sept. ἡ Βεελμεών, but in Chron. Βεελμαών v. r. Βεελμασσών, and in Ezekiel omits; otherwise BETH-MEON, <244823>Jeremiah 48:23, and BETH-BAALMEON, <061317>Joshua 13:17), a town in the tribe of Reuben beyond the Jordan, or at least one of the towns which were "built" by the Reubenites (<043238>Numbers 32:38), and to which they "gave other names." Possibly the "Beth-" (q.v.), which is added to the name in its mention elsewhere, and which sometimes superseded the "Baal-" (q.v.) of the original name, is one of the changes referred to. *SEE BAALIM*.' It is also named in <130508>1 Chronicles 5:8, and on each occasion with Nebo. In the time of Ezekiel it was in the possession of the Moabites, and under that prosperous dominion had evidently become a place of distinction, being noticed as one of the cities which are the ' glory of the country" (<262509>Ezekiel 25:9). In the days of Eusebius and Jerome *(Onomast.* s.v. Βεελμαούς, Balmen) it was still a very large village called *Balmano,* 9 miles distant from Heshbon *(*Ἰέβους, *Esbus),* near the "mountain of the hot springs," and reputed to be the native place of Elisha. At the distance of two miles south-east of Heshbon, Burckhardt (2. 624) found the ruins of a place called *Myoun,* or (as Dr. Robinson *[Researches, 3,* Append. p. 170] corrects it) *Main,* which is doubtless the same; so Schwarz, *Main (Palest.* p. 227). In <043203>Numbers 32:3, apparently the same place is called BEON, perhaps by an error of the copyists or by contraction.

Ba’al-pe’or

(Hebrews *Ba’al Peor’*, rWPh; [Bi *lord of Peor*, or sometimes only rWPh; *Peor*, respectively represented in the Sept. by Βεελφεγώρ and φογώρ appears to have been properly the idol of the Moabites (<042501>Numbers 25:1-9; <050403>Deuteronomy 4:3; <061727>Joshua 22:17; <190628>Psalm 106:28; <280910>Hosea 9:10); but also of the Midianites (<043115>Numbers 31:15, 16). It is the common opinion that this god was worshipped by obscene rites, and from the time of Jerome downward it has been usual to compare him to *Priapus* (see Sickler, in Augusti’s *Theol. Blatt.* 1, 193 sq.). Selden and J. Owen *(De Diis Syris,* 1:5; *Theologoumena,* 5:4) seem to be the only persons who have disputed whether any of the passages in which this god is named really warrant such a conclusion. The narrative (<042501>Numbers 25) seems clearly to show that this form of Baal-worship was connected with licentious rites. The least that the above passages express is the fact that the Israelites received this idolatry from the women of Moab, and were led away to eat of their sacrifices (comp. <190628>Psalm 106:28); and it is possible for that sex to have been the means of seducing them into the adoption of their worship, without the idolatry itself being of an obscene kind. It is also remarkable that so few authors are agreed even as to .the general character of these rites. Most Jewish authorities (except the Tarnum of Jonathan on <042501>Numbers 25) represent his worship to have consisted of rites which are filthy in the extreme, but not lascivious (see Braunius, *De Vestit. Sacerd.* 1:7, for one of the fullest collections of Jewish testimonies on this subject). Without laying too much stress on the rabbinical derivation of the word rWPp; *hiatus,* i.e. “aperire hymenem virgineum,” we seem to have reason to conclude that this was the nature of the worship. This is, moreover, the view of Creuzer (2. 411), Winer, Gesenius, Furst, and almost all critics. The reader is referred for more detailed information particularly to Creuzer’s *Symbolik* and Movers’ *Phonizier.* The identification of Baal with the sun *SEE BAAL*, as the generative power of nature confirms the opinion of the lascivious character of this worship. Peor is properly the name of a mountain *SEE PEOR*, and Baal-Peor was the name of the god worshipped there. Some identify this god with CHEMOSH *SEE CHEMOSH* (q.v.). *SEE BAALIM*.

Ba’al-per’azim

(Hebrews *Ba’al Peratsiml,* *having rents;* Sept. [at the first occurrence in Slm.] Βαάλ Φαρασίν [v . r. Φαρασείν*]),* the scene of a victory of David over the Philistines, and of a great destruction of their images, and so named by him in a characteristic passage of exulting poetry-”’Jehovah hath burst (/rP) upon mine enemies before me as a burst (/rP) of waters.’ Therefore he called the name of that place ‘Baal-perazim,’” i.e. *bursts* or destructions (<10520>2 Samuel 5:20; <13411>1 Chronicles 14:11). The place and the circumstance appear to be again alluded to in <23821>Isaiah 28:21, where it is called *Mount* Perazim. Perhaps this may indicate the previous existence of a highplace or sanctuary of Baal at this spot, which would lend more point to David’s exclamation (see Gesenius, *Jes.* in loc.). The Sept. render the name in its two occurrences respectively Ἐπάνω διακοπῶν and Διακοπὴ φαρασίν, the latter an instance of retention of the original word and its explanation side by side; the former uncertain. *SEE PERAZIM*. It is important as being the only one with the prefix Baal *SEE BAAL*, of which we know the circumstances under which it was imposed; and yet even here it was rather an opprobrious application of a term already in use than a new name. The locality appears to have been near the valley of Rephaim, west of Jerusalem; perhaps identical with the modern *Jebel Aly* (Van de Velde, *Map). SEE PERAZIM*.

Ba’al-shal’isha

(Hebrews *Ba’al Shalishah’* *lord of Shalishah,* or *having a third;* Sept. Βααλσαλισά v. r. Βαιδαρισά and Βαιθσαρισά*),* a place named only in <12042>2 Kings 4:42, as that from which the man came with provisions for Elisha, apparently not far from (the Ephraimite) Gilgal (comp. v. 38). It was doubtless in the district of Shalisha (q.v.) which is mentioned in <09904>1 Samuel 9:4; but whether it took its name thence, or from some modification of the worship of Baal (q.v.), of which it was the seat, is uncertain. See BAALIM. Eusebius and Jerome describe it *(Onomast.* Βαιθσαρισάθ, Bethsalisa, where the frequent interchange of “Baal” and “Beth” is observable) as a city 15 R. miles N. of Diospolis, near Matthew Ephraim. These indications correspond, to the site of the present ruins *Khurbet Hatta,* about midway between Yafa and Sebustieh (Van de Velde, *Map).*

Ba’al-ta’mar

(Hebrews *Ba’al Tamar’*, rm;T; l [Bi *place ofpalm-trees;* Sept. Βάαλ Θαμάρ*)*, a place neai Gibeah, in the tribe of Benjamin, where the other tribes fought with the Benjamites (<07203>Judges 20:33). It was doubtless so called as being one of the sanctuaries or groves of Baal. See BAALIM. The palm-tree (rm;T) of Deborah (<07046>Judges 4:5) was situated somewhere in the locality, and is possibly alluded to (Stanley, *Palest.* p. 145). Eusebius and Jerome *(Onomast.* s.v. Βααλθαμάρ, Baalthamar) call it *Bethamar* (Βησθαμάρ, Bethamari), thus affording another instance of that interchange of *Beth* and *Baal* which is also exemplified in *Baal-shalisha* and *Baal-Meon.* The notices seem to correspond to the present ruined site *Erhah,* about three miles N.E. of Jerusalem (Van de Velde, *Map),* on a ravine running toward Anathoth (Robinson, *Researches,* 2, 315 note).

Baaltis

*(*Βααλτίς, prob. fem. of *Baal),* another name apparently for the Syrian *Venus,* the chief female deity of the Phoenicians, the ASHTORETH of the O.T. *SEE ASTARTE* .

Ba’al-ze’bub

(Hebrews *Ba’al Zebub’,* bWbz] l [Bi*fly-lord;* Sept. ὁ [v. r. ἡ] Βάαλ μυῖαν) occurs in <12002>2 Kings 1:2, 3, 16, as the god of the Philistines at Ekron, whose oracle Ahaziah sent to consult. Though such a designation of the god appears to us a kind of mockery, and has consequently been regarded as a term of derision (Selden, *De Diis Syris,* p. 375), yet there seems no reason to doubt that this was the name given to the god by his worshippers, and the plague of flies in hot climates furnishes a sufficient reason for the designation. See FLY. Similarly the Greeks gave the epithet ἀπόμυιος, to Zeus (Clem. Alex. *Protrept.* 2, 38) as worshipped at Elis (Pausan. v. 14, 2), the *Myiagrus deus* of the Romans (Solin. Polyhist. 1), and Pliny (29. 6, 34, init.) speaks of a Fly-god *Myiodes.* As this name is the one used by Ahaziah himself, it is difficult to suppose that it was not the proper and reverential title of the god; and the more so, as *Beelzebul* (Βεελζεβούλ) in <401025>Matthew 10:25, seems to be the contemptuous corruption of it. *SEE BEELZEBUB.* Any explanation, however, of the symbolical sense in which flies may have been regarded in ancient religions, and by which we could conceive how his worshippers could honor him as

the *god offlies*, would appear to us much more compatible with his name than the only sense which can be derived from the Greek parallel. This receives some confirmation, perhaps, from the words of Josephus *(Ant.* 9, 2, 1), who says, “Ahaziah sent to the *Fly* (τῆς Μυῖαν*)*, for that is the name of the god” (τῷ θεῷ). The analogy of classical idolatry would lead us to conclude that all these Baals are only the same god under various modifications of attributes and emblems, but the scanty notices to which we owe all our knowledge of Syro-Arabian idolatry do not furnish data for any decided opinion on this phasis of Baal. *SEE BAALIM*.

Ba’al-Ze’phon

(Hebrews *Ba’al Tsephon’*, ˆwpx]l [B; *place of Typhon;* Sept. Βεελσεπφῶν or Βεελσεπφίον, Josephus Βελσεφών, *Ant.* 2, 15, 1), a town belonging to Egypt, on the border of the Red Sea (<0214 02>Exodus 14:2; <0433 07>Numbers 33:7). Forster *(Epist. ad J. D. Michaelem,* p. 28) believes it to have been the same place as Heroopolis (῾Ηρωόπολις), on the western gulf of the Red Sea (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* v. 12; Strabo, 17, p. 836; Ptolem. 4:5), where Typhon (which Forster makes in Coptic ΔΩΨΩΝ; but, *contra,* see Rosenmüller, *Alterthum,* 3, 261), the evil genius of the Egyptians, was worshipped. *SEE BAALIM*. But, according to Manetho (Josephus *contra Apion.* 1, 26), the name of Typhon’s city was Avaris (Αὔαρις), which some, as Champollion (who writes OYAPI, and renders “causing malediction;” *L’Egypte suos les Pharaons,* 2, 87 sq.), consider, wrongly, to be the same place, the stronghold of the Hyksos, both which places were connected with Typhon (Steph. Byz. s.v. ῾Ηρώ*)*. Avaris cannot be Heroopolis, for geographical reasons. (Compare, as to the site of Avaris, Brugsch, *Geograph’sche Inschriften,* 1, 86 sq.; as to that of Heroopolis, Lepsius, *Chron. d’,Egypt.* 1, 344 sq., and 342, against the two places being the same.) In fact, nothing is known of the situation of Baal-zephon except what is connected with a consideration of the route taken by the Israelites in leaving Egypt, for it was “over against Baal-zephon” that they were encamped before they passed the Red Sea. The supposition that identifies its site with Jebel *Deraj* or *Kulalah,* the southern barrier of the mouth of the valley leading from Cairo to the Red Sea, is as likely as any other. *SEE EXODE*. From the position of Goshen, and the indications afforded by the narrative of the route of the Israelites, Baal-zephon must have been on the western shore of the Gulf of Suez, a little below its head, which at that time, however, has been located by some many miles northward of the

present head. *SEE GOSHEN*; *SEE RED SEA, PASSAGE OF*. Its position with respect to the other places mentioned with it is clearly indicated. The Israelites encamped before or at Pi-hahiroth, between Migdol and the sea, before Baal-zephon, according to Exodus (<012412>Exodus 14:2, 9), while in Numbers Pi-hahiroth is described as being before Baal-zephon; and it is said that when the people came to the former place they pitched before Migdol (<043307>Numbers 33:7); and again, that afterward they departed from before Pi-hahiroth, here in Hebrews Hahiroth (<310108>Hebrews 5:8). Migdol and Baal-zephon must therefore have been opposite to one another, and the latter behind Pi-hahiroth, with reference to the Israelites. Baal-zephon was perhaps a well-known place, if, as seems likely, it is always mentioned to indicate the position of Pi-hahiroth, which we take to be a natural locality. *SEE PI-HAHIROTH*. The name has been supposed to mean "sanctuary of Typhon," or "sacred to Typhon," an etymology approved by Gesenius *(Thes. Heb.* p. 225), but not by Furst *(Hebrews Handw.* s.v.). Zephon would well enough correspond in sound to Typhon, had we any ground for considering the latter name to be either Egyptian or Semitic; and even then Zephon in Baal-zephon might not be its Hebrew transcription, inasmuch as it is joined with the Hebrew form לעל Hence many connect Baal-zephon, as a Hebrew compound, with the root צפה to *spy*, as if it were named from a watchtower on the frontier like the neighboring מגדל "the tower." It is noticeable that the name of the son of Gad, called Ziphion (צפיון) in <014616>Genesis 46:16, is written Zephon (צפון) in Num. 26:15. — Kitto; Smith.

Ba'ana

(Hebrews *Baana'*, בענא prob. for בעניה, *son of affliction),* the name of three or four men.

1. (Sept. Βανά.*)* Son of Ahilud, one of Solomon's twelve purveyors; his district comprised Taanach, Megiddo, and all Bethshean, with the adjacent region (<111412>1 Kings 4:12). B.C. 1012.

2. (Sept. Βαανᾶ.*)* Son of Hushai, another of Solomon's purveyors, having Asher and Bealoth (<111616>1 Kings 4:16, where, however, the name is incorrectly Anglicized "Baanah"). B.C. 1012.

3. (Sept. Βαανά.) Father of Zadok, which latter repaired a portion of the walls of Jerusalem on the return from Babylon, between the fish-gate and the oldgate (<16004>Nehemiah 3:4). B.C. 446.

4. (Βαανά.) One of those who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:8); the BAANAH *SEE BAANAH* (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (<15002>Ezra 2:2).

Ba'ainah

(Hebrews *Baanak'*, hn;[B; another form of the name *Baani* [q.v.]; Sept. Βαανά.), the name of four men.

1. One of the two sons of Rimmon the Beerothite, captains of bands in Saul's army, who assassinated Ishbosheth (<10402>2 Samuel 4:2); for which murder they were slain by David, and their mutilated bodies hung up over the pool at Hebron (ver. 5, 6, 19). B.C. 1046. Josephus represents him (Βαναόθα, *Ant.* 7, 2, 1) as a person of noble family, and instigated by personal ambition. *SEE DAVID*.

2. A Netophathite, father of Heleb or Heled, which latter was one of David's thirty heroes (<10229>2 Samuel 23:29; <13130>1 Chronicles 11:30). B.C. ante 1061. The Sept. utterly confounds the list of names at this part, but some copies retain the Βαανά.

3. (<11046>1 Kings 4:16.) *SEE BAANA*, 2.

4. One of the chief Jews who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel, B.C. 536 (<15002>Ezra 2:2; <16007>Nehemiah 7:7); possibly the same with one of those who long afterward (B.C. 410) united in the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (<16027>Nehemiah 10:27).

Baanes

SEE BAANITES.

Baani'as

(rather *Banaias* [q.v.], Βαναίας), one of the Israelites, sons of Phoros, who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (1 Esdras 5:26); evidently the BENAIAH *SEE BENAIAH* (q.v.) of the correct text (<15025>Ezra 2:25).

Baanites

a sect of Paulicians, called by the name of their leader, Baanes, in the ninth century. — Neander, *Ch. Hist. 3,* 250, 266. *SEE PAULICIANS*.

Ba'ara

(Heb. *Baara',* ar;[B; *brutish;* Sept. Βααρά v. r. Βααδά*)*, one of the wives of Shaharaim, of the tribe of Benjamin (<130808>1 Chronicles 8:8, where, however, there is some confusion as to his prior children), by whom she had several children (ver. 9, where by some error she is called HODESH, compare ver. 11). B.C. ante 1612. *SEE SHAHARAIM*.

Baaras

(Βαάρας), the name (according to Josephus, *War,* 7, 6, 3) of a valley inclosing the city of Herodium on the north, and so called from an extraordinary species of plant (but whether the same with the gigantic *rue,* πήγανον, mentioned in the same connection, does not appear), to the root of which the credulous Jewish historian ascribes magical properties of a most marvelous character. *SEE HERODIUM*. For other faint notices of a locality by names similar to Baaris, in the vicinity of Machaerus, see Reland, *Palest.* p. 881.

Baasei'ah

(Heb. *Baiseyah',* hyc{B; for hyc{yB} *son of Asaiah,* or *work of Jehotwsh; Sept.* Βαασία*), a* Gershonite Levite, son of Malchia, and father of Michael, in the lineage of Asaph (<130640>1 Chronicles 6:40 [25]). B. C. cir. 1310 .

Ba'asha

(Heb. *Basha',* av;[B; for av;[B; from an obsolete root, v[B; signifying, according to Furst [*Heb. Handw.* s.v.], to *be bold,* but according to Gesenius [*Thes. Heb.* s.v.] = vaB; to *be ojaensive,* hence *wicked;* Sept. Βαασά, Josephus Βασάνης, *Ant.* 8, 11, 4, etc.), third sovereign of the separate kingdom of Israel, and the founder of its second dynasty (<111501>1 Kings 15; 16; <141601>2 Chronicles 16; <244109>Jeremiah 41:9). He reigned B.C. 950-927. Baasha was son of Ahijah, of the tribe of Issachar, and perhaps commander of the forces of the northern kingdom; he conspired against

King Nadab, son of Jeroboam, when he was besieging the Philistine town of Gibbethon, and, having killed him, proceeded to extirpate his entire circle of relatives. He appears to have been of humble origin, as the Prophet Jehu speaks of him as having been "exalted out of the dust" (<111602>1 Kings 16:2). In matters of religion his reign was no improvement on that of Jeroboam; he equally forgot his position as king of the nation of God's election, and was chiefly remarkable for his persevering hostility to Judah. It was probably in the twenty-third year of his reign [see ASA] that he made war on its king, Asa, and began to fortify Ramah as a barrier against it. He was compelled to desist, however, being defeated by the unexpected alliance of Asa with Benhadad I of Damascus, who had previously been friendly to Baasha. Benhadad took several towns in the north of Israel, and Conquered lands belonging to it near the sources of Jordan (<111518>1 Kings 15:18 sq.). Baasha died in the twenty-fourth year of his reign, and was honorably buried in the beautiful city of Tirzah (<220604>Song of Solomon 6:4), which he had made his capital (<111533>1 Kings 15:33). For his idolatries, the Prophet Jehu declared to him the determination of God to extermiInate his family likewise, which was accomplished in the days of his son Elah (q.v.) by Zimri (<111610>1 Kings 16:10-13). *SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF*.

Baba

SEE MISHNA.

Babas

*(*Βάβας or Βάβα, since the latter only appears as a genitive), a person mentioned by Josephus as the last descendant of the Asmonaeans, but simply to relate that his sons were preserved by Costabarus from the general massacre of the adherents of Antigonus ordered by Herod the Great on obtaining possession of Jerusalem, until their concealment was disclosed by Salome to the tyrant, who immediately made sure of their death *(Ant. 1*5, 7, 10).

Babe

(לֵעֹל, *olel'*, or לוֹעָל, *ola'*, so called from its *petulance*, <191802>Psalm 8:2; 17:14, elsewhere "child" or "infant עֲלֻמִים, *taalulim'*, from the same root, <230304>Isaiah 3:4; once נַעַר, *na'ar*, <020206>Exodus 2:6, usually a "*lad;*" Gr. βρέφος, prop. an unborn *foetus*, <420144>Luke 1:41, 44, but also a very young

child, <42212>Luke 2:12, 16; <60102>1 Peter 2:2; νήπιον, strictly an *infant* [i.e. as yet unable to talk], but likewise used of children generally, <40125>Matthew 11:25; 21:16; <42102>Luke 10:21; <45820>Romans 2:10; <46301>1 Corinthians 3:1; <58513>Hebrews 5:13). This term is used figuratively in <23304>Isaiah 3:4, to represent the succession of weak and wicked princes who reigned over the kingdom of Judah from the death of Josiah to the destruction of the city and Temple. In the New Testament, the term refers to those who are weak in the Christian faith and knowledge, being ignorant and inconstant: or being but just *born again*, begotten from above, they require that heavenly nourishment which is suited to their nature — "the sincere milk of the word" (<46301>1 Corinthians 3:1; <58513>Hebrews 5:13; <60102>1 Peter 2:2). *SEE CHILD*.

Ba'bel

(Heb. *Babel'*, לבב; *confusion;* and so the Sept. Σύγχυσις, <01109>Genesis 11:9), originally the name applied to the *Tower of Babel* (<01109>Genesis 11:9), but afterward extended (in the Heb.) to the city of Babylon (<01010>Genesis 10:10), which appears to have grown up around it, and finally to the whole province of Babylonia (<26217>Ezekiel 23:17, margin), of which this was the capital. For these latter, *SEE BABYLON*; *SEE BABYLONIA*.

1. *Origin of the Tower.* — From the account in <01101>Genesis 11:1-9, it appears that the primitive fathers of mankind having, from the time of the Deluge, wandered without fixed abode, settled at length in the land of Shinar, where they took up a permanent residence. As yet they had remained together without experiencing those vicissitudes and changes in their outward lot which encourage the formation of different modes of speech, and were therefore of one language. Arrived, however, in the land of Shinar, and finding materials suitable for the construction of edifices, they proceeded to make and burn bricks, and using the bitumen, in which parts of the country abound, for cement, they built a city and a tower of great elevation. A divine interference, however, is related to have taken place. In consequence, the language of the builders was confounded, so that they were no longer able to understand each other. They therefore "left off to build the city," and were scattered "abroad upon the face of all the earth." The narrative adds that the place took its name of Babel (confusion) from this confusion of dialect. *SEE CONFUSION OF TONGUES*.

2. *Its Design.* — The sacred narrative (Genesis 11:4) assigns as the reason which prompted men to the undertaking simply a desire to possess a building so large and high as might be a mark and rallying-point in the vast plains where they had settled, in order to prevent their being scattered abroad, and thus the ties of kindred be rudely sundered, individuals be involved in peril, and their numbers be prematurely thinned at a time when population was weak and insufficient. The idea of preventing their being scattered abroad by building a lofty tower is applicable in the most remarkable manner to the wide and level plains of Babylonia, where scarcely one object exists different from another to guide the traveler in his journeying, and which, in those early days, as at present, were a sea of land, the compass being then unknown. Such an attempt agrees with the circumstances in which the sons of Noah were placed, and is in itself of a ‘commendable nature. But that some ambitious and unworthy motives were blended with these feelings is clearly implied in the sacred record, which, however, is evidently conceived and set forth in a dramatic manner (ver. 6, 7), and may wear around a historical substance somewhat of a poetical dress (Bauer, *Mythol.* 1, 223). The apostate Julian has attempted to turn the narrative into ridicule; but even if viewed only as an attempt to account for the origin of diversity of languages, and of the dispersion of the human family, it challenges consideration and respect. The opinion of Heeren (*Asiatic Nations*, 2, 146) is far different and more correct: “There is,” says he, “perhaps nowhere else to be found a narrative so venerable for its antiquity, or so important in the history of civilization, in which we have at once preserved the traces of primaeval international commerce, the first political associations, and the first erection of secure and permanent dwellings.” A comparison of this narrative with the absurd or visionary pictures which the Greeks and Romans give of the primitive condition of mankind, will gratify the student of the Bible and confirm the faith of the Christian by showing the marked difference there is between the history contained in Genesis and the fictions of the poet, or the traditions of the mythologist. (See Eichhorn, *Diversitatis linguaram ex traditione Semitica origines*, Goett. 1788; also in the *Biblioth. d. bibl. Lit. 3*, 981 sq.)

3. *Traditions concerning it.* — Versions more or less substantially correct of this account are found among other nations. The Chaldaeans themselves relate (Abydenus, quoted by Eusebius, *Prepar. Evang.* 1, 14 comp. *Chron. Armen.* 1, 38 and 59) that “the first men, relying on their size and strength, raised a tower reaching toward heaven in the place where Babylon

afterward stood, but that the winds, assisting the gods, brought the building down on the heads of the builders, out of the ruins of which Babylon itself was built. Before this event men had spoken the same tongue, but afterward, by the act of the gods, they were made to differ in their speech." Plato also reports *(Polit.* p. 272) a tradition that in the Golden Age men and animals made use of one common language, but, too ambitiously aspiring to immortality, were, as a punishment, confounded in their speech by Jupiter. In the details of the story of the war of the Titans against the gods may also be traced some traditionary resemblance to the narrative of the Bible (see Pliny, 7:1, 11 and 112; Hygin. *Fab.* 143). "The sibyl," says Josephus *(Ant.* 1, 4, 3), "also makes mention of this town, and of the confusion of language, when she *says* thus: 'When all men were of one language, some of them built a high tower, as if they would thereby ascend up to heaven; but the gods sent storms of wind and overthrew the tower, and gave every one his peculiar language; and for this reason it was that the city was called Babylon'" (comp. Philo, *Cpp.* 1, 406). The. same writer *(ib.* 2) assigns as the reason of this overthrow and confusion the displeasure of God at seeing them act so madly under the influence of Nimrod, "a bold bad man," who, in order to alienate the minds of the people from God, and to take revenge for the Deluge which had destroyed their forefathers, induced them to build a tower too high for the waters to be able to reach. Aben Ezra (in loc. *Gen.)* has given a more probable explanation. "Those," he says; "who built the Tower of Babel were not so insensate as to imagine they could by any such means reach to heaven; nor did they fear another Deluge, since they had the promise of God to the contrary; but they wished for a city which should be a common residence and a general rendezvous, serving in the wide and open plains of Babylonia to prevent the traveler from losing his way; in order that while they took measures for their own convenience and advantage, they might also gain a name with future ages." *SEE NIMROD.*

4. *Its subsequent History.* — The "Tower of Babel" is only mentioned once in Scripture (Genesis 11:4-5), and then as incomplete. No reference to it appears in the prophetic denunciations of the punishments which were to fall on Babylon for her pride. It is therefore quite uncertain whether the building ever advanced beyond its foundations. As, however, the classical writers universally, in their descriptions of Babylon, gave a prominent place to a certain tower-like building, which they called the temple (Herod. *ut inf.;* Diod. Sic. 2:9; Arrian, *Exped. Alex.* 7, 17, etc.), or the tomb (Strabo,

16, p. 738) of Belus, it has generally been supposed that the tower was in course of time finished, and became the principal temple of the Chaldaean metropolis. *SEE BEL*. Certainly this may have been the case; but, while there is presumption in favor of it, there is some evidence against it. A Jewish tradition, recorded by Bochart *(Phaleg,* 1, 9), declared that fire fell from heaven, and split the tower through to its foundation; while Alexander Polyhistor *(Frag.* 10), and the other profane writers who noticed the tower (as Abydenus, *Frs. 5* ‘and 6), said that it had been blown down by the winds. Such authorities, therefore, as we possess, represent the building as destroyed soon after its erection. When the Jews, however, were carried captive into Babylonia, struck with the vast magnitude and peculiar character of certain of the Babylonian temples, they imagined that they saw in them not merely buildings similar in type and mode of construction to the “tower” (lDkjm) of their scriptures, but in this or that temple they thought to recognize the very tower itself. *SEE BABYLON*.

5. *The “Tower of Belus,” presumed to occupy its site.* — Herodotus describes the temple in his own simple but graphic manner (i. 181). “In the other division of the city is the temple of the god Belus, with brazen gates, remaining till my own time, quadrangular, and in all of two stadia. In the middle of the sacred enclosure there stands a solid tower of a stadium both in depth and width; upon this tower another is raised, and another upon that, to the number of eight towers. An ascent to them has been made on the outside, in a circle extending round all the towers. When you reach about half way you find resting-places. In the last tower is a large temple, and in the temple lies a large bed well furnished, and near it stands a golden’ table; but there is no image within; nor does any one remain there by night, only a native female, one whom the god has chosen in preference to all others, as say the Chaldseans who are priests of that god. And these persons also say, asserting what I do not believe, that the god himself frequents the temple and reposes on the couch. And there belongs to the temple in Babylon another shrine lower down, where there stands a large golden image of the god, and near it is placed a large golden table, and the pedestal and throne are gold, and, as the Chaldaeans say, these things were made for eight hundred talents of gold. And out of the shrine is a golden altar; and there is another great altar where sheep-offerings are sacrificed, for it is not permitted to sacrifice upon the golden altar, except sucklings only; but upon the greater altar the Chaldaeans offer every year a thousand talents’ worth of frankincense at the time when they celebrate the festival

of the god. And there was at that time in the temple a statue of twelve cubits of solid gold; but I did not see it, and relate merely what was told me by the Chaldaeans. Darius Hystaspis wished to have this statue, but did not dare to take it; but Xerxes, his son, took it, and slew the priest who forbade him to move the statue. Thus is this sacred place adorned; and there are also in it many private offerings." These offerings, made by individuals, consisting of statues, censers, cups, and sacred vessels of massive gold, constituted a property of immense value. On the top Semiramis placed three golden statues of Jupiter, Juno, and Rhea. The first was 40 feet high, and weighed 1000 Babylonish talents. The statue of Rhea was of the same weight: the goddess was seated on a golden throne with lions at each knee, and two serpents of silver. The statue of Juno was erect like that: of Jupiter, weighing 800 talents; she grasped a serpent by the head with her right hand, and held in her left a scepter enriched with gems. A table of beaten gold was common to these three divinities, weighing 500 talents. On the table were two goblets of 10 talents, and two censers of 500 talents each, and three vases of prodigious magnitude. The total value of the precious articles and treasures contained in this proud achievement of idolatry has been computed to exceed six hundred millions of dollars.

From the Holy Scriptures it appears that when Nebuchadnezzar conquered Jerusalem and levelled most of the city with the ground, "he brought away the treasures of the temple, and the treasures of the king's house, and put them all into the temple of Bel at Babylon" (2 Chronicles 37:7). The brazen and other vessels which Solomon had caused to be made for the service of Jehovah are said to have been broken up by order of the Assyrian monarch, and formed into the famous gates of brass which so long adorned the superb entrances into the great area of the temple of Belus (comp. Hecataeus ap. Joseph. *Ant.* 1, 4, 3).

The purposes to which this splendid edifice was appropriated may be partly gathered from the preceding statements. These purposes varied in some degree with the changes in opinions and manners which successive ages brought. The signal disappointment inflicted on its original founders show that even in its origin there was connected with it something greatly displeasing to God. It seems, indeed, always to have existed in derogation of the divine glory. Consecrated at the first, as it probably was, to the immoderate ambition of the monotheistic children of the Deluge, it passed to the Sabian religion, and thus, falling one degree from purity of worship, became a temple of the sun and the rest of the host of heaven, till, in the

natural progress of corruption, it sank into gross idolatry, and, as the passage from Herodotus shows, was polluted by the vices which generally accompanied the observances of heathen superstition. In one purpose it undoubtedly proved of service to mankind. The Babylonians were given to the study of astronomy. This ennobling pursuit was one of the peculiar functions of the learned men denominated by Herodotus Chaldaeans, the priests of Belus; and the temple was crowned by an astronomical observatory, from the elevation of which the starry heavens could be most advantageously studied over plains so open and wide, and in an atmosphere so clear and bright as those of Babylonia.

To Nimrod the first foundations of the tower are ascribed; Semiramis enlarged and beautified it (Ctesias ap. Diod. Sic. 2:7); but it appears that the temple of Bel, in its most renowned state, was not completed till the time of Nebuchadnezzar, who, after the accomplishment of his many conquests, consecrated this superb edifice to the idolatrous object to whom he ascribed his victories. That the observatory on the tower was erected in remote times there is good reason to believe. Prideaux mentions *(Connection,* 1, 123) the circumstance that when Alexander made himself master of Babylon, Callisthenes, the philosopher, who attended him thither, found astronomical observations ascending upward 1900 years. *SEE ASTRONOMY*.

Picture for Ba’bel 1

6. *Evidence as to its present Remains.* – After the lapse of so many centuries, and the occurrence in “the land of Shinar” of so many revolutions, it is not to be expected that the identification of the Tower of Babel with any actual ruin should be easy, or lead to any very certain result. The majority of opinions, however, among the learned, make it the same as the above-described temple of Belus; and as to its modern locality, the predominant opinion has been in favor of the great temple of Nebo at Borsippa, the modern *Bits Nimrud,* although the distance of that place from Babylon is a great difficulty in the way of the identification. When Christian travelers first began to visit the Mesopotamian ruins, they generally attached the name of “the Tower of Babel” to whatever mass, among those beheld by them, was the loftiest and most imposing. Rawulf, in the 16th century, found the “Tower of Babel” at *Felugiah;* Pietro della Valle, in the 18th, identified it with the ruin *Babil* near Hillah; while early in the present century Rich and Ker Porter revived the Jewish notion, and

argued for its identity with the *Birs.* There are, in reality, no positive grounds either for identifying the tower with the temple of Belus, or for supposing that any remains of it long survived the check which the builders received when they were "scattered abroad upon the face of the earth," and "left off to build the city" (<01108>Genesis 11:8); yet the striking general similarity of its form and construction to those structures, taken in connection with its evidently great antiquity, create a presumption in favor of the identification that it is difficult to resist. *SEE SHINAR.* Nor, indeed, does the Birs Nimrud lie much, if any, farther distant from Hillah (the modern representative of Babylon) than do (in an opposite direction) some other ruins (e.g. especially the mound called *Babil,* the only other rival to the honor of representing the ancient Tower of Babel and temple of Belus in the vicinity), which were yet undoubtedly included within the ample circuit of the ancient walls; in fact, the Birs itself will fall within the line of the outer walls of Babylon, if laid down of the extent de, scribed by Herodotus. *SEE BABYLON*. Its pyramidal structure, also, with the numerous contractions of its successive stages, still traceable in the ruins, favors the identification (see below).

7. *Description of "Birs Nimrud," its supposed modern Relic.* — The appearance of this massive ruin is deeply impressive, rising suddenly as it does out of a wide desert plain, with its rent, fragmentary, and fireblasted pile, masses of vitrified matter lying around, and the whole hill itself on which it stands caked and hardened out of the materials with which the temple had been built. Its dreary aspect seems to justify the name which the remnant of the captivity, still abiding among the waters of Babylon, give to the place, namely, "Nebuchadnezzar's Prison;" an appellation which may have been assigned from the circumstance of that monarch's being confined there, under the care of the priesthood, during the period of his madness, or from the King of Israel's having been incarcerated within its precincts by Nebuchadnezzar after his last conquest of Jerusalem (<12501>2 Kings 25). A very considerable space round the tower, forming a vast court or area, is covered with ruins, affording abundant vestiges of former buildings, exhibiting uneven heaps of various sizes, covered with masses of broken brick, tiles, and vitrified fragments — all bespeaking some signal overthrow in former days. The towerlike ruin on the summit is a solid mass 28 feet broad, constructed of the most beautiful brick masonry. It is rent from the top nearly half way to the bottom. It is perforated in ranges of square openings. At its base lie several immense unshapen masses of fine

brickwork, some changed to a state of the hardest vitrification, affording evidence of the action of fire which seems to have been the lightning of heaven. The base of the tower at present measures 2082 feet in circumference. Hardly half of its former altitude remains. Of the original pyramidal form, the erections of Semiramis and Nebuchadnezzar appear to have begun at the stage of the former overthrow. From its summit, the: view in the distance presents to the south an and desert plain; to the west the same trackless waste; toward the north-east marks of buried ruins are visible to a vast distance. The bricks which compose the tower are mostly stamped with several lines of inscription, in the cuneiform or Babylonian character. Some extend to four, or even seven lines, but the dimensions of all are the same. The bricks of Babylon are of two kinds, sun-dried and fire-burnt. The former are larger and of a coarser make than the latter. Their solidity is equal to that of many kinds of stone. They are composed of clay mixed with chopped straw or broken reeds, in order to increase their compactness. This is the sort of brick which the children of Israel made while in Egyptian bondage. The unburnt bricks commonly form the interior or mass of a building. This is the case with the great tower, while it was faced with the more beautiful fabric made in the furnace or kiln. See full particulars in Rich's *Memoir of Babylon and Persepolis;* Ker Porter's *Travels in Persia;* comp. Ritter, *Erdk.* 11, 876 sq.

Picture for Ba'bel 2

8. *Type and Character of the Building.* — It must be allowed that the Birs Nimrud, though it may not be the Tower of Babel itself, which was at Babylon (<01109>Genesis 11:9), yet, as the most perfect representative of an ancient Babylonian temple-tower, may well be taken to show, better than any other ruin, the probable shape and style of the edifice. This building appears, by the careful examinations recently made of it, to have been a kind of retreating pyramid built in seven receding stages. "Upon a platform of crude brick, raised a few feet above the level of the alluvial plain, was built of burnt brick the first or basement stage-an exact square, 272 feet each way, and 26 feet in perpendicular height. Upon this stage was erected a' second, 230 feet each way, and likewise 26 feet high; which, however, was not placed exactly in the middle of the first, but considerably nearer to the south-western end, which constituted the back of the building. The other stages were arranged similarly, the third being, 188 feet, and again 26 feet high; the fourth 146 feet: square, and 15 feet high; the fifth 104 feet square, and the same height as the fourth; the sixth 62 feet square, and

again the same height; and the seventh 20 feet square, and once more the same height. On the seventh stage there was probably placed the ‘ark, or tabernacle, which seems to have been again 15 feet high, and must have nearly, if not entirely, covered the top of the seventh story. The entire original height, allowing three feet for the platform, would thus have been 156 feet, or, without the platform, 153 feet. The whole formed a sort of oblique pyramid, the gentler slope facing the N.E., and the steeper inclining to the S.W. On the N.E. side was the grand entrance, and here stood the vestibule, a separate building, the debris from which, having joined those from the temple itself, fill up the intermediate space, and very remarkably prolong the mound in this direction” (Rawlinson’s *Herodotus,* 2, 480-3). The *Birs* temple, if the same called the “Temple of the Seven Spheres,” was ornamented with the planetary colors (see the plan), but this was most likely a peculiarity The other chief features of it seem to have been common to most, if not all of the Babylonian temple-towers. The feature of stages is found in the temples at Warka and Mugheir (Loftus’s *Chaldcea,* p. 129 and 168), which belong to very primitive times (B.C. 2230); that of the emplacement, so that the four angles face the four cardinal points, is likewise common to those ancient structures; while the square form is universal. On the other hand, it may be doubted whether so large a number of stages was common. The Mugheir and Warka temples have no more than two, and probably never had more than three, or at most four stages. The great temple of Belus at Babylon (if Babil) shows only one stage; though, according to the best authorities, it too was a sort of pyramid (Herod., Strab.). The height of the Birs is 153.5 feet, that of Babil 140 (?), that of the Warka temple 100, that of the temple at Mugheir 50 feet. Strabo’s statement that the tomb of Belus was a stade (606 feet in height) would thus seem to be a gross exaggeration. Probably no Babylonian tower ever equaled the Great Pyramid, the original height of which was 480 feet. *SEE PYRAMIDS*.

9. *Its Materials and Manner of Construction.* — On these points more light is to be obtained from the Warka and Mugheir buildings than from the Birs. The Birs was rebuilt from top to bottom by Nebuchadnezzar, and shows the mode of construction prevalent in Babylon at the best period; the temples at Warka and Mugheir remain to a certain extent in their primitive condition, the upper stories alone having been renovated. The Warka temple is composed entirely of sun-dried bricks, which are of various shapes and sizes; the cement used is mud; and reeds are largely

employed in the construction. It is a building of the most primitive type, and exhibits a ruder style of art than that which we perceive from Scripture to have obtained at the date of the tower. Burnt bricks were employed in the composition of the tower (<01103>Genesis 11:3); and though perhaps it is somewhat doubtful what the *chemar* (rm;je "slime") used for mortar may have been (see Fresnel in *Journ. Asiatique* for June, 1853, p. 9), yet, on the whole, it is most probable that bitumen (which abounds in Babylonia) is the substance intended. *SEE BITUMEN*. Now the lower basement of the Mugheir temple exhibits this combination in a decidedly primitive form. The burnt bricks are of small size and of an inferior quality; they are laid in bitumen; and they face a mass of sun-dried brick, forming a solid wall outside it ten feet in thickness. No reeds are used in the building. Writing appears on it, but of an antique cast. The supposed date is B.C. 2300, but little later than the era commonly assigned to the building of Babel. Probably the erection of the two buildings was not separated by a very long interval, though it is reasonable to suppose that of the two the tower was the earlier. If we mark its date, as perhaps we are entitled to do, by the time of Peleg, the son of Eber, and father of Reu (see <01025>Genesis 10:25), we may perhaps place it about B.C. 2400. *SEE DISPERSION OF NATIONS*.

Picture for Ba'bel 3

10. *Advantages of this form.* — It is not necessary to suppose that any real idea of "scaling heaven" was present to the minds of those who raised either the Tower of Babel, or any other of the Babylonian temple-towers. The expression used in Genesis (<01104>Genesis 11:4) is a mere hyperbole for great height (comp. <05028>Deuteronomy 1:28; <27041>Daniel 4:11, etc.), and should not be taken literally. Military defense was probably the primary object of such edifices in early times; but with the wish for this may have been combined further secondary motives, which remained when such defense was otherwise provided for. Diodorus states that the great tower of the temple of Belus was used by the Chaldaeans as an observatory (2, 9), and the careful emplacement of the Babylonian temples with the angles facing the four cardinal points would be a natural consequence, and may be regarded as a strong confirmation of the reality of this application. M. Fresnel has recently conjectured that they were also used as sleeping-places for the chief priests in the summer time *(Journ. Asiatique,* June, 1853, p. 529-31). The upper air is cooler, and is free from the insects, especially

mosquitoes, which abound below; and the description which Herodotus gives of the chamber at the top of the Belus tower (1, 181) goes far to confirm this Ingenious view.

11. *Confirmation from other Pyramidal Temples.* Mr. Taylor *(Fragments* to Calmet's *Dict.)* has given views of several similar structures now extant, of which we copy two. The first, rising in several steps or stages, is at Tanjore, in the East Indies; and affords, it is presumed, a just idea of the Tower of Babel. It is, indeed, wholly constructed of stone, in which it differs from that more ancient edifice, which, being situated in a country destitute of stone, was, of necessity, constructed of brick. On the top of this pyramid is a chapel or temple, affording a specimen of the general nature of this kind of sacred edifices in India. These amazing structures are commonly erected on or near the banks of great rivers, for the advantage of ablution. In the courts that surround them innumerable multitudes assemble at the rising of the sun, after having bathed in the stream below. The gate of the pagoda uniformly fronts the east. The internal chamber commonly receives light only from the door. An *external* pathway, for the purpose of visiting the chapel at the top, merits observation.

Picture for Ba'bel 4

The next is an ancient pyramid built by the Mexicans in America; it agrees in figure with the former, and has on the outside an ascent of stairs leading up one side to the upper story, proceeding to the chapels on its summit. This ascent implies that the chapels were used from time to time, and no doubt it marks the shortest track for that purpose, as it occupies one side only.

12. *Literature.* — Kircher, *Turris Babel* (Amst. 1778); Zentgravius, *De turri Babel* (Vitemb. 1774); Hoynovius, *De turri Babylonica* (Regiom. 1694); Colombus, *De causis tur. Bab.* (Regiom. 1675); Cyrill. Alex. *De Turri* (in his *Opp.* 1, 44); Heidegger, *De Turri Babel* (in his *Hist. Patriarch.* 1); Saurin, *Tour de Babel* (in his *Disc.* 1, 135; and *Dissert.* p. 75); Calmet, *Le Tour de Babel* (in his *Commentaire*, 1, pt. 1, diss. 34); Delany, *Of the Building of Babel* (in his *Rev. Examined*, 2, 79); Berington, *The Tower of Babel* (in his *Dissertations*, p. 407); Drew, *Babel* (in his *Script. Studies, p.* 39); Deyling, *De ortu Babelis* (in his *Observat. 3*, 24); Dietric, *Turris Babylonica* (in his *Antiq.* p. 116); Perizonii *Origg. Babylon. c.* 9; Hezel, *Ueb. d. Babyl. Stadt-u. Thurmbau* (Hildb. 1774); anonymous,

Tractatus de locis quibusd. difcil. (Frcf. 1839); Kurtz, *Hist. of the Old Covenant,* § 29.

Ba’bi

*(*Βαβί v. r. Βηβαί*),* a chief Israelite whose “son” returned from Babylon (1 Esdras 8:37); evidently the BEBAI *SEE BEBAI* (q.v.) of the genuine text (Ezra 2:11), which also recurs in the same verse of Esdras.

Babi, Or Babists

a Persian sect of Mohammedans, whose founder, according to one account, was Moollah Sadik; according to others, a certain *Bab,* who, coming forth in 1835 as a prophet, was shot by order of the shall of Persia. It is probable that both names refer to the same person, and that Sadik assumed the name of Bab, i.e. *Papa, Father;* or, according to another version, the *Gate,* through which alone truth and eternal bliss can be reached. A more recent account is given by Gobineau, *Les Religions et les Philosophies d’Asie Centrale* (cited in *The Nation,* June 22, 1866, from which this account is taken). About 1843 a youth of Shiraz, named Mirza Ali Mohammed, after reading the Christian Scriptures, as well as the Oriental Sacred Books, came out as a prophet, to reform or destroy Islamism. He is said to have been endowed with many graces of person and manner, and to have soon made many proselytes. Inspired by success, he now declared that, instead of the *Gate,* he was the *Point;* that is, the very creator of truth; no longer a simple prophet, but a living manifestation of divinity. The title of the Bab was now conferred upon a priest of the Khorassan, Moollah Houssein Bousrhewich, who became the active chief and soon the warrior-apostle of Babism. Houssein was sent on a missionary tour into Irak and Khorassan, taking with him the writings of his master. He made a great sensation by his preaching. Another missionary was a woman, possessed of extraordinary beauty and eloquence. About 1848, Houssein and the Babists generally gathered at a place called Sheik Tebersi, and built a huge tower, providing it for a siege. They now gave out political predictions, in which the advent of the Bab as universal sovereign was announced. All who died fighting for the new faith were to rise again, to become princes of some of the countries over which the Bab would extend his sway. Two large armies sent against the Babists were surprised and routed. A third expedition, though it succeeded in withstanding the sortie of the Babists, and in mortally wounding the Babist

chief, Moollah Houssein, retired. The next campaign was more successful. For four months the Babists held out, in spite of tremendous odds, but at last, worn out by famine, they tried to force their way through the enemy's lines, but were overpowered, and when they surrendered only 214 were living. The survivors, and multitudes of others, even those who professed to renounce the heresy, were cruelly put to death. A similar Babist insurrection in Khamseh was also put down. Meanwhile Ali Mohammed had been living in semi-concealment at Shiraz. After the insurrection of Mezenderan he was brought before a court of royal commissioners and Mohammedan priests. In the examination which took place, the Bab, as he was still popularly called, gained the advantage. Seeing this, the discussion was abruptly broken off, and the Bab, with two of his disciples, was condemned to death, which was inflicted the next day. Everything now seemed to be finished; but the new Bab, Mirza Iaia, whom a divine mark had pointed out at the age of fifteen as the successor to the office, established himself at Bagdad, where he kept up communication with his followers through the pilgrims to the shrines there. The Babists were now forbidden from making any more attempts at insurrection until the Bab should decide that the hour had come and should give them the signal. In 1852 an attempt was made to assassinate the king, but failed. The attempted assassins were recognized as Babists. Forty others were arrested, among them the feminine apostle, Gourret-Oul-Ayn, the Consolation of Eyes. The next day she publicly confessed her Babism, was burnt at the stake with insult and indignity, and her ashes were scattered to the wind. The rest of the prisoners were distributed each to a courtier as his especial victim. Then was seen at Teheran a sight never to be forgotten. Through the streets, between the lines of executioners, marched men, women, and children, with burning splinters flaming in their wounds. The victims sing: "In truth we come from God, and we return to him." A sufferer falls in the road; he is raised by lashes and bayonet thrusts. But no apostate was found among the sufferers.

Babism, like Mohammedanism, asserts the absolute unity of God; but the eternal unity, far from shutting himself up in himself, is, on the contrary, an ever-expanding principle of life. It is ceaselessly moving, acting, creating. God has created the world by means of seven words — Force, Power, Will, Action, Condescension, Glory, and Revelation — which words embrace the active plenitude of the virtues which they respectively represent. God possesses other virtues, even to infinity, but he manifests

only these. The creature who emanates from God is distinguished from him by the privation of all emanatory action, but he is not altogether separated from him, and at the last day of judgment he will be confounded anew with him in the eternal unity. The Babist doctrine of revelation does not claim that the Bab has revealed the complete truth, but only as his predecessors, the prophets before him, have done — that portion of truth necessary for the age. The Bab is declared superior to Mohammed as Mohammed was to Jesus; and another revelation, which will complete the Bab's, is announced as coming in the future. Nineteen is a sacred number, which the Bab declares ought to preside over everything. Originally, he says, the Unity was composed of nineteen persons, among whom the highest rank belongs to the Bab. All the prophets who have appeared are, like the world, manifestations of God; divine words; not God, but beings who come from God more really than common men. At the death of a prophet or a saint, his soul does not quit the earth, but joins itself to some soul still in the flesh, who then completes his work. Babism enjoins few prayers, and only upon fixed occasions, and neither prescribes nor defends ablutions, so common in the religious rites of Mohammedanism. All the faithful wear amulets. Mendicancy, so much in honor among the Mussulman people, is forbidden. Women are ordered to discard veils, and to share in the intercourse of social life, from which Persian usage excludes them.

What will be the future of Babism it is difficult to tell. Since 1852 it has changed its character to a secret doctrine, which recruits its disciples in silence. The same Babists who before suffered martyrdom so courageously rather than deny their religion, now, obedient to the new order of their chief, conceal their faith: with Oriental dissimulation. Babism is much more in harmony with the subtle and imaginative genius of the Persian people than the Shiite Mohammedanism. The growing spirit of nationality makes their present religion and the present dynasty, both of which were established among them by foreign conquest, less and less acceptable every year. The hour when the Bab shall send word from Bagdad that the time has come for the Babists to take up arms again will be a very critical one for the present dynasty of Persia and for Shiite Mohammedanism.

The first thorough work on the origin and the history of the Babis is the one above referred to by Count Gobineau (formerly French minister in Teheran). Little had previously been published in Europe concerning the sect. (See *Zeitschrfft der deutschen Morgenland. Gesellschaft,* vol. 5; Petermann, *Reisen im Orient,* vol. 2.) The history of the Babis in

Gobineau's work is followed by treatises on their doctrines, and, as a concluding appendix, he gives the sacred book of the Babis, *"The Book of Precepts."* See also Polak (a German, court-physician of the shall, and director of a medical school at Teheran), *Persien. Das Land wnd seine Bewohner* (Leipzig, 1865, 2 vols., vol. 1, p. 350354). — Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon,* 2, 117; *The Nation,'* June 22,1866; *American Ann. Cyclopcedia,* 1865, p. 698.

Babington, Gervase

an eminent English prelate, was born at Nottingham in the year 1551. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he became master of arts in 1578. He applied himself closely to theology, and became one of the most impressive and useful preachers of his day. In 1588 he was installed into the prebend of Wellington, in the cathedral of Hereford, and through the interest of the Earl of Pembroke was advanced to the bishopric of Llandaff in 1591. In 1594 he was translated to the see of Exeter, from whence, in 1597, he was translated to Worcester. Bishop Babington was a man of eminent Christian character as well as scholarship. Fuller testifies that he "was not tainted with pride, idleness, or covetousness." He died 17th May, 1610. His works are collected under the title *"The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God, Gervase Babington, late Bishop of Worcester"* (Lond. 1622, fol.). They contain Notes on the Pentateuch, Exposition of the Creed, the Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer, with a Conference between Man's Frailty and Faith, and three sermons. — Jones, *Christian Biography,* p. 16; Hook, *Eccl. Biog.* 1, 446.

Babylas

St., became bishop of Antioch about the year 230. When the Emperor Philip, who, in ascending the throne, had murdered the youn- Emperor Gordian, came to Antioch on his way to Rome, about Easter, 244, Babylas repulsed him from the church door, and refused to permit him to join in worship. Philip, according to the legend, humbly confessed his sins, and appeared among the public penitents. After a time Decius robbed Philip of his empire and life, and stirred up a virulent persecution against the Christians. Babylas, conspicuous from his lofty station, did not escape this storm, and about the end of the year 250 he was arrested and thrown into prison, where, in the following year, he died. The Latins commemorate him on the 24th of January, the Greeks on the 4th of September. Chrysostom

has a homily in honor of Babylas (t. 2, 576, ed. Montf.). See Eusebius, *Ch. Hist.* 6, 39; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall,* ch. 23.

Bab'ylon

(Hebrews and Chald. *Babel',* לָבֶב; Gr. Βαβυλών), the name of more than one city in the Scriptures and other ancient writings. *SEE BABEL*.

I. Originally the capital of the country called in Genesis *Shinar* (רָנְעָשְׁ) and in the later Scriptures *Chaldaea,* or the land of the Chaldeans (יִמְדַּשְׂכַּ). See those articles severally.

1. *The Name.* — The word *Babel* seems to be connected in its first occurrence with the Hebrew root לָלַב; *balal',* "to confound" (as if by contraction from the reduplicated form לְבַלְבַּ; *Balbel'),* "because the Lord did there confound the language of all the earth" (<011109>Genesis 11:9); but the native etymology (see the *Koran,* 2, 66) is *Bab-il,* "the gate of the god *Il,*" or perhaps more simply "the gate of God;" and this no doubt was the original intention of the appellation as given by Nimrod, though the other sense came to be attached to it after the confusion of tongues (see Eichhorn, *Biblioth. d. bibl. Lit.* 3, 1001). Another derivation deduces the word from לְבֵאבַ; "the court or city of Belus" (see Abulfeda in Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* 2, 60), or לְאֵרְבִ (=רְיַבְגִּ), *Bel's Hill* (Furst, *Hebrews Handw.* s.v.). A still different etymology is proposed by Tuch *(Genesis* p. 276), from לְבֵתְיַבְּ, "the house of Bel." Whichever of these etymologies may be regarded as the preferable one, the name was doubtless understood or accommodated by the sacred writer in Genesis so as to be expressive of the disaster that soon befell the founders of the place. In the Bible at a later date the place is appropriately termed "Babylon the Great" (הָבוּלָּהָ לְבָבּ; <265158>Jeremiah 51:58; אָתְיָרִלְבָּ; <270427>Daniel 4:27), and by Josephus also *(Ant.* 8, 6, 1, ἡ μεγάλη Βαβυλών). The name *Babylon* is likewise that by which it is constantly denominated in the Sept. and later versions, as well as by the Apocrypha (1 Maccabees 6:4; Susann. 1:5) and New Test. (<440743>Acts 7:43), and finally by the ancient Greek and Roman writers (see Smith, *Diet. of Class. Geogr.* s.v.). On the outlandish name *Shesh ik* (קַשַׁךְ), applied to it in <242526>Jeremiah 25:26; 51:41, see the various conjectures in Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* 1, 2, 50 sq. The Jews believe it is a cabalistic mode of writing by the method known as "Athbash" (q.v.). *SEE SHISHAK*.

The word “Babel,” besides its original application to the tower (<01109>Genesis 11:9), and its usual one (in the original) to the city of Babylon, is also occasionally applied to the whole district of Chaldea, coincident with the plain of Shinar (<23402>Isaiah 14:2), as well as to Babylonia, the province of the Assyrian empire of which it was the metropolis (<14331>2 Chronicles 32:31; 33:11), and eventually to Persia itself (<15153>Ezra 5:13; <16106>Nehemiah 13:6). *SEE NINEVEH*.

2. *Origin and Growth of the City.* — This famous city was the metropolis of the province of Babylon and of the Babylonio-Chaldaean empire. It was situated in a wide plain on the Euphrates, which divided it into two nearly equal parts. According to the book of Genesis, its foundations were laid at the same time with those of the Tower of Babel. In the revolutions of centuries it underwent many changes, and received successive reparations and additions. The ancients were not agreed as to the authors or times of these, and any attempt to determine them now with strict accuracy must be fruitless. Semiramis and Nebuchadnezzar are those to whom the city was indebted for its greatest augmentations and its chief splendor. Probably a temple was the first building raised by the primitive nomades, and in the gate of this temple justice would be administered in early times (comp. <10908>2 Samuel 19:8), after which houses would grow up about the gate, and in this way the name would readily pass from the actual portal of the temple to the settlement. According to the traditions which the Greeks derived from the Babylonians in Alexander’s age, the city was originally built about the year B.C. 2230. The architectural remains discovered in southern Babylonia, taken in conjunction with the monumental records, seem to indicate that it was not at first the capital, nor, indeed, a town of very great importance. It probably owed its position at the head of Nimrod’s cities (<01010>Genesis 10:10) to the power and pre-eminence to which it afterward attained rather than to any original superiority that it could boast over the places coupled’ with it. *Erech, Ur,* and *Ellasar* appear to have been all more ancient than Babylon, and were capital cities when *Babil* was a provincial village. The first rise of the Chaldaean power was in the region close upon the Persian Gulf, as Berosus indicated by his fish-god Oannes, who brought the Babylonians civilization and the arts out of the sea (ap. Syncell. p. 28, B). Thence the nation spread northward up the course of the rivers, and the seat of government moved in the same direction, being finally fixed at Babylon, perhaps not earlier than B.C. 1700. See ASSYRIA.

3. *Its Fall and subsequent Condition.* — Under Nabonnadus, the last king, B.C. 538, Babylon was taken by Cyrus, after a siege of two years, in the dead of the night. Having first, by means of its canals, turned the river into the great dry lake west of Babylon, and then marched through the emptied channel, he made his way to the outer walls of the fortified palace on its banks, when, finding the brazen gates incautiously left open by the royal guards while engaged in carousals, he entered with all his train; "'the Lord of Hosts was his leader," and Babylon, as an empire, was no more. An insurrection, under Darius Hystaspis (B.C. 500), the object of which was to gain emancipation' from Persian bondage, led that prince to punish the Babylonians by throwing down the walls and gates which had been left by Cyrus, and by expelling them from their homes. Xerxes plundered and destroyed' the temple of Belus, which Alexander the Great would probably, but for his death, have restored. Under Seleucus Nicator the city began to sink speedily, after that monarch built Seleucia on the Tigris, and made it his place of abode. In the time of Strabo and Diodorus Siculus the place lay in ruins. Jerome, in the fourth century of the Christian era, learned that the site of Babylon had been converted into a park or hunting-ground for the recreation of the Persian monarchs, and that, in order to preserve the game, the walls had been from time to time repaired. If the following extract from Rich (p. 30) is compared with these historical facts, the prophecy of Isaiah (Isaiah 13:19) will appear to have been strikingly fulfilled to the letter: "I had always imagined the belief of the existence of satyrs was confined to the mythology of the West; but a choadar who was with me when I examined this ruin (the Mujelibeh) mentioned that in this desert an animal is found resembling a man from the head to the waist, but having the thighs and legs of a sheep or goat; he also said that the Arabs hunt it with dogs, and eat the lower parts, abstaining from the upper, on account of their resemblance to those of the human species." More thorough destruction than that which has overtaken Babylon cannot well be conceived. Rich was unable to discover any traces of its vast walls, and even its site has been a subject of dispute. "On its ruins," says he, "there is not a single tree growing, except an old one," which only serves to make the desolation more apparent. Ruins like those of Babylon, composed of rubbish impregnated with nitre, cannot be cultivated. For a more detailed account of the history of Babylon, see the article *SEE BABYLONIA*.

4. *Ancient Descriptions.* — The statements respecting the topography and appearance of Babylon which have come down to us in classical writers are

derived chiefly from two sources, the works of Herodotus and of Ctesias. These authors were both of them eyewitnesses of the glories of Babylon — not, indeed, at their highest point, but before they had greatly declined — and left accounts of the city and its chief buildings, which the historians and geographers of later times were, for the most part, content to copy. To these accounts are to be added various other details by Quintus Curtius, and Pliny, and a few notices by other ancient visitors.

According to the account of Herodotus (1, 178-186) the walls of Babylon were double, the outer line being 56 miles in circumference, built of large bricks cemented together with bitumen, and raised round the city in the form of an exact square; hence they measured 14 miles along each face. They were 87 feet thick and 350 feet high (Quintus Curtius says four horse-chariots could pass each other on them without danger), protected on the outside by a vast ditch lined with the same material, and proportioned in depth and width to the elevation of the walls. The city was entered by twenty-five gates on each side, made of solid brass, and additionally strengthened by 250 towers, so placed that between every two gates were four towers, and four additional ones at the four corners. From all the gates proceeded streets running in straight lines, each street being nearly fifteen miles in length, fifty in number, and crossing each other at right angles. Other minor divisions occurred, and the whole city contained 676 squares, each about two miles and a quarter in circumference. Herodotus appears to imply that this whole space was covered with houses, which, he observes, were frequently three or four stories high. The river ran through the city from north to south, and on each side was a quay of the same thickness as the walls of the city, and 100 stadia in length. In these quays were gates of brass, and from each of them steps descending into the river. A bridge was thrown across the river, of great beauty and admirable contrivance, a furlong in length and 30 feet in breadth. As the Euphrates overflows during the summer months, through the melting of the snows on the mountains of Armenia, two canals were cut to turn the course of the waters into the Tigris, and vast artificial embankments were raised on each side of the river. On the western side of the city an immense lake, forty miles square, was excavated to the depth, according to Herodotus, of 35 feet, and into this lake the river was turned till the work was completed. At each end of the bridge was a palace, and these had a subterraneous communication. In each division of the town, Herodotus says, there was a fortress or stronghold, consisting in the one case of the

royal palace, in the other of the great temple of Belus. This last was a species of pyramid, composed of eight square towers placed one above the other, the dimensions of the basement tower being a stade — or above 200 yards — each way. The height of the temple is not mentioned by Herodotus. A winding ascent, which passed round all the towers, led to the summit, on which was placed a spacious ark or chapel, containing no statue, but regarded by the natives as the habitation of the god. The temple stood in a sacred precinct, two stades (or 400 yards) square, which contained two altars for burntofferings and a sacred ark or chapel, wherein was the golden image of Bel.

According to Ctesias (ap. *Diod. Sic.* 2, 7 sq.), the circult of the city was a little under 42 miles. It lay, he says, on both sides of the Euphrates, and the two parts were connected together by a stone bridge above 1000 yards long, and 30 feet broad, of the kind described by Herodotus. At either extremity of the bridge was a royal palace, that in the eastern city being the most magnificent of the two. It was defended by a triple *enceinte*, the outermost 7 miles round; the second, which was circular, 4.5 miles; and the third 2.25 miles. The height of the second or middle wall was 300 feet, and its towers were 420 feet. The elevation of the innermost circuit was even greater than this. The walls of both the second and the third enclosure were made of colored brick, and represented hunting scenes — the chase of the leopard and the lion — with figures, male and female, regarded by Ctesias as those of Ninus and Semiramis. The other palace was inferior both in size and magnificence. It was enclosed within a single *enceinte* 3.5 miles in circumference, and contained representations of hunting and battle scenes, as well as statues in bronze, said to be those of Ninus, Semiramis, and Jupiter Belus. The two palaces were joined, not only by the bridge, but by a tunnel under the river. Ctesias' account of the temple of Belus has not come down to us. We may gather, however, that he represented its general character in much the same way as Herodotus, but spoke of it as surmounted by three statues, one of Bel, 40 feet high, another of Rhea, and a third of Juno or Beltis.

The account given by Quintus Curtius (v. 1) of the entrance of Alexander into Babylon may serve to enliven the narrative, and, at the same time, make the impression on the reader's mind more distinct. "A great part of the inhabitants of Babylon stood on the walls, eager to catch a sight of their new monarch. Many went forth to meet him. Among these, Bagophanes, keeper of the citadel and of the royal treasure, strewed the

entire way before the king with flowers and crowns; silver altars were also placed on both sides of the road, which were loaded not merely with frankincense, but all kinds of odoriferous herbs. He brought with him for Alexander gifts of various kinds — flocks of sheep and horses; lions also and panthers were carried before him in their dens. The magi came next, singing, in their usual manner, their ancient hymns. After them came the Chaldaeans, with their musical instruments, who are not only the prophets of the Babylonians, but their artists. The first are wont to sing the praises of the kings; the Chaldaeans teach the motions of the stars and the periodic vicissitudes of the times and seasons. Then followed, last of all, the Babylonian knights, whose equipment, as well as that of their horses, seemed designed more for luxury than magnificence. The king, Alexander, attended by armed men, having ordered the crowd of the towns-people to proceed in the rear of his infantry, entered the city in a chariot and repaired to the palace. The next day he carefully surveyed the household treasure of Darius, and all his money. For the rest, the beauty of the city and its age turned the eyes not only of the king, but of every one, on itself, and that with good reason." Within a brief period after this Alexander lay a corpse in the palace.

One or two additional facts may aid in conveying a full idea of this great and magnificent city. When Cyrus took Babylon by turning the Euphrates into a neighboring lake, the dwellers in the middle of the place were not for some time aware that their fellow-townsmen who were near the walls had been captured. This, says Herodotus (i. 191), was owing to the magnitude of the city, and to the circumstance that at the time the inhabitants were engaged in carousals, it being a festive occasion. Nor, according to Xenophon, did the citizens of the opposite quarter learn the event till three hours after sunrise, the city having been taken in the night. Alexander had to employ 10,000 men during two months to remove the accumulated ruins precipitated by order of Xerxes nearly 200 years before. From the fallen towers of Babylon have arisen not only all the present cities in its vicinity, but others which, like itself, have long since gone down into the dust. Since the days of Alexander, four capitals, at least, have been built out of its remains: Seleucia, by the Greeks; Ctesiphon, by the Parthians; Al Maidan, by the Persians; and Kufa, by the caliphs; with towns, villages, and caravansaries without number. The necessary fragments and materials were transported along the rivers and the canals.

The antiquity of the canals of Babylonia dates from the most remote periods of the Chaldaeo-Babylonian monarchy. The ancient kings of Assyria and Babylonia rwell understood the value of canals, and their empire arose upon alluvial plains, amid a system of irrigation and draining which spread like a net-work over the land. It may be sufficient to specify the Nahr Malikah, or Royal Canal, the origin of which has been referred both to Nimrod and Cush. Abydenus, however, attributes it to Nebuchadnezzar. From the account of Herodotus, it appears to have been of sufficient breadth and depth to be navigable for merchant vessels. It is not, therefore, surprising that some writers have considered it as the ancient bed of the Euphrates. The soil around Babylon is of a light, yielding nature, easily wrought for canals and other purposes, whether of art or war. Cyrus, therefore, would find no great difficulty in digging a trench about the city sufficient to contain the waters of the river *(Cyrop.* 7). Alexander (Strabo, 16, p. 510), in enlarging one of the canals and forming basins for his fleet, laid open the graves of many buried kings and princes, which shows how readily the soil yields and gives way before the labors of man.

The new palace built by Nebuchadnezzar was prodigious in size and superb in embellishments. Its outer wall embraced six miles; within that circumference were two other embattled walls, besides a great tower. Three brazen gates led into the grand area, and every gate of consequence throughout the city was of brass. In accordance with this fact are the terms which Isaiah (2460Isaiah 45:1, 2) employs when, in the name of Jehovah, he promises Cyrus that the city should fall before him: “I will open before him the two-leaved gates; I will break in pieces the gates of brass;” a prophecy which was fulfilled to the letter when Cyrus made himself master of the place. The palace was splendidly decorated with statues of men and animals, with vessels of gold and silver, and furnished with luxuries of all kinds brought thither from conquests in Egypt, Palestine, and Tyre. Its greatest boast were the hanging gardens, which acquired even from Grecian writers the appellation of one of the wonders of the world. They are attributed to the gallantry of Nebuchadnezzar, who constructed them in compliance with a wish of his queen Amytis to possess elevated groves such as she had enjoyed on the hills around her native Ecbatana. Babylon was all flat; and to accomplish so extravagant a desire, an artificial mountain was reared, 400 feet on each side, while terraces one above another rose to a height that overtopped the walls of the city, that is, above

300 feet in elevation. The ascent from terrace to terrace was made by corresponding flights of steps, while the terraces themselves were reared to their various stages on ranges of regular piers, which, forming a kind of vaulting, rose in succession one over the other td the required height of each terrace, the whole being bound together by a wall of 22 feet in thickness. The level of each terrace or garden was then formed in the following manner: the top of the piers was first laid over with flat stones, 16 feet in length and 4 feet in width; on these stones were spread beds of matting, then a thick layer of bitumen; after which came two courses of bricks, which were covered with sheets of solid lead. The earth was heaped on this platform; and in order to admit the roots of large trees, prodigious hollow piers were built and filled with mould. From the Euphrates, which flowed close to the foundation, water was drawn up by machinery. The whole, says Q. Curtius (v. 5), had, to those who saw it from a distance, the appearance of woods overhanging mountains. Such was the completion of Nebuchadnezzar's work, when he found himself at rest in his house, and flourished in his palace: The king spoke and said, "Is not this great Babylon that I have built for the house of the kingdom by the might of my power and the honor of my majesty" (<2001>Daniel 4), a picture which is amply justified by the descriptions of heathen writers. Nowhere could the king have taken so comprehensive a view of the city he had so magnificently constructed and adorned as when walking on the highest terrace of the gardens of his palace.

Babylon, as the center of a great kingdom, was the seat of boundless luxury, and its inhabitants were notorious for their addiction to self-indulgence and effeminacy. Q. Curtius (v. 1) asserts that "nothing could be more corrupt than its morals, nothing more fitted to excite and allure to immoderate pleasures. The rites of hospitality were polluted by the grossest and most shameless lusts. Money dissolved every tie, whether of kindred, respect, or esteem. The Babylonians were very greatly given to wine and the enjoyments which accompany inebriety. Women were present at their convivialities, first with some degree of propriety, but, growing worse and worse and worse by degrees, they ended by throwing off at once their modesty and their clothing." Once in her life, according to(Herodotus (1, 199), every native female was obliged to visit the temple of Mylitta, the Babylonian Astarte (q.v.) or Venus, and there receive the embraces of the first stranger who threw a piece of money into her lap; an abominable custom, that is alluded to in the Apocrypha (Baruch 6:43) and

by Strabo (vi. 1058). On the ground of their awful wickedness, the Babylonians were threatened with condign punishment, through the mouths of the prophets; and the tyranny with which the rulers of the city exercised their sway was not without a decided effect in bringing on them the terrific consequences of the Divine vengeance. Nor in the whole range of literature is there any thing to be found approaching to the sublimity, force, and terror with which Isaiah and others speak on this painful subject (<2314>Isaiah 14:11; 47:1; <2459>Jeremiah 51:39; <2701>Daniel 5:1). Babylon even stands, therefore, in the New Test. (<6705>Revelation 17:5) as the type of the most shameless profligacy and idolatry.

5. *Investigation of the ancient Topography.* — In examining the truth of these descriptions, we shall most conveniently commence from the outer circuit of the town. All the ancient writers appear to agree in the fact of a district of vast size, more or less inhabited, having been enclosed within lofty walls, and included under the name of Babylon. With respect to the exact extent of the circuit they differ. The estimate of Herodotus and of Pliny *(H. N.* 6, 26) is 480 stades, of Strabo (16, 1:5) 385, of Q. Curtius (v, 1:26) 368, of Clitarchus (ap. Diod. Sic. 2:7) 365, and of Ctesias (ap. eund.) 360 stades. It is evident that here we have merely the moderate variations to be expected in independent measurements, except in the first of the numbers. Setting this aside, the difference between the greatest and the least of the estimates is little more than one half per cent. With this near agreement on the part of so many authors, it is the more surprising that in the remaining case we should find the great difference of one third more, or 33.333 per cent. Perhaps the true explanation is that Herodotus spoke of the *outer* wall, which could be traced in his time, while the later writers, who never speak of an inner and an outer barrier, give the measurement of Herodotus's *inner* wall, which may have alone remained in their day. This is the opinion of M. Oppert, who even believes that he has found traces of both enclosures, showing them to have been really of the size ascribed to them. This conclusion is at present disputed, and it is the more general belief of those who have examined the ruins with attention that no vestiges of the ancient walls are to be found, or, at least, that none have as yet been discovered. Still it is impossible to doubt that a line of wall inclosing an enormous area originally existed. The testimony to this effect is too strong to be set aside, and the disappearance of the wall is easily accounted for, either by the constant quarrying, which would naturally have commenced with it (Rich, *First .Mem.* p. 44), or by the subsidence of the bulwark into

the moat from which it was raised. Taking the lowest estimate of the extent of the circuit, we shall have for the space within the rampart an area of above 100 square miles-nearly five times the size of London. It is evident that this vast space cannot have been entirely covered with houses. Diodorus confesses (2, 9, *adfin.)* that but a small part of the enclosure was inhabited in his own day, and Q. Curtius (5, 1:27) says that as much as nine tenths consisted, even in the most flourishing times, of gardens, parks, paradises, fields, and orchards.

With regard to the height and breadth of the walls there is nearly as much difference of statement as with regard to their extent. Herodotus makes the height 200 royal cubits, or 337.5 feet; Ctesias, 50 fathoms, or 300 feet; Pliny and Solinus, 200 royal feet; Strabo, 50 cubits, or 75 feet. Here there is less appearance of independent measurements than in the estimates of length. The two original statements seem to be those of Herodotus and Ctesias, which only differ accidentally, the latter having omitted to notice that the royal scale was used. The later writers do not possess fresh data; they merely soften down what seems to them an exaggeration-Pliny and Solinus changing the cubits of Herodotus into feet, and Strabo the fathoms of Ctesias into cubits. We are forced, then, to fall back on the earlier authorities, who are also the only eye-witnesses; and, surprising as it seems, perhaps we must believe the statement that the vast enclosed space above mentioned was surrounded by walls which have well been termed "artificial mountains," being nearly the height of the dome of St. Paul's (see Grote's *Greece,* 3, 397; and, on the other side, Mure's *Lit. of Greece,* 4, 546). The ruined wall of Nineveh was, it must be remembered, in Xenophon's time. 150 feet high *(Anab.* 3, 4, 10), and another wall which he passed in Mesopotamia was 100 feet *(ib.* 2, 4, 12).

The estimates for the thickness of the wall are the following: Herodotus, 50 royal cubits, or nearly 85 feet; Pliny and Solinus, 50 royal, or about 60 common feet; and Strabo, 32 feet. Here again Pliny and Solinus have merely softened down Herodotus; Strabo, however, has a new number. This may belong properly to the inner wall, which, Herodotus remarks (1, 181), was of less thickness than the outer.

According to Ctesias, the wall was strengthened with 250 towers, irregularly disposed, to guard the weakest parts (Diod. Sic. 2:7); and, according to Herodotus, it was pierced with a hundred gates, which were made of brass, with brazen lintels and side-posts (1, 179). The gates and

walls are alike mentioned in Scripture, the height of the one and the breadth of the other being specially noticed (Jeremiah 51:58; comp. 1, 15, and 51:53).

Herodotus and Ctesias both relate that the banks of the river, as it flowed through the city, were on each side ornamented with quays. The stream has probably often changed its course since the time of Babylonian greatness, but some remains of a quay or embankment on the eastern side of the stream still exist, upon the bricks of which is read the name of the last king. The two writers also agree as to the existence of a bridge, and describe it very similarly. Perhaps a remarkable mound which interrupts the long flat valley — evidently the ancient course of the river — closing in the principal ruins on the west, may be a trace of this structure.

Picture for Bab'ylon 1

6. *Present Character and Extent of the Ruins of Babylon.* — The locality and principal structures of this once famous city are now almost universally admitted to be indicated by the remarkable remains near the modern village of *Hillah,* which lies on the W. bank of the Euphrates, about 50 miles directly S. of Bagdad.

About five miles above Hillah, on the opposite bank of the Euphrates, occur a series of artificial mounds of enormous size, which have been recognized in all ages as probably indicating the site of the capital of southern Mesopotamia. They consist chiefly of three great masses of building — the high pile of unbaked brickwork called by Rich *"Mujellibe,"* but which is known to the Arabs as *"Babil;"* the building denominated the *'Kasr"* or palace; and a lofty mound upon which stands the modern tomb of *Amran ibn-Alb* (Loftus's *Chaldea,* p. 17). Besides these principal masses the most remarkable features are two parallel lines of rampart bounding the chief ruins on the east, some similar but inferior remains on the north and west, an embankment along the river side, a remarkable isolated heap in the middle of a long valley, which seems to have been the ancient bed of the stream, and two long lines of rampart, meeting at a right angle, and with the river forming an irregular triangle, within which all the ruins on this side (except Babil) are enclosed. On the west, or right bank, the remains are very slight and scanty. There is the appearance of an enclosure, and of a building of moderate size within it, nearly opposite the great mound of *Amran,* but otherwise, unless at a long distance from the

stream, this side of the Euphrates is absolutely bare of ruins. (See Rawlinson's *Herodotus,* 2, 473).

Scattered over the country on both sides of the Euphrates, and reducible to no regular plan, are a number of remarkable mounds, usually standing single, which are plainly of the same date with the great mass of ruins upon the river bank. Of these by far the most striking is the vast ruin called the *Birs Nimrud,* which many regard as the Tower of Babel, situated about six miles to the S.W. of Hillah, and almost that distance from the Euphrates at the nearest point. This is a pyramidical mound, crowned apparently by the ruins of a tower, rising to the height of 1531 feet above the level of the plain, and in circumference somewhat more than 2000 feet. *SEE BABEL (TOWER OF)*. There is considerable reason to believe from the inscriptions discovered on the spot, and from other documents of the time of Nebuchadnezzar, that it marks the site of Borsippa, and may thus have been beyond the limits of Babylon (Beros. *Fr.* 14).

Picture for Bab'ylon 2

7. *Identification of Sites.* — On comparing the existing ruins with the accounts of the ancient writers, the great difficulty which meets us is the position of the remains almost exclusively on the left bank of the river. All the old accounts agree in representing the Euphrates as running through the town, and the principal buildings as placed on the opposite sides of the stream. In explanation of this difficulty, it has been urged, on the one hand, that the Euphrates, having a tendency to run off to the right, has obliterated all trace of the buildings in this direction (Layard's *Nin. and Bab.* p. 420); on the other, that, by a due extension of the area of Babylon, it may be made to include the Birs Nimrud, and that thus the chief existing remains will really lie on the opposite banks of the river (Rich, *Second Memoir,* p. 32; Ker Porter, *Travels,* 2, 383). But the identification of the Birs with Borsippa seems to interfere with this latter theory; while the former is unsatisfactory, since we can scarcely suppose the abrasion of the river to have entirely removed all trace of such gigantic buildings as those which the ancient writers describe. Perhaps the most probable solution is to be found in the fact that a large canal (called *Shebil)* intervened in ancient times between the *Kasr* mound and the ruin now called Babil, which may easily have been confounded by Herodotus with the main stream. This would have had the two principal buildings upon opposite sides; while the real river, which ran down the long valley to the west of the Kasr and

Amran mounds, would also have separated (as Ctesias related) between the greater and the lesser palace. If this explanation be accepted as probable, we may identify the principal ruins as follows:

1. The great mound of Babil will be the ancient temple of Belus. It is an oblong mass, composed chiefly of unbaked brick, rising from the plain to the height of 140 feet, flattish at the top, in length about 200, and in breadth about 140 yards. This oblong shape is common to the temples, or rather temple-towers of Lower Babylonia, which seem to have had nearly the same proportions. It was originally coated with fine burnt brick laid in an excellent mortar, as was proved by Mr. Layard *(Nin. and Bab.* p. 452); and was, no doubt, built in stages, most of which have crumbled down, but which may still be in part concealed under the rubbish. The statement of Berosus *(Fragm.* 14), that it was rebuilt by Nebuchadnezzar, is confirmed by the fact that all the inscribed bricks which have been found in it bear the name of that king. It formed the tower of the temple, and was surmounted by a chapel; but the main shrine, the altars, and no doubt the residences of the priests, were at the foot, in a sacred precinct.

2. The mound of the Kasr will mark the site of the great palace of Nebuchadnezzar. It is an irregular square of about 700 yards each way, and may be regarded as chiefly formed of the old palace platform (which resembles those at Nineveh, Susa, and elsewhere), upon which are still standing certain portions of the ancient residences to which the name of *"Kasr"* or "palace" especially attaches. The walls are composed of burnt bricks, of a pale yellow color, and of excellent quality, bound together by a fine lime cement, and stamped with the name and titles of Nebuchadnezzar. They contain traces of architectural ornament piers, buttresses, pilasters, etc.; and in the rubbish at their base have been found slabs inscribed by Nebuchadnezzar, and containing an account of the building of the edifice, as well as a few sculptured fragments, and many pieces of enamelled brick of brilliant hues. On these last portions of figures are traceable, recalling the statements of Ctesias (ap. Diodor. Sicul.) that the brick walls of the palace were colored, and represented hunting-scenes. No plan of the palace is to be made out from the existing remains, which are tossed in apparent confusion on the highest point of the mound.

3. The mound of *Armran* is thought by M. Oppert to represent the "hanging gardens" of Nebuchadnezzar; but this conjecture does not seem to be a very happy one. The mound is composed of poorer materials than

the edifices of that prince, and has furnished no bricks containing his name. Again, it is far too large for the hanging gardens, which are said to have been only 400 feet each way. The Amran mound is described by Rich as an irregular parallelogram, 1100 yards long by 800 broad, and by Ker Porter as a triangle, the sides of which are respectively 1400, 1100, and 850 feet. Its dimensions therefore, very greatly exceed those of the curious structure with which it has been identified. Most probably it represents the ancient palace, coeval with Babylon itself, of which Nebuchadnezzar speaks in his inscriptions as adjoining his own more magnificent residence. It is the only part of the ruins from which bricks have been derived containing the names of kings earlier than Nebuchadnezzar, and is therefore entitled to be considered the most ancient of the existing remains.

4. The ruins near each side of the Euphrates, together with all the other remains on the west bank, may be considered to represent the lesser palace of Ctesias, which is said to have been connected with the greater by a bridge across the river, as well as by a tunnel under the channel of the stream (!). The old course of the Euphrates seems to have been a little east of the present one, passing between the two parallel ridges near it at the bend in the middle, and then closely skirting the mound of Amran, so as to have both the ruins just named upon its right bank. These ruins are of the same date and style. The bricks of that on the east bank bear the name of Neriglissar; and there can be little doubt that this ruin, together with those on the opposite side of the stream, are the remains of a palace built by him. Perhaps (as already remarked) the little mound immediately south of this point, near the east bank, may be a remnant of the ancient bridge.

5. The two long parallel lines of embankment on the east, which form so striking a feature in the remains as represented by Porter and Rich, but which are ignored by M. Oppert, may either be the lines of an outer and inner enclosure, of which Nebuchadnezzar speaks as defences of his palace, or they may represent the embankments of an enormous reservoir, which is often mentioned by that monarch as adjoining his palace toward the east.

6. The southernmost embankment, near the east bank of the river, is composed of bricks marked with the name of Labynetus or *Nabunit*, and is undoubtedly a portion of the work which Berosus ascribes to the last king (*Fragm.* 14)

Picture for Bab'ylon 3

Picture for Bab'ylon 4

It must be admitted, however, that the foregoing scheme of identification (which is that proposed by Rawlinson, *Herodotus,* 2, Essay 4) involves the improbable supposition of a mistake on the part of the ancient authorities concerning the course of the Euphrates through the middle of the city; it seems also unduly to restrict the ancient limits, and thus excludes the Birs Nimrud; and it affords no explanation of the remarkable line of mounds meeting in a right angle on the east of the ruins, and most naturally thought by nearly all topographers (Rich, Ker Porter, Flandin, Layard, and Fergusson) to have been one of the corners of the city wall. Nor does it altogether agree with the recent conjectural restoration of the royal residence at Babylon on the bold plan of M. Oppert (in the *Altas* accompanying his *Expedition en Mesopotamie,* Par. 1858), who supposes the extant remains opposite Hillah to be those alone of the palace, with its accompanying structures, and gardens, and enclosing walls, the double line of city walls being of much larger extent. He appears, however, to have disregarded many details of the modern as well as ancient indication in his identification (see Rawlinson, *ut sup.* p. 487 sq.). Perhaps it will yet appear that, while Rawlinson's locations (as above) are correct so far as concerns the royal buildings themselves, the chart of Oppert (given above) truly represents the entire circuit of the city; and that the palace, with its appendages, was enclosed in an interior quadrangle, which the river likewise divided diagonally, its eastern half corresponding to the triangle embracing the modern ruins here described.

Picture for Bab'ylon 5

The most remarkable fact connected with the magnificence of Babylon is the poorness of the material with which such wonderful results were produced. The whole country, being alluvial, was entirely destitute of stone, and even wood was scarce and of bad quality, being only yielded by the palm-groves which fringed the courses of the canals and rivers. In default of these, the ordinary materials for building, recourse was had to the soil of the country — in many parts an excellent clay — and with bricks made from this, either sun-dried or baked, the vast structures were raised which, when they stood in their integrity, provoked comparison with the pyramids of Egypt, and which, even in their decay, excite the astonishment

of the traveler. A modern writer has noticed, as the true secret of the extraordinary results produced, "the unbounded command of naked human strength" which the Babylonian monarchs had at their disposal (Grote's *Hist. of Greece*, 2:401); but this alone will not account for the phenomena; and we must give the Babylonians credit for a genius and a grandeur of conception rarely surpassed, which led them to employ the labor whereof they had the command in works of so imposing a character. With only "brick for stone," and at first only "slime (dm;j) for mortar" (Genesis 11:3), they constructed edifices of so vast a size that they still remain at the present day among the most enormous ruins in the world, impressing the beholder at once with awe and admiration.

8. *Literature.* — For the descriptive portions, Rich's *Two Memoirs on Babylon;* Ker Porter's *Travels*, 2:238 sq.; Layard's *Nineveh and Babylon*, ch. 22; Fresnel's *Two Letters to M. Mohl*, in the *Journal Asiatique*, June and July, 1853; Loftus's *Chaldea*, ch. 2; Olivier, *Voyages*, 2:436 sq.; Maurice, *Observ. on the Ruins of Bab.* (Lond. 1816); Wellsted, *Travels* (Lond. 1838); Ritter, *Erdkunde*, 11:865 sq.; Mannert, *Geographie*, VI, 1:408 sq.; Ainsworth's *Researches* (Lond. 1838); Chesney, *Euphrates Exped.* (Lond. 1850); Buckingham, *Trav. in Mesopotamia* (Lond. 1828); Mignan, *Trav. in Chaldaea* (Lond. 1829); Fraser, *Travels in Kurdistan* (Lond. 1840). On the identification of the ruins with ancient sites, compare Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, vol. 2, Essay 4; Oppert's *Maps* and *Plans* (Paris, 1858); Rennell's Essay in Rich's *Babylon and Persepolis* (Lond. 1839); *Jour. Royal Asiatic Soc.* (Lond. 1855), 15, pt. 2. On the architecture, Hirt, *Gesch. d. Baukunst*, 1:145 sq.; Fergusson, *Palaces of Nineveh and Persepolis* (Lond. 1851). On the religion, language, arts, and customs, Minter, *Rel. d. Babylon.* (Copenh. 1829); Miller, *Archaol.* p. 283 sq.; Botticher, *Vasengemalde*, 1:105 sq.; Heine, *De Babylon. mulier. in temple Veneris*, in the *Comment. Soc. Gotting.* 16:32 sq.; Bertholdt, *Ueb. d. Magier-Institut*, in his 3*te Exc. zu Daniel;* Wahl, *Gesch. d. morg. Sprach.* p. 570 sq. Jahn, *Einleit.* 1:284; Grotefend, in the *Zeitschr. f. d. Kurde d. Morgenl.* 1:212 sq.; 2:171 sq.; 3:179 sq.; Rawlinson, *Cuneiform Inscriptions* (Lond. 1850); *Jour. Sac. Lit.* Jan. 1859. *SEE BABYLONIA*.

II. Another Babylon lay in Egypt, south of Heliopolis, on the east bank of the Nile (Strabo, 17:807); it was founded by Babylonians, who had emigrated to Egypt during the civil commotions between the two empires (Diod. Sic. 1:56; Josephus, *Ant.* 2:15, 1). Its ruins are described by

Hartmann (*Erdbeschr, v. Africa,* 1926), Prokesch (*Erinnerungon,* 1:59 sq.), and Champollion (*L'Egypte,* 2:33). It is now called *Baboul* (Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geogr.* s.v.).

III. The Babylon in 1 Peter 5:13, is thought by some to be Rome, but by others (in accordance with a tradition of the Coptic Christians) to be the above place in Egypt. Baronius contradicts this last assertion by saying there is no mention of a *Bishop* of Babylon till 500 years after Peter's time, under Justin the Younger (see also Bertholdt, *Einl.* 6:3063; Steiger, *Br. Pet.* p. 21 sq.). There is no good reason for supposing any other than ancient Babylon to be here meant, since it is known that this continued to be inhabited by Jews down to the Christian era (Gesen. *Jesa.* 1:470. Compare Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 1:79, 80; Davidson, *Introd. to N.T.* 3, 366. *SEE PETER (EPISTLES OF)*.

IV. In the Apocalypse (Revelation 14:8; 16:19; 17:5; 18:2) Babylon stands for Rome, symbolizing heathenism: "Babylon is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication." This reference appears to have been derived from the practice of the Jews, who were accustomed to designate Rome, which they hated, by the opprobrious and not inappropriate name of Babylon (Schottgen, *Hor. Hebr.* 1:1125). The literal Babylon was the beginner and supporter of. tyranny and idolatry; first by Nimrod or Ninus, and afterward by Nebuchadnezzar; and therefore, in Isaiah 47:12, she is accused of magical enchantments from her youth or infancy, i.e. from her very first origin as a city or nation. This city and its whole empire were taken by the Persians under Cyrus; the Persians were subdued by the Macedonians, and the Macedonians by the Romans; so that *Rome succeeded to the power of Old Babylon.* And it was her method to *adopt the worship* of the false deities she had conquered; so that by her own acts she became the *heiress and successor* of all the Babylonian idolatry, and of all that was introduced into it by the intermediate successors of Babylon, and consequently of all the idolatry of the earth. *SEE REVELATION*.

Further, that Babylon is Rome is evident from the explanation given by the angel in Revelation 17:18, where it is expressly said to be "that great city which ruleth over the kings of the earth;" no other city but Rome being 'n the exercise of such power at the time when the vision was seen. That Constantinople is not meant by Babylon is plain also from what Mede has stated (*Works,* p. 922): "The seven heads of the beast (says he) are by the

angel made a double type, both of the *seven hills* where the woman sitteth, and of the *seven sovereignties* with which in a successive order the beast should reign. This is a pair of fetters to tie both beast and whore to *Western Rome."* Rome or Mystic Babylon (says the same author, p. 484) is called the "Great City," not from any reference to its extent, but because it was the queen of other cities. See ROME.

Babylonia

(Βαβυλωνία), a name for the southern portion of Mesopotamia, constituting the region of which Babylon was the chief city. The latter name alone is occasionally used in Scripture for the entire region; but its most usual designation is CHALDEA *SEE CHALDEA* (q.v.). The Chaldaeans proper, or *Chasdim,* however, were probably originally from the mountainous region farther north, now occupied by the *Kurds* (with which name, indeed, many find an etymological connection; see Golius, *ad Alfrag.* p. 17; Rodiger, in the *Zeitschr. f. d. Kunde d. Morgenl.* 3, 8), a portion of whom under the Assyrian sway may have migrated into Mesopotamia (see Isaiah 23:13), and thus eventually became masters of the rich plain of Shinar (see Vitringa, *ad Jesa.* 1:412 sq.; Gesenius, art. *Chaldaer,* in Ersch and Gruber's *Encycl.*). The original inhabitants nevertheless appear to have been of the Shemitic family (see Adelung, *Mithridat.* 1:314 sq.; Olshausen, *Emend. zum A. T.* p. 41 sq.); and their language belonged to the class of tongues spoken by that race, particularly to the Aramaic branch, and was indeed a dialect similar to that which is now called the Chaldee. *SEE ARAMAEAN LANGUAGE*; *SEE CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTIONS*. The two words, Babylonia and Chaldaea, were, however, sometimes used in another signification; Babylonia, as containing in an extended sense Assyria also and Mesopotamia, nearly all the countries which Assyria in its widest meaning embraced; while Chaldaea indicated, in a narrower signification, the south-western part of Babylonia between the Euphrates and Babylon (Strabo, 16; Ptol.). In Hebrew, Babylonia bore the name of SHINAR *SEE SHINAR* (q.v.), or "the land of Shinar;" while "Babylon" (Psalm 137:1) and "the land of the Chaldaeans" (Jeremiah 24:5; Ezekiel 12:13) seem to signify the empire of Babylon. It is in the latter sense that we shall here treat it. *SEE CHALDAEANS*.

I. *Geography and general Description.* — This province of Middle Asia was bordered on the north by Mesopotamia, on the east by the Tigris, on

the south by the Persian Gulf, and on the west by the Arabian Desert. On the north it began at the point where the Euphrates and Tigris approach each other, and extended to their common outlet in the Persian Gulf, pretty nearly comprising the country now designated *Irak Arabi.* The climate is temperate and salubrious. The country in ancient times was very prolific, especially in corn and palms. Timber-trees it did not produce. Many parts have springs of naphtha. As rain is infrequent, even in the winter months, the country owes its fruitfulness to the annual overflow of the Euphrates and the Tigris, whose waters are conveyed over the land by means of canals. Quintus Curtius (i. 5) declares that the country between the Euphrates and the Tigris was covered with so rich a soil that the cattle were driven from their pastures lest they should be destroyed by satiety and fatness. During the three great empires of the East, no tract of the whole appears to have been so reputed for fertility and riches as the district of Babylonia, which arose in the main from the proper management of the mighty river which flowed through it. Herodotus mentions that, when reduced to the rank of a province, it yielded a revenue to the kings of Persia which comprised half their income. The terms in which the Scriptures describe its natural as well as its acquired supremacy when it was the imperial city, evidence the same facts. They call it “Babylon, the glory of kingdoms; the beauty of the Chaldee excellency; the lady of kingdoms, given to pleasure; that dwelleth carelessly, and sayeth in her heart *I am,* and there is none else beside me.” But now, in the expressive and inimitable language of the same book, may it be said, “She sits as a widow on the ground. There is no more a throne for thee, O daughter of the Chaldaeans!” As for the abundance of the country, it has vanished as clean away as if “the besom of desolation” had swept it from north to south, the whole land, from the outskirts of Bagdad to the farthest reach of sight, lying a melancholy waste.

In order to defend the country against hostile attacks from its neighbors, northward from Babylonia, between the two rivers, a wall was built, which is known under the name of the Median Wall (Xen. *Anab.* 2:4,12). — The Babylonians were famous for the manufacture of cloth and carpets; they also excelled in making perfumes, in carving in wood, and in working in precious stones. They were a commercial as well as manufacturing people, and carried on a very extensive trade alike by land and by sea. Babylon was indeed a commercial depot between the Eastern and the Western worlds (<26704>Ezekiel 17:4; <23914>Isaiah 43:14). *SEE COMMERCE*. Thus favored by

nature and aided by art, Babylonia became the first abode of social order and the cradle of civilization. Here first arose a powerful empire-here astronomy was first cultivated here measures and weights were first employed. Herodotus has noticed the Chaldaeans as a tribe of priests (i. 28); Diodorus (i. 28) as a separate caste under Belus, an Egyptian priest; while the book of Daniel refers to them as astrologers, magicians, and soothsayers; but there can be little doubt, as laid down by Gesenius (*Jesa.* 23:13), that it was the name of a distinct nation, if not, as Heeren (*Manual of Anc. Hist.* p. 28) has maintained, the name of the northern nomades in general. In connection with Babylonia, the Chaldaeans are to be regarded as a conquering nation as well as a learned people; they introduced a correct method of reckoning time, and began their reign with Nabonassar, B.C. 747. There is a scriptural reference to the proud period in the history of the Chaldees when learned men filled the streets and the temples of Nineveh and Babel: "' Behold the land of the Chaldaeans; this people was not, till the Assyrian founded it for them that dwell in the wilderness: they set up the towers thereof, they raised up the palaces thereof; and he brought it to ruin" (<23B23:13>Isaiah 23:13). Babylonia, during this period, was "the land of the Chaldaeans," the same as that into which the children of Judah were carried away captive (<24B24:5>Jeremiah 24:5). *SEE CAPTIVITY*.

II. *History of the Babylonian Empire.* — The history of Babylon itself mounts up to a time not very much later than the Flood. *SEE BABEL*. The native historian seems to have possessed authentic records of his country for above 2000 years before the conquest by Alexander (Berosus, *Fragm.* 11); and Scripture represents the "beginning of the kingdom" as belonging to the time of Nimrod, the grandson of Ham, and the great-grandson of Noah (<01B10:6>Genesis 10:6-10). Of Nimrod no trace has been found in the Babylonian remains, unless he is identical with the god Bel of the Babylonian Pantheon, and so with the Greek Belus, the hero-founder of the city. This identity is possible, and at any rate the most ancient inscriptions appear to show that the primitive inhabitants of the country were really Cushite, i.e. identical in race with the early inhabitants of Southern Arabia and of Ethiopia. The seat of government at this early time was, as has been stated, in lower Babylonia, Erech (*Warka*) and Ur (*Mugheir*) being the capitals, and Babylon (if built) being a place of no consequence. The country was called *Shinar* (דָנְעָב) and *Akkadim* (comp. *Accad* of <01B10:10>Genesis 10:10). Of the art of this period we have specimens in the ruins of Mugheir and Warka, the remains of which date from at least the 20th century before

our era. We find the use of kiln-baked as well as of sun-dried bricks already begun; we find writing practiced, for the bricks are stamped with the names and titles of the kings; we find buttresses employed to support buildings, and we have probable indications of the system of erecting lofty buildings in stages. On the other hand, mortar is unknown, and the bricks are laid either in clay or in bitumen (comp. <01103>Genesis 11:3); they are rudely moulded, and of various shapes and sizes; sun-dried bricks predominate, and some large buildings are composed entirely of them; in these reed-matting occurs at intervals, apparently used to protect the mass from disintegration. There is no trace of ornament in the erections of this date, which were imposing merely by their size and solidity.

The first important change which we are able to trace in the external condition of Babylon is its subjection, at a time anterior to Abraham, by the neighboring kingdom of Elam or Susiana. Berosus spoke of a first Chaldean dynasty consisting of eleven kings, whom he probably represented as reigning from B.C. 2234 to B.C. 1976. At the last mentioned date he said there was a change, and a new dynasty succeeded, consisting of 49 kings, who reigned 458 years (from B.C. 1976 to B.C. 1518). It is thought that this transition may mark the invasion of Babylonia from the East, and the establishment of Eiamitic influence in the country, under Chedorlaomer (<01401>Genesis 14), whose representative appears as a conqueror in the inscriptions. Amraphel, king of Shinar, and Arioch, king of Ellasar (*Larsa*), would be tributary princes whom Chedorlaomer had subjected, while he himself may have become the founder of the new dynasty, which, according to Berosus, continued on the throne for above 450 years. From this point the history of Babylon is almost a blank for above twelve centuries. Except in the mention of the plundering, of Job by the Chaldaeans (<18017>Job 1:17), and of the "goodly Babylonish garment" which Achan coveted (<06072>Joshua 7:21), Scripture is silent with regard to the Babylonians from the time of Abraham to that of Hezekiah. Berosus covered this space with three dynasties; one (which has been already mentioned) of 49 Chaldaean kings, who reigned 458 years; another of 9 Arab kings, who reigned 245 years; and a third of 49 Assyrian monarchs, who held dominion for 526 years; but nothing beyond this bare outline has come down to us on his authority concerning the period in question. The monumental records of the country furnish a series of names, the reading of which is very uncertain, which may be arranged with a good deal of probability in chronological order, apparently belonging to the first of these

three dynasties. Of the second no traces have been hitherto discovered. The third would seem to be identical with the Upper Dynasty of Assyria, of which some account has been given in the article ASSYRIA *SEE ASSYRIA*. It would appear, then, as if Babylon, after having a native Chaldaean dynasty which ruled for 224 years (Brandis, p. 17), and a second dynasty of Elamitic Chaldeans who ruled for a further period of 458 years, fell wholly under Semitic influence, becoming subject first to Arabia for two centuries and a half, and then to Assyria for above five centuries, and not regaining even a qualified independence till the time marked by the close of the Upper and the formation of the Lower Assyrian empire. This is the conclusion which seems naturally to follow from the abstract which is all that we possess of Berosus; and doubtless it is to a certain extent true. But the statement is too broad to be exact; and the monuments show that Babylon was at no time absorbed into Assyria, or even for very many years together a submissive vassal. Assyria, which she had colonized during the time of the second or great Chaldaean dynasty, to which she had given letters and the arts, and which she had held in subjection for many hundred years, became in her turn (about B.C. 1270) the predominant Mesopotamian power, and the glory of Babylon in consequence suffered eclipse. But she had her native kings during the whole of the Assyrian period, and she frequently contended with her great neighbor, being sometimes even the aggressor. Though much sunk from her former greatness, she continued to be the second power in Asia, and retained a vitality which at a later date enabled her to become once more the head of an empire.

The line of Babylonian kings becomes exactly known to us from the year B.C. 747. An astronomical work of the geographer Ptolemy has preserved to us a document, the importance of which for comparative chronology it is scarcely possible to exaggerate. The *Canon of Ptolemy*, as it is called, gives us the succession of Babylonian monarchs, with the exact length of the reign of each, from the year B.C. 747, when Nabonassar mounted the throne, to B.C. 331, when the last Persian king was dethroned by Alexander. This document, which, from its close accordance with the statements of Scripture, always vindicated to itself a high authority in the eyes of Christian chronologers, has recently been confirmed in so many points by the inscriptions that its authentic character is established beyond all possibility of cavil or dispute. As the basis of all accurate calculation for Oriental dates previous to Cyrus, it seems proper to transcribe the earlier

portion of it in this place. [The accessions are given according to the aera of Nabonassar, and dates B.C. are added for convenience sake.]

Kings	**Years.**	**AE.N.**	**B.C.**
Nabonassar	14	1	747
Nadius	2	15	733
Chinzinus and Porus	5	17	731
Elulaeus	5	22	726
Mardocempalus	12	27	721
Arceanus	5	39	709
First interregnum	2	44	704
Belibus	3	46	702
Aparanadius	6	49	699
Regibelus	1	55	693
Mesesimordacus	4	56	692
Second interregnum	8	60	688
Asaridanus	13	68	680
Saosduchinus	20	81	667
Cinneladanus	22	101	647
Nabopolassar	21	123	625
Nebuchadnezzar	43	144	604
Illoarudamus	2	187	531
Nerigassolassarus	4	189	559
Nabonadius	17	193	555
Cyrus	9	210	538

Of Nabonassar, the first king in Ptolemy’s list, nothing can be said to be known except the fact, reported by Berosus, that he destroyed all the annals of his predecessors for the purpose of compelling the Babylonians to date from himself (*Fragm.* 11 a). It has been conjectured that he was the husband or son of Semiramis, and owed to her his possession of the throne. But of this theory there is at present no proof. It rests mainly upon a synchronism obtained from Herodotus, who makes Semiramis a Babylonian queen, and places her five generations (167 years) before Nitocris, the mother of the last king. The Assyrian discoveries have shown that there was a Semiramis about this time, but they furnish no evidence of her connection with Babylon, which still continues uncertain. The immediate successors of Nabonassar are still more obscure than himself. Absolutely nothing beyond the brief notation of the canon has reached us

concerning Nadius (or Nabius), Chinzinus (or Chinzirus), and Porus, or Elulaeus, who certainly cannot be the Tyrian king of that name mentioned by Menander (ap. Joseph. *Ant.* 9, 14, 2). Mardocempalus, on the contrary, is a monarch to whom great interest attaches. He is undoubtedly the Merodach-Baladan, or Berodach-Baladan (q.v.) of Scripture, and was a personage of great consequence, reigning himself twice, the first time for 12 years, contemporaneously with the Assyrian king Sargon, and the second time for six months only, during the first year of Sennacherib; and leaving a sort of hereditary claim to his sons and grandsons, who are found to have been engaged in hostilities with Essarhaddon and his successor. His dealings with Hezekiah sufficiently indicate the independent position of Babylon at this period, while the interest which he felt in an astronomical phenomenon (2 Chronicles 32:31) harmonizes with the character of a native Chaldaean king which appears to belong to him. The Assyrian inscriptions show that after reigning 12 years Merodach-Baladan was deprived of his crown and driven into banishment by Sargon, who appears to have placed Arceanus (his son?) upon the throne as viceroy, a position which he maintained for five years. A time of trouble then ensued, estimated in the canon at two years, during which various pretenders assumed the crown, among them a certain Hagisa, or Acises, who reigned for about a month, and Merodach-Baladan, who held the throne for half a year (Polyhist. ap. Euseb.). Sennacherib, bent on re-establishing the influence of Assyria over Babylon, proceeded against Merodach-Bala-dan (as he informs us) in his first year, and having dethroned him, placed an Assyrian named *Belib*, or Belibus, upon the throne, who ruled as his viceroy for three years. At the end of this time, the party of Merodach-Baladan still giving trouble, Sennacherib descended again into Babylonia, once more overran it, removed *Belib*, and placed his eldest son — who appears in the canon as Aparanadius — upon the throne. Aparanadius rejoined for six years, when he was succeeded by a certain Regibelus, who reigned for one year; after which Mesesimordacus held the throne for four years. Nothing more is known of these kings, and it is uncertain whether they were viceroys or independent native monarchs. They were contemporary with Sennacherib, to whose reign belongs also the second interregnum, extending to eight years, which the canon interposes between the reigns of Mesesimordacus and Asaridanus. In Asaridanus critical eyes long ago detected Esarhaddon, Sennacherib's son and successor; and it may be regarded as certain from the inscriptions that this king ruled in person over both Babylonia and Assyria, holding his court alternately at

their respective capitals. Hence we may understand how Manasseh, his contemporary, came to be "carried by the captains of the king of Assyria to *Babylon"* instead of to Nineveh, as would have been done in any other reign. *SEE ESARHADDON*. Saosduchinus and Ciniladanus (or Cinneladanus), his brother (Polyhist.), the successors of Asaridanus, are kings of whose history we know nothing. *Probably* they were viceroys under the later Assyrian monarchs, who are represented by Abydenus (ap. Euseb.) as retaining their authority over Babylon up to the time of the last siege of Nineveh.

With Nabopolassar, the successor of Cinneladanus, and the father of Nebuchadnezzar, a new era in the history of Babylon commences. According to Abydenus, who probably drew his information from Berosus, he was appointed to the government of Babylon by the last Assyrian king, at the moment when the Medes were about to make their final attack; whereupon, betraying the trust reposed in him, he went over to the enemy, arranged a marriage between his son Nebuchadnezzar and the daughter of the Median leader, and joined in the last siege of the city. See NINEVEH. On the success of the confederates (B.C. 625) Babylon became not only an independent kingdom, but an empire; the southern and western portions of the Assyrian territory were assigned to Nabopolassar in the partition of the spoils which followed on the conquest, and thereby the Babylonian dominion became extended over the whole valley of the Euphrates as far as the Taurus range, over Syria, Phoenicia, Palestine, Idumaea, and (perhaps) a portion of Egypt. Thus, among others, the Jews passed quietly and almost without remark from one feudal head to another, exchanging dependency on Assyria for dependency on Babylon, and continuing to pay to Nabopolassar the same tribute and service which they had previously rendered to the Assyrians. Friendly relations seem to have been maintained with Media throughout the reign of Nabopolassar, who led or sent a contingent to help Cyaxares in his Lydian war, and acted as mediator in the negotiations by which that war was concluded (Herod. i, 74). At a later date hostilities broke out with Egypt. Necho, the son of Psamatik I, about the year B.C. 608 invaded the Babylonian dominions on the south-west, and made himself master of the entire tract between his own country and the Euphrates (2 Kings 23:29, and 24:7). Nabopolassar was now advanced in life, and not able to take the field in person (Beros. *Frag.* 14). He therefore sent his son, Nebuchadnezzar, at the head of a large army, against the Egyptians, and the battle of Carchemish, which soon followed,

restored to Babylon the former limits of her territory (comp. 2 Kings 24:7 with Jeremiah 46:2-12). Nebuchadnezzar pressed forward and had reached Egypt, when news of his father's death recalled him, and hastily returning to Babylon, he was fortunate enough to find himself, without any struggle, acknowledged king (B.C. 604).

A complete account of the works and exploits of this great monarch — by far the most remarkable of all the Babylonian kings — will be given in the article *SEE NEBUCHADNEZZAR*. It is enough to note in this place that he was great both in peace and in war, but greater in the former. Besides recovering the possession of Syria and Palestine, and carrying off the Jews after repeated rebellions into captivity, he reduced Phoenicia, besieged and took Tyre, and ravaged, if he did not actually conquer, Egypt. But it was as the adorner and beautifier of his native land — as the builder and restorer of almost all her cities and temples — that this monarch obtained that great reputation which has handed down his name traditionally in the East on a par with those of Nimrod, Solomon, and Alexander, and made it still a familiar term in the mouths of the people. Probably no single man ever left behind him as his memorial upon the earth one half the amount of building that was erected by this king. The ancient ruins and the modern towns of Babylonia are alike built almost exclusively of his bricks. Babylon itself, the capital, was peculiarly the object of his attention. It was here that, besides repairing the walls and restoring the temples, he constructed that magnificent palace, which, with its triple enclosure, its hanging gardens, its plated pillars, and its rich ornamentation of enamelled brick, was regarded in ancient times as one of the seven wonders of the world (Strab. 16:1, § 5).

Nebuchadnezzar died B.C. 561, having reigned 43 years, and was succeeded by Evil-Merodach, his son, who is called in the *Canon* Illoarudamus. This prince, who, "in the year that he began to reign, did lift up the head of Jehoiachin, king of Judah, out of prison" (2 Kings 25:27), was murdered, after having held the crown for two years only, by Neriglissar, his brother-in-law. *SEE EVIL-MERODACH*. Neriglissar — the Nerigassolassar of the *Canon* — is (apparently) identical with the "Nergal-shar-ezer, Rab-Mag" of Jeremiah (39:3, 13, 14). He bears this title, which has been translated "chief of the Magi" (Gesenius), or "chief priest" (Colossians Rawlinson), in the inscriptions, and calls himself the son of a "king of Babylon." Some writers have considered him identical with "Darius the Mede" (Larcher, Conringius, Bouhier); but this is improbable,

SEE DARIUS THE MEDE, and he must rather be regarded as a Babylonian of high rank, who, having married a daughter of Nebuchadnezzar, raised his thoughts to the crown, and finding Evil-Merodach unpopular with his subjects, murdered him, and became his successor. Neriglissar built the palace at Babylon, which seems to have been placed originally on the west bank of the river. He was probably advanced in life at his accession, and thus reigned but four years, though he died a natural death, and left the crown to his son Laborosoarchod. This prince, though a mere lad at the time of his father's decease, was allowed to ascend the throne without difficulty; but when he had reigned nine months he became the victim of a conspiracy among his friends and connections, who, professing to detect in him symptoms of a bad disposition, seized him, and tortured him to death. Nabonidus (or Labynetus), one of the conspirators, succeeded; he is called by Berosus "a certain Nabonidus, a Babylonian" (ap. Joseph. *Ap.* 1:21), by which it would appear that he was not a member of the royal family; and this is likewise evident from his inscriptions, in which he only claims for his father the rank of "Rab-Mag." Herodotus seems to have been mistaken in supposing him (i. 188) the son of a great queen, Nitocris, and (apparently) of a former king, Labynetus (Nebuchadnezzar?). Indeed, it may be doubted whether the Babylonian Nitocris of Herodotus is really a historical personage. His authority is the sole argument for her existence, which it is difficult to credit against the silence of Scripture, Berosus, the Canon, and the Babylonian monuments. She may perhaps have been the wife of Nebuchadnezzar, but in that case she must have been wholly unconnected with Nabonidus, who certainly bore no relation to that monarch.

Nabonidus, or Labynetus (as he was called by the Greeks), mounted the throne in the year B.C. 555, very shortly before the war broke out between Cyrus and Croesus. He entered into alliance with the latter of these monarchs against the former, and, had the struggle been prolonged, would have sent a contingent into Asia Minor. Events proceeded too rapidly to allow of this; but Nabonidus had provoked the hostility of Cyrus by the mere fact of the alliance, and felt at once that sooner or later he would have to resist the attack of an avenging army. He probably employed his long and peaceful reign of 17 years in preparations against the dreaded foe, executing the defensive works which Herodotus ascribes to his mother (i. 185), and accumulating in the town abundant stores of provisions (*ib.* c. 190). In the year B.C. 539 the attack came. Cyrus advanced at the head of

his irresistible hordes, but wintered upon the Diyaleh or Gyndes, making his final approaches in the ensuing spring. Nabonidus appears by the inscriptions to have shortly before this associated with him in the government of the kingdom his son, Bel-shar-ezer or Belshazzar; on the approach of Cyrus, therefore, he took the field himself at the head of his army, leaving his son to command in the city. In this way, by help of a recent discovery, the accounts of Berosus and the book of Daniel — hitherto regarded as hopelessly conflicting — may be reconciled. *SEE BELSHAZZAR*. Nabonidus engaged the army of Cyrus, but was defeated and forced to shut himself up in the neighboring town of Borsippa (marked now by the *Birs-Nimrud*), where he continued till after the fall of Babylon (Beros. ap. Joseph. *Ap.* 1:21). Belshazzar guarded the city, but, over-confident in its strength, kept insufficient watch, and recklessly indulging in untimely and impious festivities (Daniel 5), allowed the enemy to enter the town by the channel of the river (Herod. 1:191; Xen. *Cyrop.* 7:7). Babylon was thus taken by a surprise, as Jeremiah had prophesied (Jeremiah 51:31) — by an army of Medes and Persians, as intimated 170 years earlier by Isaiah (Isaiah 21:1-9), and, as Jeremiah had also foreshown (Jeremiah 51:39), during a festival. In the carnage which ensued upon the taking of the town, Belshazzar was slain (Daniel 5:30). Nabonidus, on receiving the intelligence, submitted, and was treated kindly by the conqueror, who not only spared his life, but gave him estates in Carmania (Beros. *ut sup.;* comp. Abyd. *Fragm.* 9).

Such is the general outline of the siege and capture of Babylon by Cyrus, as derivable from the fragments of Berosus, illustrated by the account in Daniel, and reduced to harmony by aid of the important fact, obtained recently from the monuments, of the relationship between Belshazzar and Nabonidus. It is scarcely necessary to remark that it differs in many points from the accounts of Herodotus and Xenophon; but the latter of these two writers is in his *Cyropaedia* a mere romancer, and the former is very imperfectly acquainted with the history of the Babylonians. The native writer, whose information was drawn from authentic and contemporary documents, is far better authority than either of the Greek authors, the earlier of whom visited Babylon nearly a century after its capture by Cyrus, when the tradition had doubtless become in many respects corrupted.

According to the book of Daniel, it would seem as if Babylon was taken on this occasion, not by Cyrus, king of Persia, but by a Median king named Darius (5:31). The question of the identity of this personage with any

Median or Babylonian king known to us from profane sources will be discussed under DARIUS THE MEDE *SEE DARIUS THE MEDE*. It need only be remarked here that: Scripture does not really conflict on this point with profane authorities, since there is sufficient indication, from the terms used by the sacred writer, that "Darius the Mede," whoever he may have been, was not the real conqueror, nor a king who ruled in his own right, but a monarch intrusted by another with a certain delegated authority (see <27053>Daniel 5:31, and 9:1).

With the conquest by Cyrus commenced the decay and ruin of Babylon. The "broad walls" were then to some extent "broken down" (Beros. *Fr.* 14), and the "high gates" probably "burnt with fire" (<24558>Jeremiah 51:58). The defences, that is to say, were ruined; though it is not to be supposed that the laborious and useless task of entirely demolishing the gigantic fortifications of the place was attempted or even contemplated by the conqueror. Babylon was weakened, but it continued a royal residence not only during the lifetime of Darius the Mede, but through the entire period of the Persian empire. The Persian kings held their court at Babylon during the larger portion of the year, and at the time of Alexander's conquests it was still the second, if not the first city of the empire. It had, however, suffered considerably on more than one occasion subsequent to the time of Cyrus. Twice in the reign of Darius (Behist. Ins.), and once in that of Xerxes (Ctes. *Pers.* § 22), it had risen against the Persians, and made an effort to regain its independence. After each rebellion its defences were weakened, and during the long period of profound peace which the Persian empire enjoyed from the reign of Xerxes to that of Darius Codomannus they were allowed to go completely to decay. The public buildings also suffered grievously from neglect. Alexander found the great temple of Belus in so ruined a condition that it would have required the labor of 10,000 men for two months even to clear away the rubbish with which it was encumbered (Strabo, 16:1, 5). His designs for the restoration of the temple and the general embellishment of the city were frustrated by his untimely death, and the removal of the seat of empire to Antioch under the Seleucidae gave the finishing blow to the prosperity of the place. The great city of Seleucia, which soon after arose in its neighborhood, not only drew away its population, but was actually constructed of materials derived from its buildings (Pliny *H. N.* 6:30). Since then Babylon has been a quarry from which all the tribes in the vicinity have perpetually derived the bricks with which they have built their cities, and (besides Seleucia) Ctesiphon, Al-

Modain, Bagdad, Kufa, Kerbelah, Hillah, and numerous other towns, have risen from its ruins. The “great city,” “the beauty of the Chaldees’ excellency,” has thus emphatically “become heaps” (Jeremiah 51:37) — she is truly “an astonishment and a hissing, without an inhabitant.” Her walls have altogether disappeared — they have “fallen” (Jeremiah 51:44), been “thrown down” (Jeremiah 50:15), been “broken utterly” (Jeremiah 51:58). “A drought is upon her waters” (Jeremiah 50:39); for the system of irrigation, on which, in Babylonia, fertility altogether depends, has long been laid aside; “her cities” are everywhere “a desolation” (Jeremiah 51:43), her “land a wilderness;” “wild beasts of the desert” (jackals) “lie there,” and “owls dwell there” (comp. Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 484, with Isaiah 13:21, 22, and Jeremiah 50:39): the natives regard the whole site as haunted, and neither will the “Arab pitch tent nor the shepherd fold sheep there.”

After the exile many of the Jews continued settled in Babylonia; the capital even contained an entire quarter of them (comp. Susann. 1:5 sq.; 1 Peter 5:13; Josephus, *Ant.* 20:2, 2; 15:3, 1; 18:9, 1; Philo, *Opp.* 2:578, 587); and after the destruction of Jerusalem these Babylonian Jews established schools of considerable repute, although the natives were stigmatized as “Babylonians” by the bigoted Jewish population (Talm. Babyl. *Joma,* fol. 66). Traces of their learning exist not only in much rabbinical literature that emanated from these now extinct schools, but M. Layard has recently discovered several earthen bowls covered with their Hebrew inscriptions in an early character, copies and translations of which are given in his *Bab. and Nin.* p. 436 sq.

III. *Literature.* — On the history, see Niebuhr’s *Geschichte Asshur’s und Babel’s;* Brandis’s *Rerum Assyriarum Tempora Emendata;* Bosanquet’s *Sacred and Profane Chronology;* and Rawlinson’s Herodotus, vol. 1, Essays 6 and 8. Compare also the *Am. Biblical Repository,* April, 1836, p. 364-368; July, 1836, p. 158185; *Jour. Sac. Literature,* July, 1860, p. 492 sq.; Rollin, *Anc. Hist.* 2:54 etc.; Prideaux, *Connection,* 1:51 etc.; Heeren, *Ideen,* I, 2:172 sq.; Cellarii *Notit.* 2:746 sq.; Norberg, *Opusc. acad.* 3, 222 sq.; Kesler, *Historia excidii Babyl.* (Tubing. 1766); Bredow, *Untersuchungen ub. alt. Gesch.* (Altona, 1800); *Jour. Roy. As. Soc.* (Lond. 1855), xv, pt. 2, and *Maps* accompanying it. *SEE BABYLON*.

Babylo'nian

(Heb. *Ben-Babel',* lbB'ˆB, *son of Babel* or *Babylon,* Ezekiel 23:15, 17, 23; Chald. *Bablay',* ylbBi, Ezra 4:9; Gr. Βαβυλώνιος, Bel 3), an inhabitant of BABYLON or BABYLONIA.

Babylo'nian Captivity

SEE CAPTIVITY.

Babylo'nish Garment

(dr;a/ dae[;vi, *adde'reth Shinar';* Sept. ψιλὴ ποικίλη, Vulg. *pallium coccineum*), a *Babylonish mantle, SEE ATTIRE,* i.e. a large rote variegated with the figures of men and animals interwoven in rich colors (comp. Pliny, *Hist.Nat.* 8:48), such as were fabricated at Babylon (q.v.); hence a valuable piece of clothing in general (Joshua 7:21). *SEE EMBROIDERY.*

Ba'ca, Valley Of

(Heb. *E'mek hab-Baka',* qm,[eB. hq;bi, *vale of* [*the*] *weeping;* Sept. κοιλὰς τοῦ κλαυθμῶνος, Vulg. *Vallis lacrymalrum*), a valley apparently somewhere in Palestine, through which the exiled Psalmist sees in vision the pilgrims passing in their march toward the sanctuary of Jehovah at Zion (Psalm 84:6). The passage seems to contain a play, in the manner of Hebrew poetry, on the name of the trees (µyaeB.q;, *bekaim'; SEE MULBERRY*) from which the valley probably derived its name, and the "tears" (ykeB.q;, *beki'*) shed by the pilgrims in their joy at their approach to Zion. These tears are conceived to be so abundant as to turn the dry valley in which the *baka* trees delighted (so Lengerke, *Kenaan,* p. 135) into a springy or marshy place (ˆy:P.[m;). That a real locality was in the mind of the Psalmist is most probable, from the use of the definite article before the name (Gesen. *Thes.* p. 205). A valley of the same name (*Bekaa*) still exists in the Sinaitic district (Burckhardt, p. 619); but this, as well as the valley near Mecca (Niebuhr, *Beschr.* p. 339), is entirely out of the region demanded by the context. Some regard this as a valley (*el-Bekaa*) or plain in which Baalbek is situated. But this spot is far from possessing the dreariness and drought on which the point of the Psalmist's allusion depends. The rendering of the Targum is *Gehenna, i.e.* the Ge-Hinnom or

ravine below Mount Zion. This locality agrees well with the mention of *bakaim-trees* in 2 Samuel 5:23. To the majority of interpreters, however, it does not appear necessary to understand that there is any reference to a valley actually called by this name. The Psalmist in exile, or at least at a distance from Jerusalem, is speaking of the privileges and happiness of those who are permitted to make the usual pilgrimages to that city in order to worship Jehovah in the Temple: “They knew the ways that lead thither; yea, though they must pass through rough and dreary paths, even a vale of tears; yet such are their hope and joy of heart, that all this is to them as a well-watered country, a land crowned with blessings of the early rain.” Dr. Robinson (*Add.* to Calmet’s *Dict.*) concludes that something like this is the sense of the passage; and it seems, on the whole, the most intelligible and forcible explanation of the passage to suppose that the sacred writer thus poetically describes some one of the many desolate valleys which the stated worshippers at Jerusalem were obliged to traverse in their yearly visits to the solemn festivals.

Baccalaureus

(i.e. BACHELOR), one who takes a first degree in divinity, arts, medicine, or civil law. This degree was first introduced in the thirteenth century by Pope Gregory IX. Rhenanus maintains that the title is taken from the *Baculus* placed in the hand of the new graduate. The usual derivation is that given by Alciatus, viz. *bacca laurea,* a laurel berry; “but the Spanish *bachillir,* which means at once *a babbler* and a master of arts, taken in conjunction with the Portuguese *bacharel* and *bacillo,* a shoot or twig of the vine (from the Latin *baculus* or *baculum,* a stick or shoot), and the French *bachelette,* a damsel, seem to point to its original and generic meaning, which probably was a *person shooting or protruding from one stage of his career into another more advanced.* With this general signification, all the special meanings of the word given by Ducange (*Glossariun,* s.v.) seem to have some analogy.

1. It was used, he says, to indicate a person who cultivated certain portions of church lands called *baccalaria* — which he supposed to have been a corruption of *vasseleria* — a few belonging to an inferior vassal, or to one who had not attained to a full feudal recognition.

2. It indicated ecclesiastics of a lower dignity than the other members of a religious brotherhood, i.e. monks who were still in the first stage of monkhood.

3. It was used by later writers to indicate persons in the first or probationary stage of knighthood; i.e. not esquires simply, but knights who, from poverty and the insufficient number of their retainers, from their possessing, perhaps, only the *baccalaria* above referred to, or from nonage, had not yet raised their banners in the field (*leve banniere*).

4. It was adopted to indicate the first grade or step in the career of university life. As an academical title, it was first introduced by Pope Gregory IX in the thirteenth century into the University of Paris to denote a candidate who had undergone his first academical trials, and was authorized to give lectures, but was not yet admitted to the rank of an independent master or doctor. At a later period it was introduced into the other faculties as the lowest academical honor, and adopted by the other universities of Europe." In the Middle Ages two kinds of bachelors were recognized in theological studies, viz. *Baccalaurei cursores* and *Baccalaurei formati.* The former were those who, after six years of study, were admitted to perform their courses. There were two *courses,* one in explaining the Bible for three years, and the other in explaining for one year the Master of the Sentences; consequently, those who performed the biblical course were called *Baccalaurei biblici;* the others, *Baccalaurei sententiarii;* while those who had finished *both* courses were known as *Baccalaurei formati. — Chambers, Encyclopaedia,* s.v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie,* Suppl. 1:424; Hilscher, *De nomine Baccalaurei* (Lips. 1733); Gottsched, *De dignitate Bacc. Lipsiensis* (Lips. 1739); Landon, *Eccles.Dictionary,* s.v. *SEE DEGREES*; *SEE UNIVERSITIES.*

Baccanarists

a society in the Church of Rome, founded in Italy by one Baccanari after the suppression of the Jesuits in 1773. Its object was to restore the order under a new name and form. Pius VI favored the organization, and it spread into Austria, Holland, and England. In 1814 its members were united with the re-established order of Jesuits, *SEE JESUITS.*

Bac'chides

(Βακχίδης, *son of Bacchus*), a friend of Antiochus Epiphanes (Josephus, *Ant.* 12:10, 2) and governor of Mesopotamia (ἐν τῷ πέραν τοῦ ποταμοῦ, 1 Maccabees 7:8), who was commissioned by Demetrius Soter to investigate the charges which Alcimus (q.v.) preferred against Judas Maccabaeus. He confirmed Alcimus in the high-priesthood; and, having inflicted signal vengeance on the extreme party of the Assidaeans (q.v.), he returned to Antioch. After the expulsion of Alcimus and the defeat and death of Nicanor, he led a second expedition into Judea. Judas Maccabaeus fell in the battle which ensued at Laisa (B.C. 161), and Bacchides re-established the supremacy of the Syrian faction (1 Maccabees 9:25, οἱ ἀσεβεῖς ἄνδρες; Joseph. *Ant.* 13:1,1). He next attempted to surprise Jonathan, who had assumed the leadership of the national party after the death of Judas; but Jonathan escaped across the Jordan. Bacchides then placed garrisons in several important positions, and took hostages for the security of the present government. Having completed the pacification of the country (Joseph. *Ant.* 13:1, 5), he returned to Demetrius (B.C. 160). After two years he came back at the request of the Syrian faction, in the hope of overpowering Jonathan and Simon, who still maintained a small force in the desert; but, meeting with ill success, he turned against those who had induced him to undertake the expedition, and sought an honorable retreat. When this was known by Jonathan he sent envoys to Bacchides and concluded a peace (B.C. 158) with him, acknowledging him as governor under the Syrian king, while Bacchides pledged himself not to enter the land again, a condition which he faithfully observed (1 Maccabees 9:70 sq.; Joseph. *Ant.* 12:1, 6; 13:1; comp. 2 Maccabees 8:30).

He must have been a different person from the Bacchides, the general of Antiochus Epiphanes in charge of the fortresses of Judaea, whom the Asmonaean priest Matthias, with his sons, slew with their daggers (Joseph. *War*, 1:1, 2).

Bacchu'rus

(Βακχοῦρος; Vulg. *Zaccarus*), given as one of the "holy singers" (τῶν ἱεροψαλτῶν) who had taken a foreign wife (1 Esdras 9:24); but no name corresponding with this is added in the genuine list (Ezra, 10:24).

the Latinized form (in the Auth. Vers. at 2 Maccabees 6:7; 14:33) of the heathen deity called by the Greeks DIONYSUS *SEE DIONYSUS* (q.v.). The latter occurs also in (the so-called) 3 Maccabees 2:29. In all these instances this mythic deity is named in connection with circumstances which would indicate that he was an, object of special abhorrence to the Jews; for in the first it is stated that the Jews were compelled to go in procession to Bacchus; in the second, the erection of a temple to him is threatened in order to compel the priests to deliver up Judas to Nicanor; and in the third, the branding with the ivy leaf, sacred to him, is reported as inflicted on them by way of punishment. This falls in with what Tacitus says, that it was a mistake to imagine that, because the priests of the Jews accompanied their singing with flute and cymbals, and had garlands of ivy, and a golden vine was found in the Temple, they worshipped Bacchus, for that this was not at all in accordance with their institutes (nequaquam congruentibus institutis, *Hist. v.* 5). As Bacchus was the god of wine, and in general of earthly festivity and jollity, and as his rites sanctioned the most frantic excesses of revelry and tumultuous excitement, he would necessarily be an object of abhorrence to all who believed in and worshipped Jehovah. Probably also the very fact that some things connected with the Jewish worship had, as mentioned by Tacitus, and still more fully by Plutarch (*Symposiac.* 4, qu. 6), led to the supposition that they reverenced Bacchus, may have produced in their minds a more determined recoil from and hatred of all pertaining to his name. In the pagan system Bacchus is the god of wine, and is represented as the son of Jupiter and Semele, the daughter of Cadmus. His mother perished in the burning embraces of the god, whom she persuaded to visit her with his attribute of royalty, the thunderbolt; the embryo child was sewn up in Jupiter’s thigh, whence, in due time, he was produced to light. Mythology abounds with the adventures of Bacchus, the most noted of which are the transformation of the Tyrrhenian pirates, who carried him off to sell for a slave, into dolphins; his revenge on the scoffing Pentheus, and his invasion and conquest of India. Bacchus was generally figured as a young man of effeminate appearance (θηλύμορφος, Eurip. *Bacch.* 853; Euseb. *Chron.* p. 29), with a garland of ivy binding his long hair (Strabo, 15, p. 1038); in his hand he bore a thyrsus, or rod wreathed with ivy, and at his feet lay his attendant panther. His companions were the Bacchantes, the Lenae, the Naiads and Nymphs, etc., and especially Silenus. His worship seems to

have arisen from that "striving after objectivity" (Wachsmuth, *Hellen. Alterthumsk.* 2:2, p. 113), which is the characteristic of a primitive people. The southern coast of Thrace appears to have been the original seat of this religion, and it was introduced thence into Greece shortly after the colonization by the *A*Eolians of the Asiatic coast of the Hellespont. The admission of the identity of Osiris and Dionysus by Plutarch and other mythological theorists, as well as Herodotus's simple statement of the assertions of the Egyptian priests to that effect, is no proof of the common origin of the worship of this divinity in Egypt and Greece; but there is no doubt that certain modifications of the Dionysiac rites took place after the commencement of the intercourse between the Ionians and the Egyptians (*Penny Cyclop.* s.v.). The worship of Bacchus was intimately connected with that of Demeter, and under the name of *Iacchus* he was adored along with that goddess at Eleusis. Virgil invokes them together (*Georg.* 1:5) as the lights of the universe. According to the Egyptians, they were the joint rulers of the world below (Herod. 2:123). In a cameo he is represented as sitting with her in a chariot drawn by male and female centaurs. (For a fuller account of the mythological history and attributes of Bacchus, see Creuzer, *Aymbolik und Mythologie*, pt. 3, bk. 3, ch. 2 of Moser's Abridgment.)

Bace'nor

(Βακήνωρ; Vulg. *Bacenor*), apparently a captain of horse in the army of Judas Maccabeus, to whose detachment Dositheus belonged (2 Maccabees 12:35); or possibly it may have been only the title of one of the Jewish companies or squadrons.

Bachelor

SEE BACCALAUREUS.

Bach'rite

(Heb. with the article *hab-Bakri'*, יִרְכָּבַהַ; Sept. omits, but some copies have ὁ Βεχερί; *Vulg. familia Becheritarum;* Auth. Vers. "the Bachrites"), the family name of the descendants of BECHER *SEE BECHER* (q.v.), the son of Ephraim (Numbers 26:35). *SEE BERIAH*.

Bachuth

SEE ALLON-BACHUTH.

Backbite

(in <19503>Psalm 15:3, לגר; *ragal',* to *run about* tattling; in <20253>Proverbs 25:23, רטש, *se'ther, secrecy* in tale-bearing; in <45103>Romans 1:30, κατάλαλος, an *evil speaker;* in <47220>2 Corinthians 12:20, καταλαλιά, *evil-speaking*), maliciously to defame an absent person. *SEE SLANDER*.

Backslide

(in <20144>Proverbs 14:14, גשׂ, *sug,* to *go back;* in <28016>Hosea 4:16, רסר; *salar'* to *be refractory;* elsewhere in the O.T. בשׁו, *shub,* to *return;* in <19039>Hebrews 10:39, ὑποστέλλω, to "draw back"). *SEE APOSTASY*.

1. This term popularly denotes a falling off or defection in matters of religion; an apostasy, <44212>Acts 21:21; <53203>2 Thessalonians 2:3; <54401>1 Timothy 4:1. This may be either partial or complete; partial, when it is in the heart, as <20144>Proverbs 14:14; complete, as that described in <19604>Hebrews 6:4, etc.; 10:6, etc. On the latter passage Chrysostom observes: "When a house has a strong foundation, suppose an arch fall, some of the beams break, or a wall decline, while the foundation is good, these breaches may be repaired; so in religion, while a person maintains the true doctrines, and remains on the firm rock, though he fall, true repentance may restore him to the favor and image of God: but as in a house, when the foundation is bad, nothing can save the building from ruin; so, when heretical doctrines are admitted for a foundation, nothing can save the professor from destruction." It is important, in interpreting these passages, to keep it steadfastly in mind that the apostasy they speak of is not only *moral,* but *doctrinal. SEE FALLING AWAY*.

2. It is also used less accurately of a loss of fervor in religious feeling and of zeal in religious duty. In this sense it should be called *partial backsliding,* which must be distinguished from *hypocrisy,* as the former may exist where there are good intentions on the whole; but the latter is a studied profession of appearing to be what we are not. The *causes* of backsliding are — the cares of the world; improper connections; inattention to secret or closet duties; self-conceit and dependence; indulgence; listening to and parleying with temptations. A *backslidden state is manifested* by indifference to prayer and self-examination; trifling or unprofitable conversation; neglect of public ordinances; shunning the people of God; associating with the world; thinking lightly of sin; neglect

of the Bible; and often by gross immorality. The *consequences* of this awful state are — loss of character; loss of comfort; loss of usefulness; and loss of a well-grounded hope of future happiness. To *avoid this state*, or recover from it, we should beware of the first appearance of sin; be much in prayer; attend the ordinances; and unite with the people of God. We should consider the awful instances of apostasy, as Saul, Judas, Demas, etc.; the many warnings we have of it, <4024 13>Matthew 24:13; <5810 38>Hebrews 10:38; <4006 2>Luke 9:62; how it grieves the Holy Spirit; and how wretched it makes us; above all things, our dependence should be on God, that we may always be directed by his Spirit, and kept by his power. — Watson, *Theol. Dictionary*, s.v.; Buck, *Theol. Dictionary*, s.v.; Clarke, *Theology* (by Dunn), p. 360. On the possibility of "falling from grace," *SEE PERSEVERANCE*.

Backus, Azel

D.D., president of Hamilton College, was born at Norwich, Conn., Oct. 13th, 1765. While yet a boy he imbibed infidel principles, but was reclaimed by the instructions of his uncle, the Rev. Charles Backus. He graduated A.B. at Yale in 1787. He was licensed in 1789, and succeeded Dr. Bellamy as pastor at Bethlem in 1791. Here he labored faithfully, both as pastor and as principal of a classical school, till 1812, when he was elected president of Hamilton College. After five years of successful administration, he died of typhus fever, Dec. 9, 1817. He was a man of good endowments and great industry. — Sprague, *Annals*, 2:287.

Backus, Charles

D.D., an eminent Congregational minister, was born in Norwich, Conn., Nov. 5, 1749. He lost his parents in his childhood, but, as he early discovered a love of learning, his friends assisted him to obtain a liberal education. He graduated A.B. at Yale in 1769, and, after studying theology under Dr. Hart, of Preston, he was licensed in 1773. In 1774 he was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church in Somers, where he remained until his death, December 30,1803. During the course of his ministry nearly fifty young men studied theology under his roof, and among them were Dr. Woods, of Andover, President Moore, of Amherst, and others. His reputation brought him invitations to the chair of theology at Dartmouth, and also at Yale, but he declined both calls. He published a number of occasional sermons. — Sprague, *Annals*, 2:61.

Backus, Isaac

A.M., a distinguished Baptist minister, was born at Norwich, Conn., Jan. 9, 1724. In 1748 he was ordained pastor of a Congregational church in Titicut, Middleborough, Mass. In 1749 a number of the members of Mr. Backus's church altered their sentiments with regard to baptism, and he at length united with them in opinion. He was immersed in 1751. For some years he held to open communion, but afterward abandoned it. A Baptist church was duly constituted in 1756, and he was installed its pastor. He faithfully discharged his pastoral duties till his death, Nov. 20, 1806. To his labors during this long period the Baptists of America owe much of their success. He was a voluminous writer, and published, among other works, a *History of the Baptists* (3 vols.), and also an *Abridgment* of the same (1 vol.). A list of his writings may be seen in Sprague, *Annals,* 6:56. See also Hovey, *Life and Times of Backus* (Bost. 1858, 12mo); *Christian Review,* 14:197.

Bacon, Francis

Viscount St. Albans and Baron Verulam, one of the most celebrated philosophers of modern times, was born in London, Jan. 22, 1561. His father, Sir Nicholas Bacon, was keeper of the seal under Elizabeth, and a distinguished lawyer and statesman; his mother was a learned and pious woman, who had translated several ascetic works from Italian, and had taken part in the theological controversies of her time. Early in life he gave signs of extraordinary talent, and Queen Elizabeth used to call him playfully her young lord keeper. In his twelfth year he is said to have speculated on the laws of imagination, and in the next year he was matriculated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he remained for three years and a half. After the termination of his studies in 1577, his father sent him to France, under the care of Sir Amyas Paulet, English ambassador at the French court. There he came in contact with a number of distinguished men, and laid out a plan for a reconstruction of the philosophical sciences. The death of his father recalled him to England in 1580, and, failing to get an office for which he applied, he devoted himself to the study of law. In 1582 he was called to the bar, in 1586 he was made a bencher, and in 1589, at the age of 28, counsel extraordinary to the queen. Still he could not rise under Elizabeth, who rejected his claims for preferment on the ground that he was "not very deep." As some compensation for his disappointment, Count Essex made him a present of Twickenham Court,

worth about £1800, and so beautiful that Bacon called it the Garden of Paradise. Bacon, some years later, was charged with rewarding this disinterested kindness with ingratitude on the trial of Essex; but probably unjustly (see the *Penny Cyclopoedia*, s.v.). In 1595 he was returned to Parliament as member for Middlesex, and greatly distinguished himself for parliamentary eloquence. After the accession to the throne of James I, he rapidly rose in dignities and influence. In 1603 he received the honor of knighthood, in 1604 he was appointed king's counsel, in 1607 solicitor general, in 1613 attorney general, in 1617 keeper of the great seal. In January of 1618 he was appointed lord high chancellor, and in the same year raised to the peerage as Baron of Verulam. Three years later the title of Viscount of St. Albans was conferred on him. From the same year, 1621, dates his fall. A committee of the House of Commons reported two cases of corruption against him, and before the close of the proceedings similar cases to the number of 24 were presented. When his case was referred to the House of Peers he abandoned all defense, confessed his guilt, and was sentenced, on May 3d, to a fine of £40,000, and to imprisonment in the Tower during the king's pleasure. The sentence proved to be little more than a form. He was released from imprisonment after two days, and the fine was subsequently remitted, but he never recovered his standing. Only once he was afterward summoned to attend Parliament, and the remainder of his life was spent in humble circumstances and among the few friends whom adversity left him. He died at Highgate, April 9,1626.

Bacon was the author of a philosophical system which is called after him the Baconian philosophy, and which has had a marked influence on the subsequent development of philosophy and of literature in general. "The sciences," he says, "I have hitherto been in a most sad condition. Philosophy, wasted in empty and fruitless logomachies, has failed during so many centuries to bring out a single work or experiment of actual benefit to human life. Logic hitherto has served more to the establishment of error than to the investigation of truth. Whence all this? Why this penury of science? Simply because they have broken away from their root in nature and experience. The blame of this is chargeable to many sources: first, the old and rooted prejudice that the human mind loses somewhat of its dignity when it busies itself much and continuously with experiments and material things; next, superstition and a blind religious zeal, which has been the most irreconcilable opposer to natural philosophy; again, the exclusive

attention paid to morals and politics by the Romans, and since the Christian era to theology by every acute mind; still farther, the great authority which certain philosophers have exercised, and the great reverence given to antiquity; and, in fine, a want of courage, and a despair of overcoming the many and great difficulties which lie in the way of the investigation of nature. All these causes have contributed to keep down the sciences. Hence they must now be renewed, and regenerated, and reformed in their most fundamental principles; there must now be found a new basis of knowledge and new principles of science. Thus radical reformation of the sciences depends upon two conditions — objectively, upon the referring of science to experience and the philosophy of nature; and subjectively, upon the purifying of the sense and the intellect from all abstract theories and traditional prejudices, Both conditions furnish the correct method of natural science, which is nothing other than the method of induction. Upon a true induction depends all the soundness of the sciences." In these propositions the Baconian philosophy is contained. The historical significance of its founder is, therefore, in general this: that he directed the attention and reflection of his contemporaries again upon the given actuality, upon nature; that he affirmed, the necessity of experience, which had been formerly only a matter of accident, and made it as in and for itself an object of thought. His merit consists in having brought up the principle of scientific empiricism, and only in this (Schwegler, *History of Philosophy,* transl. by Seelye, p. 166). The principles of his method are to be found in many writers before him, even in Aristotle; but it-was Bacon's glory that he so set forth those principles as to bring mankind to act upon them. His plagiarisms, especially from his great namesake, Roger Bacon, are unquestionable (see De Maistre, *Soirees de St. Petersbourg; Methodist Quarterly,* Jan. and April, 1858; and *SEE BACON, ROGER*).

So far as Bacon's own mind was concerned, he was a firm believer in divine revelation (see his *Confession of Faith; Prayers; Character of a Christian; Works,* ed. Montague, vol. 7). Theology, as science, he held to rest on data given by inspiration, just as metaphysics must rest on postulates. On this last point the following passage is pregnant: "Wherefore, whatever primitive matter is, together with its influence and action, it is sui generis, and admits of no definition drawn from perception, and is to be taken just as it is found, and not to be judged of from any preconceived idea. For the mode of it, if it is given to us to know it, cannot be judged of by means of its cause, seeing that it is, next to God, the cause

of causes, itself without cause. For there is a certain real limit of causes in nature, and it would argue levity and inexperience in a philosopher to require or imagine a cause for the last and positive power and law of nature, as much as it would not to demand a cause in those that are subordinate" (*Fable of Cupid, Works,* ed. Montague, 15:45). As to theology, his language is: "Omnis enim scientia duplicemn sortitur informationem. Una inspiratur divinitus; alter oritur a sensu. Partiemur, igitur, scientiam in theologiam et philosophiam. Theologiam hic intelligimus inspiratam, non naturalem" (*De Agmentis,* 3, 1). In book 9 of the same work he expressly sets religion in opposition, so far as its source is concerned, to the inductive sciences, inasmuch as in religion the first principles are independent and self-subsistent (*per se subsistentes*). "Let us conclude," he says, a that sacred theology ought to be drawn from the word and oracles of God, not from the light of nature or the dictates of reason. For it is written, *the heavens declare the glory of God,* but not *the heavens declare the will of God."* See also his striking prayer in the preface to the *Instauratio Magna.* Bacon's own position, then, is clearly defined, although De Maistre, in his *Soirees de St. Petersbourg,* seeks to deprive him not only of all merit with regard to the science of induction, but also almost of the name of Christian. It is another question how far the influence of the Baconian system, confined as it is to the material sciences, has tended to generate a materialist and rationalist way of thinking. On this point, *SEE RATIONALISM*; *SEE PHILOSOPHY*.

The greatest of the philosophical works of Bacon is the *Novum Organum* (Lond. 1620, translated in Bohn's *Scientific Library,* Lond.). The most important among the other works of Bacon are:

(1) *Essays, or Counsels Civil and Moral* (Lond. 1597, augment. edit. 1612 and 1624), the best known and most popular of his works. A new edition, with an introduction and many valuable notes, has been published by archbishop Whately (Lond. 1857; Boston, 1860): —

(2) A treatise *On the Advancement of Learning* (Lond. 1605). This work, revised and enlarged, was afterward translated by Ben Jonson, George Herbert, and other friends of Bacon, into Latin, and published under the title *De Augmentis Scientiarum* (Lond. 1623). The works *De Sapientia Veterum, Sylva Sylvarum, Nova Atlantis,* are likewise highly valued. Complete editions were published by Rawley (Amsterd. 1663, 6 vols.); Mallet (Lond. 1740); Stephens, Locker, and Birch (Lond. 1765, 5 vols.

4to); Basil Montagu (Lond. 1825-34, 17 vols. 8vo); Spedding, Ellis, and Heath (Lond. 1857 sq.); American ed., Boston, 1863-65. A biography of Bacon may be found at the head of every complete edition of his works; that by Montagu is especially valued (reprinted in Bacon's *Works*, Phila. 3 vols. 8vo). See also Bouillet, *Les OEuvres Philos. de B.* (Paris, 1834-35); De Maistre, *Examen de la Philos. de B.* (Paris, 1836, 2 vols.); Remusat, *Bacon, sa Vie et son Influence* (Paris, 1857); Tenison, *Baconiana* (1679); Macaulay, in *Edinburgh Review*, July, 1837; *Methodist Quarterly*, Jan. 1848, p. 22; April, 1851, art. 1; Jan. 1859, art. 1; April, 1851, art. 1; *Princeton Review*, 12:350; 15:481; *Am. Bib. Repository*, 3d series, 3, 127; *Qu. Christian Spectator*, 4:528; *Encyclop. Brit.* (1st and 3d Prelim. Diss. by Stewart and Playfair); K. Fisher, *Bacon von Verulam* (Leipz. 1856, tr. by Oxenford, Lond. 1857); Dixon, *Personal History of Bacon* (Lond. 1860); *English Cyclopoedia;* Morell, *History of Philosophy*, pt. 1, ch. 1, § 1; Lewes, *Biog. Hist. of Philos.* vol. 3, epoch. 1.

Bacon, John

an English writer of the fourteenth century; born at Baconthorp, in Norfolk, and styled "the Resolute Doctor" (*Doctor Resolutus*). He took the degrees of doctor of canon and civil law and of divinity at Paris, and became so strongly attached to the opinions of the Averroists that he was looked upon as their head. In 1329 he was elected provincial of the Carmelite order, which he had entered in his youth, and died at London in 1346. He wrote *Commentaria super quatuor libros senfentiarum* (Paris, 1484, fol., often reprinted), and many other works. See Dupin, *Hist. Eccl. Writers*, 14th cent.; Landon, *Eccl. Dict.* 1:192.

Bacon, Roger

the greatest of English philosophers before the time of his namesake, Lord Bacon, was born near Ilchester, in Somersetshire, about 1214. He was educated at Oxford, and, according to the custom of his day, proceeded to the university of Paris to study philosophy and theology. Here he received his doctor's degree. About 1240(?) he returned to Oxford, and there (perhaps on the advice of Grossetete q.v.), he took the vows as a Franciscan, and applied himself closely in his convent to the study of languages, as well as to experimental philosophy. It was the mistake of his life that he joined the Franciscans; his brethren soon began to manifest a spirit of enmity, a prohibition being issued against Bacon's lectures in the

university, as well as against the publication of any of his writings. He was charged with magic and diabolism, as was commonly the case at that time with those who studied the sciences, and particularly chemistry. Bacon was a true thinker, and, as such, was necessarily regarded as an innovator in such an age, although it was the age of Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventura. He complained of the absolute submission to authority. "I would burn all the books of Aristotle if I had them in hand" (*Comp. Theol.* pt. 1, ch. 2). He was very severe upon the scholastic theology, even upon Alexander de Hales, Albert the Great, and Thomas Aquinas, whom he styles *vir erroneus et famosus.* It was not unnatural that the monks should suspect so plainspoken a man, especially one who kept cauldrons and crucibles at work, studied the stars, and made strange experiments of all sorts. Wadding, the historian of the Franciscans, says that Bacon was condemned *propter novitates quasdam suspectas.* From 1257 until 1267 he was continually persecuted; most of the time kept in prison, his studies hindered, and all intercourse with the outer world prohibited. In 1265 Clement IV (Guy Foulques, a Frenchman) became pope. He had been Bacon's friend when cardinal legate in England, had taken great interest in his studies, and had sought to get hold of his writings, but the strict watch kept on Bacon prevented him from sending them. Bacon managed to get letters conveyed to the new pope, stating his sad case, and asking help in the name of religion and good learning. Clement's answer required him to send his writings with haste, any command of his superiors or constitution of his order notwithstanding. Bacon at once prepared his *Opus Majus* from his materials on hand, with an account of his troubles and persecutions in the preface. The book was sent in the year 1267, but the pope did not venture to release him from prison till several months had elapsed, so great was the power of the Franciscan order. Clement died in November, 1268, and Bacon was thus again at the mercy of his enemies; but he still pursued his studies, and was allowed to remain free from open persecution up to 1278; but in that year Jerome of Ascoli, general of the Franciscan order, afterward pope under the title of Nicholas IV, was appointed legate to the court of France. Bacon, then sixty-four years old, was summoned to Paris, where a council of Franciscans, with Jerome at their head, condemned his writings, and committed him to close confinement. A confirmation of the proceeding was immediately obtained from the court of Rome. During ten years every effort made by him to procure his enlargement was without success; but, on the accession of Jerome (Nicholas IV), that which was not to be obtained from the justice of the pope was conceded to private

interest, and Bacon was at last restored to liberty by the intercession of some powerful nobles. Some say he died in prison; but the best authorities unite in stating that he returned to Oxford, where he wrote his *Compendium Theologiae*, and died June 11, 1291, or, as some say, a year and a half after Nicholas IV (who died April, 1292). The suspicion and fear of the monks followed the great man's books after his death; "the books were nailed to boards, so that they could not be read, and were left to rot amid dirt and damp."

Of the grandeur of Bacon's scientific intellect, and of the marvellous discoveries made by him, this is not the place to speak at length. Humboldt calls him the greatest apparition of the Middle Ages. In the depths of an age of tradition, he saw what *science* was, and devoted his life to its pursuit. In languages, he mastered Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and Arabic. He held, with Plato, that Mathematics is the mistress and key of all the sciences (*Opus Majus*, pt. 4). In twenty years he spent 2000 livres (a vast sum for that age) in books, apparatus, and experiments. As early as 1264 he sent the pope a proposal to rectify the Julian calendar — three centuries before the thing was done. "Roger Bacon, the vastest intellect that England has produced, studied nature as a natural philosopher rather than as a chemist, and the extraordinary discoveries he made in those branches of science are familiarly known: the rectification of the errors committed in the Julian calendar with regard to the solar year; the physical analysis of the action of lenses and convex glasses; the invention of spectacles for the aged; that of achromatic lenses; the theory and perhaps the first construction of the telescope. From the principles and laws laid down or partially apprehended by him, a system of unanticipated facts was sure to spring, as he himself remarked; nevertheless, his inquiries into chemical phenomena have not been without fruit for us. He carefully studied the properties of saltpetre, and if, in opposition to the ordinary opinion, he did not discover gunpowder, which had been explicitly described by Marcus Graecus fifty years before, he improved its preparation by teaching the mode of purifying saltpetre by first dissolving the salt in water and then crystallizing it. He also called attention to the chemical action of air in combustion" (Figuier, *L'Alchimie et les Alchimistes*, part 1, ch. 4, p. 80, 81).

The history of Bacon's writings is among the curiosities of literature. A number of his smaller works were printed before the 18th century, but his greatest writings waited until that date. Among the former are his

Perspectiva (Frank. 1614); *De Speculis* and *Specula Mathematica* (Frank. 1614, reprinted in 1671); *De Mirabili Potestate Artis et Naturae* (Paris, 1542); Girard, *De l'admirable Pouvoir, etc., ou est traicte de la Pierre Philosophale* (translation of the preceding) (Paris, 1557, reprinted in 1629); *Scripta quaedam de Arte Chemiae* (Frank. 1603 and 1620); *Speculum Alchemiae* and *De Secretis Operibus Artis et Naturae, et de Nullitate Magiae* (in vols. 2 and 5 of Zetzner's *Theatrum Chemicum,* Strasb. 1659, transl. by Girard, under the title *Misroir d'Alquimie,* Lyon, 1557; Paris, 1612 and 1627); *De retardandis Senectutis Accidentibus* (Oxf. 1590, translated by Dr. R. Browne, Lond. 1683). The greatest of his works were not published until 1733. A number of Bacon's MSS. were known to exist in the libraries of the Continent and of England, especially in the Cottonian Library and in that of Dublin, and Dr. Samuel Jebb, at the request of Richard Mead (court physician), edited and printed the *Opus Majus* (Lond. 1733, fol.). It is carefully done, but yet omits ch. 7 (the *Ethica*), and inserts other things not belonging to this book. Professor Ingram, of the University of Dublin, has discovered some of the missing part of the work, and a complete edition of his works is promised, as the British government intrusted the task to Professor Brewer, of King's College, who published vol. 1 in 1859, including the *Opus Minus, Opus Tertium, Compendium philosophiae,* and *de Nullitate Magiae* (large 8vo). The *Opus Minus* is an epitome and complement of the *Opus Majus;* the *Opus Tertium* is an enlargement of it. Cousin discovered a MS. of this last work in the library of Douai, and published an enthusiastic account of it and of Bacon in the *Journal des Savants,* 1848. Pursuing his researches, he found in the Amiens library a manuscript commenting on Aristotle. Cousin now appealed to England to vindicate the name of one of her greatest sons, and the result is seen in the edition announced above. A French scholar, M. Emile Charles, also devoted years of study and travel to Roger Bacon, and published *Roger Bacon, sa vie, ses oeuvres, ses doctrines, d'apres des textes inedits* (1862, 8vo).

Roger Bacon was the forerunner, in philosophy, of Lord Bacon, who borrowed largely from him, not only in method, but also even in details. The monk possessed, what the chancellor had not, the power of penetrating the secrets of nature. Lord Bacon promoted science by his method, but in actual application of the method he was a child. Roger Bacon anticipated him in the method, and was, at the same time, himself a great experimenter and successful inventor. On the relations between these

two great men, see Professor Holmes's excellent articles in the *Methodist Quarterly*, January and April, 1858, where the subject is more ably and thoroughly treated than by any other writer. Professor Holmes sums up as follows: "That Lord Bacon was anticipated by Roger Bacon in nearly everything that was most distinctive in the double forms of the same identical philosophy cannot be doubted after the copious illustrations given in this essay. That he borrowed directly and consciously from him is our own private conclusion; and that the forced loan amounted to plagiarism, and was levied, like one of James I's voluntary gifts from his people, forcibly and without acknowledgment, is also our conviction, though we will not demand from the public an absolute verdict to this effect. But we do claim that the highest honors which have been assigned to Francis Bacon are due to Roger Bacon and his contemporaries, and we do assert that the friar has been as harshly and unjustly dealt with by the lord chancellor of nature as Aubrey, and Egerton, and the other suitors in the court of equity were handled by the lord high chancellor of England."

"Throughout the whole of his writings Bacon is a strict Roman Catholic; that is, he expressly submits matters of opinion to the authority of the church, saying (Cott. MSS. cited by Jebb) that if the respect due to the vicar of the Savior (*vicarius Salvatoris*) alone, and the benefit of the world, could be consulted in any other way than by the progress of philosophy, he would not, under such experiments as lay in his way, proceed with his undertaking for the whole Church of God, however much it might entreat or insist. His zeal for Christianity, in its Latin or Western form, breaks out in every page; and all science is considered with direct reference to theology, and not otherwise. But, at the same time, to the credit of his principles, considering the book-burning, heretic-hunting age in which he lived, there is not a word of any other force except that of persuasion. He takes care to have both authority and reason for every proposition that he advances; perhaps, indeed, he might have experienced forbearance at the hand of those who were his persecutors, had he not so clearly made out prophets, apostles, and fathers to have been partakers of his opinions. 'But let not your serenity imagine,' he says, 'that I intend to excite the *clemency* of your holiness, in order that the papal majesty should employ force against weak authors and the multitude, or that my unworthy self should raise any stumbling-block to study' (*Penny Cyclopoedia*, s.v.). Indeed, the whole scope of the first part of the work is to prove, from authority and from reason, that philosophy and Christianity cannot disagree — a

sentiment altogether of his own revival, in an age in which all philosophers, and mathematicians in particular, were considered as at best of dubious orthodoxy. The effect of his writings on theology was to introduce a freer spirit, and to prepare the way for Wickliffe, Huss, and the later reformers. He combatted the one-sided supremacy of Aristotle, and even the authority of the fathers; he pointed out errors in their writings, and appealed to the original sources of theological knowledge. He was distinguished for his knowledge of languages, and made himself familiar with the original Scriptures. In a treatise on the advantages of grammar, he endeavored to prove the necessity of linguistic studies, in order better to understand the Bible, which, he said, every layman ought to study in the original. He disputed the authority of the Vulgate, in which he detected mistakes. The Bible, according to his view, ought to be the supreme law. to which every department of life and knowledge must be subjected. A reformatory germ lay in this exaltation of the Bible above the authority of the church and tradition, Theology he placed at the head of all the sciences; revelation is the completion and perfecting of human reason; in all knowledge, including philosophical and theological, harmony necessarily reigns. “Theology develops immediately the contents of Scripture; speculation is the link between Scripture and natural reason. It receives what is true in earlier speculation, and connects with it those truths which reason might indeed know of itself, but which it would never have found without the impulse which revelation gives it. Christian philosophy can therefore be reconciled with faith, since it asserts rational truths which every wise man admits, although if left to himself he would not have known them. This corresponds not only to Christian philosophy, but also to the Christian consciousness, which must bring all truth to divine truth, to be subordinate to it and serve it. *Propter conscientiam Christianam, quae valet omnem veritatem ducere ad divinam, ut ei subjiciatur et famuletur. Opus Majus*, p. 41.” (Neander, *History of Dogmas*, 2:554, 577.) See an essay by Saisset, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, also in Saisset’s *Precurseurs et disciples de Descartes* (Paris, 1862; transl. by Howland, in *American Presb. Review*, Oct. 1863); and, besides the works cited in the course of this article, see Daunou and Leclerc, in *Hist. Litt. de la France*, 20:230. Hoefer, *Histoire de la Chimie*, t. i, Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 3, 91; Ritter, *Geschichte d. Christlichen Philosophie*, 4:473 sq.; Gieseler, *Church Hist.* § 74; Neander, *Church Hist.* 4:424: *Biographia Britannica*, 4:616; Ingram, *On the Opus Majus of Roger Bacon* (Dublin, 1858, 8vo).

Bacon, Thomas

one of the early Episcopal ministers of America, was born in the Isle of Man about 1700, and was ordained deacon and priest 1744. He had previously been engaged in civil pursuits, and in 1737 published, by order of the chief commissioners and governors of the revenue of the kingdom, a volume entitled a "Complete System of Revenue in England." In 1745 he came to Maryland, and became pastor of the English church at Oxford, Talbot county. Here he labored faithfully both for whites and colored, and published in 1750 *Four Sermons on the Duties of Masters* (London, 12mo). They were republished in 1817 by the Rev. Dr. Meade (late bishop of Virginia), who, however, left out the title-page, the very valuable preface, and some other portions, in one place to the amount of six pages, and this, too, without a hint of any such omissions. In 1758 he was transferred to All Saints', Frederick county, a parish worth about £1000 per annum. In 1765 he published a *Collection of the Laws of Maryland* (1000 pp. fol.). He died May 24, 1768. — Sprague, *Annals*, v. 120; *Am. Quar. Church Review*, Oct. 1865.

Bacon, William

a Presbyterian (N. S.) minister, was born in Cherry Valley, N. Y., August, 1789, and graduated at Union College in 1815. He studied theology with Drs. Nott and Yates, and was ordained by the Presbytery of Buffalo in 1817. He served as pastor at Waterloo, Cayuga, Cortland, and Saratoga Springs, and as missionary in Troy, N.Y., and Philadelphia, Pa., and New Orleans, La. His later years were spent in retirement and affliction, but not in idleness; his time was taken up in writing for the press. Besides numerous contributions to periodicals, he published *Tracts on Episcopacy, Old and New School Presbyterianism, Salvation made Sure, Salvation in Earnest*, etc. He died April 2, 1863. — Wilson, *Presbyterian Hist. Almanac*, 1864, p. 283.

Baconthorp

SEE BACON, JOHN.

Baculariі

a sect of Anabaptists which sprung up in 1528, and was so called because its members believed that it was a sin to carry any other arms than a stick

(*baculus*)*;* and that it was forbidden to Christians to resist violence by violence, because our Lord orders him who is smitten on one cheek to offer the other; they also held it to be contrary to the spirit of Christianity to bring any one to justice. They are also called Steblevians. — Landon, *Eccl. Dict.* 1:693.

Bad

SEE LINEN.

Badby, John

an English mechanic, born in the 14th century, and who fell a martyr in the persecution against the Lollards, whose principles he had adopted. He replied to Arundel, the archbishop of Canterbury, who was disputing with him on transubstantiation, that. were the Host the body of God, there would be some 20,000 gods in England, while he believed but in one. He was burnt at Smithfield in 1409, and remained steadfast to the end.

Badcock, Samuel

an English theologian, born at South Molton, Devonshire in 1747, died at London in 1788. He was first a dissenting minister, but in 1787 took orders in the Church of England. He was a contributor to the *London Review, Monthly Review,* and several other periodicals. His review of Priestley's *History of the Corruptions of Christianity* (in *Monthly Review,* June and August, 1783) was generally regarded as the best refutation of Priestley's views. Priestley answered immediately ("*A Reply to the Animadversions, etc, in the Monthly Review for June,* 1783,"), and Badcock again replied by another article in the *Monthly Reviewer* (Sept. 1783). He also published in the *Gentleman's Magazine,* 1785, some memoirs of the Wesleys, charging them with Jacobitism, which John Wesley refuted. — Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors,* 1:98; Jones, *Christ. Biography,* s.v.; Wesley, *Works,* N.Y. ed. 7:256, 414.

Baden, Grand-Duchy Of

one of the minor German states. *SEE GERMANY*.

I. *Church History* — We have no precise information as to the first introduction of Christianity into the country now forming the grand-duchy of Baden. The reports of the missionary labors of Fridolin (q.v.) in the 6th

or 7th century, Trudprat in the Breisgau about 640, and Pirmins on the island of Reichenau, are largely mixed up with legends. Toward the beginning of the 8th century the majority of the population was converted, principally through the efforts of the bishops of Strasburg and Constance, which sees had been erected in the 7th century. The University of Heidelberg, in the Palatinate, was founded in 1386; that of Freiburg (then under Austrian rule) in 1456, both of which fostered a spirit of opposition to the corruptions in the Church. Under the influence of Tauler (q.v.) when preacher at Strasburg, and of the writings of Suso (q.v.), an association of pious mystics, the *Friends of God* (q.v.), labored zealously for evangelizing the lower classes of the people. Among other illustrious men who prepared, in this region, the way for the Reformation of the 16th century, we mention Jerome of Prague, John Wessel, Reuchlin, Agricola, and, later (1511), Wolfgang Capito. Of great influence was the visit of Luther and his disputation in April, 1518, and two years later he received assurances of the approbation of his writings from John von Botzheim in Constance, and Caspar Hedio (Heyd). Among the pioneers of evangelical preaching were Urban Regius, John Eberlin, Jacob Otter, Erhard Schnepf, etc.; among the first noblemen who embraced the doctrines of the Reformation, the Count von Wertheim and Goetz von Berlichingen. The bishops of Mentz, Wurzburg, and Spires, however, opposed the Reformation, especially after the promulgation of the Edict of Worms. In Freiburg some 2000 evangelical books were burnt in the presence of the minister, and many Protestants, both ministers and laymen, had to flee. In Constance, however, the citizens protected the works of Luther against the imperial edict, and John Wanner, a follower of Luther, became cathedral preacher. In the Austrian part of Baden, where Anabaptist and revolutionary movements mixed themselves up with the progress of the Reformation, the Austrian government succeeded in crushing out Protestantism altogether (Dec. 1525). After the Diet of Spires (1526) the Reformation made rapid progress in Wertheim, the Lowlands of Baden, Pforzheim, Durlach, and even in the Palatinate under the ministry of John Galling. Yet the opposition continued in the upper countries, and. in Freiburg Peter Speyler, preacher at Schlatt, was drowned in the Ill. In Constance, on the other hand, the Reformation was firmly established; clerical celibacy was abolished in 1525, and the bishops and chapter were compelled to leave. In 1530 Constance adopted the Tetrapolitan Confession, and joined the Schmalcaldian confederacy. After Margrave Philip’s death, 1535, the northern half became altogether Protestant, while the southern remained

Romish. In August, 1548, Constance was put under the ban of the empire for not accepting the Interim (q.v.), and the Romish worship was re-established, and persecutions commenced afresh, which did not end even at the peace of Augsburg (1555). Yet after that event, Margraves Charles II of Baden-Durlach, Philibert of Baden-Baden, and Duke Christopher of Wurtemberg aided the progress of Protestantism. Under the Elector Frederick III Calvinism was more particularly favored. In 1561 the elector introduced the Heidelberg Catechism, which he himself had composed with the aid of Olevianus and Ursinus, in the place of the catechisms of Luther and Brentz. In his possessions Calvinism was established, but in the other districts of Baden Lutheranism maintained the ascendency. The Romish worship was for a time reestablished in Baden-Baden by Duke Albrecht of Bavaria and Margrave Philip, successor of Philibert, who joined the Romish Church in his fifteenth year. The contest between the two evangelical confessions was renewed by the *Formula Concordance* (q.v.), till a union was effected in 1821 at a synod of the clergy and laity of both the churches. Since 1834, when the General Synod met again for the first time, this union has been confirmed by the introduction of a new catechism, a new *agenda* (q.v.), and a new hymn-book. In 1843 a supreme ecclesiastical council was created for the administration of ecclesiastical affairs. The greater portion of the clergy and people were pleased with the union: only a small body of Lutherans demanded the maintenance of the pure doctrines and practices of their church; and when they saw that their wishes could not be gratified in the State Church, they seceded. Several years of persecution, however, passed before they succeeded in obtaining legal recognition as a Lutheran Church. Within the State Church, in which, at the conclusion of this union, Rationalism prevailed, and was taught by men like Paulus (q.v.), a hot contest arose between the Rationalistic and evangelical parties. The General Synod of 1857 resolved to introduce after 1859 a new *agenda,* in which the liturgical part of divine service is considerably enlarged and the forms of prayer greatly changed (see Bahr, *Das Badische Kirchenbuch,* Carlsruhe, 1859). About the beginning of the 19th century, the more cultivated of the Roman clergy of Baden, under the guidance of such men as Wessenberg (q.v.), proposed many liberal reforms. Indeed a large portion of the priesthood demanded the abolition of celibacy, the introduction of the German language at divine service, the convocation of diocesan synods with lay delegations, and other reforms. The government desired to make Wessenberg the first archbishop of the newly-erected see of Freiburg, but could not obtain the papal confirmation.

A reaction in favor of ultramontane views commenced under the Archbishop Vicari (1844), and in 1853 a violent contest began between State and Church. The priests received one class of directions from the archbishop, and another from the supreme ecclesiastical council of the state. Some priests were arrested for siding with the archbishop, others were suspended ecclesiastically for obeying the government. The archbishop excommunicated the members of the Catholic supreme ecclesiastical council, and was himself arrested in 1854. The Legislature unwaveringly supported the government, which, however, showed itself anxious to conclude a compromise with the archbishop. Negotiations with Rome concerning a convention (concordat) were eagerly pursued in 1855, but were not concluded before 1859. The convention with Rome created a great deal of dissatisfaction among the people; the Chambers in 1860 decidedly refused to ratify it, and it was at length abandoned by the government also. *SEE CONCORDAT*.

II. *Ecclesiastical Statistics.* — The number of Roman Catholics was, in 1864, 933,476; of members of the Evangelical Church, 472,258; of Mennonites and other dissidents, 2554; of Israelites, 25,263. The Evangelical Church is divided into 28 dioceses (deaneries) and 330 parishes. All the pastors of a diocese, with half the number of lay deputies of the local church councils, meet every third year in a synod. In the year after the meeting of a synod, all the clergymen of a diocese meet under the presidency of the dean for the discussion of moral questions; and in the third year a school convention is held in a similar manner for discussing the affairs of the primary schools, which in Baden, as in every German state, have a denominational character, and are subject to the control of the clergy. The General Synod meets regularly every seventh year, but may at any time be convoked by order of the grand-duke. Every two dioceses elect a clerical delegate, and every four dioceses a lay delegate. The grand-duke adds to this number of delegates two clerical and two lay members of the supreme ecclesiastical council, one professor of the theological faculty of Heidelberg, and a commissary who presides. A theological faculty is connected with the University of Heidelberg: it has counted among its members some of the most distinguished theologians of Germany, such as Rothe, Schenkel, Umbreit, and Ullmann. The two latter are known in the literary world as the founders of the best German theological quarterly, the *Studien und Kritiken.* Connected with the theological faculty is also an evangelical *Preachers' Seminary,* at which every native candidate for the

ministry must spend one year. For the training of teachers there is a Protestant Normal School. The Roman Catholic Church, under the Archbishop of Freiburg, has 35 deaneries, with 747 parishes, 2 normal schools, and a theological faculty connected with the University of Freiburg. The liberal school among the Roman clergy is dying out. A theological quarterly was for some years published by the theological faculty of Freiburg, but is discontinued. The most celebrated Roman theologians in the present century have been Hug and Hirscher; a Romanist writer of great influence among the people is Alban Stolz. Some convents of nuns have been established since 1848. The Lutheran seceders from the State Church (old Lutheran Church) had, in 1859, three parishes with about 900 members. The principal work on the history of Protestantism in Baden is Vierordt, *Geschichte der Evangelischen Kirche in Baden.* See also Wiggers, *Kirchl. Statistik,* 2:203, 207; Schein, *Eccles. Year-book.*

Bader, Johannes

one of the German reformers of the 16th century, was born about 1490. He was the tutor of Duke Ludwig II of Zweibrucken, and subsequently (after 1518) pastor of Landau, a town in the Bavarian Palatinate. He adhered to the Reformation in 1521, and worked for its introduction into Landau with such zeal and success, that at the time of his death only a few canons and monks of the Augustine convent remained in connection with the Roman Catholic Church. Bader was one of the first reformers who published an outline of the doctrines held by the reformed churches (*Ein Gesprach-Buchlein vom Anfange des christlichen Lebens,* Strasburg, 1526) several years before the appearance of Luther’s catechisms. In 1527 he wrote a pamphlet against the Anabaptists, and especially against the learned Denck. His views on the Lord’s Supper were nearly the same as those of Zuinglius and Bucer, and a tabular summary of them (*Summarium und Rechenschaft vom Abentmahl unseres Herrn J. C.*) was printed in 1533 at Strasburg on one side of a folio sheet. He was, in general, like his friend Bucer, for a reconciliation of the reformatory parties. In later years Bader was on friendly terms with Schwenkfeld, who visited him at Landau, and most of his friends at Strasburg and Zweibrucken were on this account greatly displeased with him. Bader died in August, 1545. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie,* Supplem. 1:160.

Badger

Picture for Badger 1

is the interpretation in the Auth. Vers. of the word vj T¦ *tach'ash* (26160Ezekiel 16:10; Sept. δέρματα ὑακίνθινα*;* Aid. ed. ἰάνθινα*;* Compl. ὑάνθινα, al. πεπυρωμένα in 02515Exodus 25:5; Alex. δέρματα ἅγια in 02507Exodus 35:7; ὑάκινθος, Aq. and Sym. ἰάνθινα in 26160Ezekiel 16:10; Vulg. *pelles ianthinoe, ianthinus*)*;* but many doubt its correctness, since the badger is not found in Southern Asia, and has not as yet been noticed out of Europe. The word occurs in the plural form in 02515Exodus 25:5; 26:14; 35:7, 23; 36:19; 39:34; 04406Numbers 4:6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 25; and, in connection with t rfo *oroth',* "skins," is used to denote the covering of the Tabernacle, of the Ark of the Covenant, and of other sacred vessels. In 26160Ezekiel 16:10, it indicates the material of which the shoes of women were made. Possibly the Latin *taxus* or *taxo,* the original of the Spanish *taxon,* Ital. *tasso,* Fr. *taisson,* Germ. *Dachs,* is the same word as *tachash;* and these designate the badger. This, however, appears to be the only support for the rendering "badger" (*meles tarus*) besides that of the Chaldee paraphrast (anwqs¦ "*taxus,* sic dictus quia gaudet et superbit in coloribus multis," Buxtorf, *Lex. Rab.* s.v.). *SEE ZOOLOGY.*

Picture for Badger 2

Picture for Badger 3

The ancient interpreters understand by it a color given to leather, e.g. Sept. ὑακίνθινα*:* so Aquila, Symmachus, and the Syriac, which are followed by Bochart (*Hieroz.* 2:387), Rosenmüller (*Schol. ad V. T.,* 02515Exodus 25:5; 26160Ezekiel 16:10), Bynaeus (*De Calceis Hebraeorum,* lib. 1, ch. 3), Scheuchzer (*Phys. Sacr.* in 02515Exodus 25:5), and others. Parkhurst (*Heb. Lex.* s.v.), observes that "an outermost covering for the tabernacle of azure or sky-blue was very proper to represent the sky or azure boundary of the system." But this is mere conjecture. The Talmudists say that it is an animal like a *weasel.* Others, as Gesner and Harenberg (in *Musaeo Brem.* 2:312), have thought that some kind of wolf, known by the Greek name θώς, and the Arabic *Shaghul* is intended. Hasaeus (in *Dissert. Philolog. Sylloge.* diss. 9, § 17) and Bisching, in his preface to the Epitome of Scheuchzer's *Physica Sacra,* are of opinion that *tachash* denotes a cetacean animal, the *Trichechus manatus* of Linnaeus, which, however, is

only found in America and the West Indies. Others, with Sebald Ran (*Comment. de iis quae ex Arab. in usum Tabernac. fuerunt repetita,* Traj. ad Rhen. 1753, ch. 2), are in favor of *tachash* representing some kind of seal (*Phoca vitulina,* Lin.). Dr. Geddes (*Crit. Rem.* on Exodus 25:5) is of the same opinion. Gesenius understands (*Heb. Lex.* s.v.) some "kind of seal or badger, or other similar (!) creature." Of modern writers Dr. Kitto (*Pict. Bibl.* on Exodus 25:5) thinks that *tachash* denotes some clean animal, as in all probability the skin of an unclean animal would not have been used for the sacred coverings. The corresponding Arabic word is not only *a dolphin,* but also *a seal,* and seals (?) were numerous on the shores of the peninsula of Sinai (Strab. 16:776). The etymology of the word in Hebrews is favorable to this view, from the root חשׁך *chashah',* to *rest;* and seals no less than badgers are somnolent animals. (See Simonis *Exercitatio de* תחשׁ Hal. 1735.) Maurer, however (*Comment. in Exod.*), derives it from the root תחשׁ *tachash',* to *penetrate,* a notion which suits the burrowing of the badger as well as the plunging of the seal. Pliny (2:56) mentions the use of the skins of seals as a covering for tents, and as a protection from lightning. (Comp. Plut. *Symp.* v. 9; Sueton. *Octav.* 90; Faber, *Archaeol. Hebr.* 1:115.) The *tachash* has also been identified with the *Trichechus marinus* of Linnaeus, and with the sea-cow called *lamantin* or *dugong.* Others find it in an animal of the hyena kind, which is called by the Arabs *tahesh* (Botta's *Voyage in Yemen,* 1841). Robinson (*Researches,* 1:171) mentions sandals made of the thick skin of a fish which is caught in the Red Sea. It is a species of halicore, named by Ehrenberg (*Symb. Phys.* 2) *Halicora Hemprichii.* The skin is clumsy and coarse, and might answer very well for the external covering of the Tabernacle. According to Ehrenberg, the Arabs on the coast call this animal *Naka* and *Lottum.* Arabian naturalists applied the term *ensan alma,* "'man of the sea," to this creature. Thevenot speaks of a kind of sea-man, which is taken near the port of Tor. "It is a great strong fish, and hath two hands, which are like the hands of a man, saving that the fingers are joined together with a skin, like the foot of a goose; but the skin of the fish is like the skin of a wild goat or chamois. When they spy that fish, they strike him on the back with harping irons, as they do whales, and so kill him. They use the skin of it for making bucklers, which are musket-proof." Niebuhr adds the information that "a merchant of Abushahr called *dahash* that fish which the captains of English ships call *porpoise.*" The same traveler reports that he saw prodigious schools of these animals swimming. Professor Ruppell (*Mus.*

Senck. 1:113, t. 6), who saw the creature on the coral banks of the Abyssinian coast, ascertained by personal examination that the creature in question was a sort of dugong, a genus of marine Pachydermata, to which he gave the name of *Halicore tabernaculi,* from a conviction that it was the *tachash* of Moses. It grows to eighteen feet in length. See WHALE.

"In the present state of zoological knowledge, however, it is not necessary to refute the notions that *tachash* was the name of a mermaid or *homo-marinus,* or of the walrus, a Polar animal, or of the *dugong* or seal, for neither of these is known in the Indian, Red, or Persian Seas, and there is little probability that in remote ages they frequented the south-east extremity of the Mediterranean, where the current sweeps all things northward; still less that they nestled in the lakes of the Delta, where crocodiles then abounded. But Niebuhr's hint respecting the name *tachash,* given, with some reference to colors, to a species of delphinus or porpoise, by the Arabs near Cape Mussendum, may deserve consideration, since the same people still make small rounded bucklers and soles of sandals of the *hout's* skin, which is a cetaceous animal, perhaps identical with Niebuhr's. This material might have been obtained from the caravan-traders of Yemen, or from the Ismaelites of Edom, but does not appear to have been fitted for other purposes than pack-saddles and sandal-soles. Considering *tachash,* therefore, not to indicate a color, but the skin of an animal, which may have derived its name from its color, probably deep gray, ash, or slaty (*hysginus*), we must look for the object in question to the zoology of the region around, or to places accessible by means of the traders and tribute importations of raw materials in Egypt, where we actually observe leopard or panther skins, and others of a smaller animal with a long fox-tail, represented in the triumphal procession of Thothmes III at Thebes (Wilkinson's *Anc. Egyptians,* 1, pl. 4). These may have been of a canine genus, such as the agriodus, or megalotis Lalandii, which is actually iron-gray; or of a viverrous species, of which there are many in Africa both gray and spotted. Still these are unclean animals, and for this reason we turn to another view of the case, which may prove the most satisfactory that can now be obtained. Negroland and Central and Eastern Africa contain a number of ruminating animals of the great antelope family; they are known to the natives under various names, such as *pacasse, empacasse, thacasse, facasse,* and *tachaitze,* all more or less varieties of the word *tachash;* they are of considerable size, often of slaty and purple-gray colors, and might be termed stag-goats and ox-goats. Of these one or more occur in the

hunting-scenes on Egyptian monuments, and therefore we may conclude that the skins were accessible in abundance, and may have been dressed with the hair on for coverings of baggage, and for boots, such as we see worn by the human figures in the same processions. Thus we have the greater number of the conditions of the question sufficiently realized to enable us to draw the inference that *tachash* refers to a ruminant of the Aigocerine or Damaline groups, most likely of an iron-gray or slaty-colored species" *SEE ANTELOPE*.

Bag

Picture for Bag

a purse or pouch. The following words in the original are thus rendered in the English version of the Bible:

1. Fyrjæ; *charit', a pocket* (Sept. θύλακος, Vulg. *saccus*), the "bags" in which Naaman bound up the two talents of silver for Gehazi (<121523>2 Kings 5:23), probably so called, according to Gesenius, from their long. cone-like shape. The word only occurs besides in <230322>Isaiah 3:22 (A. V. "crisping-pins"), and there denotes the reticules carried by the Hebrew ladies.

2. syK, *kis* (Sept. μάρσιππος, μαρσύπιον, Vulg. *sacculus, saccellus*), a *bag* for carrying weights (<051513>Deuteronomy 25:13; <201611>Proverbs 16:11; <330611>Micah 6:11); also used as a *purse* (<201114>Proverbs 1:14; <234606>Isaiah 46:6); hence a *cup* (<202331>Proverbs 23:31).

3. ylK; *keli'* (Sept. κάδιον, Vulg. *pera*), translated "bag" in <091740>1 Samuel 17:40, 49, is a word of most general meaning, and is generally rendered "vessel" or "instrument." In <014225>Genesis 42:25, it is the "sack" in which Jacob's sons carried the corn which they brought from Egypt, and in <090907>1 Samuel 9:7; 21:5, it denotes a bag or wallet for carrying food (A. V. "vessel;" compare <070705>Judges 10:5; 13:10, 15). The shepherd's "bag" which David had seems to have been worn by him as necessary to his calling, and was probably, from a comparison of <381115>Zechariah 11:15, 16 (where A.V. "instruments" is the same word), for the purpose of carrying the lambs which were unable to walk or were lost, and contained materials for healing such as were sick and binding up those that were broken (comp. <263404>Ezekiel 34:4, 16).

4. rwrx *tseror'* (Sept. ἔνδεσμος, δεσμός, Vulg. *sacculus*), properly a "bundle" (<01425>Genesis 42:35; <01359>1 Samuel 25:29), appears to have been used by travelers for carrying money during a long journey (<20720>Proverbs 7:20; <37106>Haggai 1:6; compare <42133>Luke 12:33; Tob. 9:5). In such "bundles" the priests bound up the money which was contributed for the restoration of the Temple under Jehoiada (<12210>2 Kings 12:10; A. V. "put up in bags")

5. The "bag" (γλωσσόκομον, Vulg. *loculi*) which Judas carried was probably a small box or chest (<43106>John 12:6; 13:29). The Greek word is the same as that used in the Sept. for "chest" in <14408>2 Chronicles 24:8, 10,11, and originally signified a box used by musicians for carrying the mouthpieces of their instruments.

6. The βαλάντιον, or *wallet* (<42104>Luke 10:4; 12:33; 22:35, 36). Of these terms it will only be necessary here to discuss one application, which they all sustain, i.e. as a receptacle for money. The money deposited in the treasuries of Eastern princes, or intended for large payments, or to be sent to a government as taxes or tribute, is collected in long, narrow bags or purses, each containing a certain amount of money, and sealed with the official seal. As the money is counted for this purpose, and sealed with great care by officers properly appointed, the bag or purse passes current, as long as the seal remains unbroken, for the amount marked thereon. In the receipt and payment of large sums, this is a great and important convenience in countries where the management of large transactions by paper is unknown, or where a currency is chiefly or wholly of silver; it saves the great trouble of counting or weighing loose money. This usage is so well established that, at this day, in the Levant, "a purse" is the very name for a certain amount of money (now twenty-five dollars), and all large payments are stated in "purses." The antiquity of this custom is attested by the monuments of Egypt, in which the ambassadors of distant nations are represented as bringing their tributes in sealed bags of money to Thothmes III; and we see the same bags deposited intact in the royal treasury (Wilkinson, 1:148, abridgm.). When coined money was not used, the seal must have been considered a voucher not only for the amount, but for the purity of the metal. The money collected in the Temple, in the time of Joash, seems to have been made up into bags of equal value after this fashion, which were probably delivered sealed to those who paid the workmen (2 Kings, 12:10; comp. also <12252>2 Kings 5:23; Tobit 9:5; 11:16). *SEE MONEY*.

Bagger, Hans Olesan

a Danish theologian, born at Lund in 1646, became bishop of Zealand in 1675, and died at Copenhagen in 1693. He is the author of the Danish Church-Ritual, which was introduced in 1686, and of a revised altar-book, both of which are still in use in the Danish Church. Being consulted by the Danish government as to whether the interest of the Lutheran Church allowed the admission to Denmark of the French Calvinists, who had been expelled by Louis XIV, he answered in the negative, because such an admission "would expose the souls of the Lutherans to temptation and to the risk of everlasting damnation." — Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon,* s.v.

Ba'go

(Βαγώ), the head of one of the Israelitish families ("sons"), to which is assigned the Uthi, son of Istalcuriorus, who returned from the captivity (1 Esdras 8:40); evidently the BIGVAI *SEE BIGVAI* (q.v.) of the true text (1Esdras 8:14Ezra 8:14).

Bago'as

(Βαγώας), the eunuch (or chamberlain) who had charge of the tent of Holofernes, and introduced Judith (Judith 12:11, 13, 15; 13:1, 3; 14:14). The name is said (Pott, *Etymol. Forsch.* 1, 37) to be equivalent to *eunuch* in Persian (Pliny *Hist. Nat.* 13:4, 9), and, as such, was probably a title of office rather than a personal appellation (see Quintil. v. 12; comp. Burmann ad *Ovid. Am.* 2:2, 1). Accordingly, we find the name often recurring in Eastern history (see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v.) even so late as that of the chief eunuch of Herod's harem, who was put to death for intriguing with the Pharisees (Josephus, *Ant.* 17:2, 4 ad fin.).

Bag'oi

(Βαγοΐ), one of the Israelitish family heads, whose "sons" (to the number of 2066) returned from the exile (1 Esdras 5:14); evidently the BIGVAI *SEE BIGVAI* (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (1Esdras 2:14Ezra 2:14).

Bagoses

(Βαγώσης), the general of Artaxerxes (probably Mnemon; the text, as emended by Hudson, has τοῦ ἄλλου Ἀρταξέρξου v. r. τοῦ Ἄχου

Ἀρτ.); he sacrilegiously entered the Temple at Jerusalem, and imposed oppressive taxes upon the Jews (Josephus, *Ant.* 11:7,1).

Bagot, Lewis

a bishop of the Church of England, Was born in 1740. He was a son of Lord Bagot. After studying at the University of Oxford, he became a canon, and later, successively bishop of Bristol, Norwich, and St. Asaph. He died in 1802. He is the author of numerous theological works, the most important of which is *Twelve Discourses on the Prophecies concerning the First Establishment and subsequent History of Christianity, preached at the Warburtonian Lecture, in Lincoln's Inn Chapel,* 1780. — Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors,* 1:99; Hoefer, *Biographie Generale,* 4:168.

Bagshaw, William

a Nonconformist minister, was born in 1628, and died in 1702. His zeal in the northern parts of Derbyshire acquired for him the title of "the Apostle of the Peak." He published *Water for a Thirsty Soul,* in several sermons on Revelation 21:6 (1653), and a number of other works. Some 50 of his works, upon various subjects, have never been printed. — Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors,* 1:99.

Baha'rumite

(Heb. with the art. *hab-Bacharumi',* ymrjBhi; Sept. ὁ Βαρσαμί v. r. Βαρωμί), an epithet of Azmaveth, one of David's warriors (1 Chronicles 11:33); doubtless as being a native of BAHURIM *SEE BAHURIM* (q.v.).

Bahat

SEE MARBLE.

Bahr, Joseph Friedrich

a German theologian, was born in 1713, and died in 1775. He became, in 1739, deacon at Bischofswerda; in 1741, pastor at Schonfeld; and, after filling several other church positions, finally became superintendent. He wrote, among other works against the Socinians, *Abhandlung der reinena Lehre unserer ecangelischen Kirche von der Sterblichkeit und dem*

leiblichen Tode des menschlichen Geschlechtes: a life of Christ (*Lebensgeschichte Jesu Christi*), 1772. — Hoefer, *Biog. Geaneale,* 4:172.

Bahrdt, Karl Friedrich

a German Rationalist, notorious for his bold infidelity and for his evil life, was born Aug. 25,1741, at Bischofswerda, Saxony. He studied at Pforta and at Leipzig, where his father was professor of theology. The old Lutheran faith was still taught there; but Ernesti was one of the professors, and a new era was dawning. Bahrdt first imbibed Crusius's (q.v.) philosophical orthodoxy. In 1761 he became master, and began to lecture, and did it fluently and with applause, on dogmatic theology. He soon became very popular, also, from his eloquence in the pulpit. In 1768 he was compelled to resign as professor ext. of theology on account of a charge of adultery, and it is clear that even thus early he was leading a very immoral life. Through the influence of Klotz, a man of kindred spirit, he was made professor of Biblical archaeology at Erfurt; but he soon fell into ill repute there, and next obtained a chair at Giessen. Here he abandoned the doctrines of the Trinity and the Atonement, and published several books which brought down the wrath even of Semler (q.v.). After many wanderings to and fro in search of fame and wealth, of which he was always greedy, yet always poor, he returned to Halle in 1779. His career here for ten years was erratic and disgraceful; he wrote books, lectured when he could get hearers, and opened a tavern in a vineyard, with the assistance of his maid, who lived with him as his wife, though his own good wife was yet alive. In 1789 he was imprisoned. He died near Halle, April 23, 1792. He was the living type and illustration of the vulgar rationalism of his age. His writings were very numerous (nearly 150 in number), but are of no critical or theological value, and therefore need not be enumerated. — Kahnis, *German Protestantism,* ch. 2, p. 130; Hurst, *History of Rationalism,* p. 139-142.

Bahu'rim

(Heb. *Bachurim',* µyrjB; or [in 2Sa 3:16; 19:17] µyrwjB; *low grounds,* otherwise *young men's* village; Sept. Βαουρίμ, but Βαχουρίμ [v. r. Βαρακίμ] in 2Sa 3:16; Josephus Βαχουρής, *Ant.* 7:9, 7, ed. Havercamp; for other var. readings, see Reland, *Palaest.* p. 614), a place not far from Jerusalem, of which the slight notices remaining connect it almost exclusively with the flight of David

(q.v.) from his son Absalom (q.v.). It was apparently on or close to the road leading up from the Jordan valley to Jerusalem. Shimei, the son of Gera, resided here (2 Samuel 17:18; 1 Kings 2:8), and from the village, when David, having left the "top of the mount" behind him, was making his way down the eastern slopes of Olivet into the Jordan valley below. Shimei issued forth, and running along (Josephus διατρεχων) on the side or "rib" of the hill over against the king's party, flung his stones and dust, and foul abuse (16:5), with a virulence which is to this day exhibited in the East toward fallen greatness, however eminent it may previously have been. Here in the court of a house was the well in which Jonathan and Ahimaaz eluded their pursuers (17:18). In his account of the occurrence, Josephus (*Ant.* 7:9, 7) distinctly states that Bahurim lay off the main road (παῖδες ἐκτραπέντες τῆς ὁδοῦ), which agrees well with the account of Shimei's behavior. Here Phaltiel, the husband of Michal, bade farewell to his wife on her return to king David at Hebron (2 Samuel 3:16). Bahurim must have been near the southern boundary of Benjamin; but it is not mentioned in the lists in Joshua, nor is any explanation given of its being Benjamite, as, from Shimei's residing there, we may conclude it was. In the Targum Jonathan on 2 Samuel 16:5, we find it given as *Almon* (ˆmdb][); but the situation of Almon (see Joshua 21:18) will not at all suit the requirements of Bahurim. Dr. Barclay conjectures that the place lay where some ruins (apparently those called *Kubbeh* on Van de Velde's *Map,* near the remains of *Deir es-Sid,* as in Robinson's *Researches,* 2:109) still exist close to a *Wady Ruwaby,* which runs in a straight course for three miles from Olivet toward Jordan, offering the nearest, though not the best route (*City of the Great King,* p. 563). AZMAVETH "the Barhumite" (2 Samuel 23:31), or "the Baharumite" (1 Chronicles 11:33), one of the heroes of David's guard, is the only native of Bahurim that we hear of except Shimei. — Smith, s.v.

Baier, John William

a Lutheran divine, born at Nuremberg in 1647. He was a member of several German universities, and rector and theological professor of the University of Halle, where he died in 1694. He wrote, *Compendium Theologie Positive* (Jena, 1686, 8vo, often reprinted): — De *Purgatorio* (Jena, 1677, 4to): — *De Aqua lustrali Pontiffciorum* (Jena, 1692, 4to): — *Collatio doctrince Quackerorum et Protestantium* (Jena, 1694, 4to): —

Biog. Univ. 3, 223; Winer, *Theol. Literatur.* — *Landon, Eccles. Dictionary*, s.v.

Bail

(Heb. בָּרַב; *arab'*, to *become surety;* Gr. ἐγγυᾶσθαι), as a legal regulation, does not occur in the Mosaic civil polity, nor is the word found in the Auth. Vers. of the Scriptures; but the custom nevertheless prevailed among the (later) Hebrews, as is evident from the many allusions to it in the Book of Proverbs. Indeed, these maxims are evidence of great rigor in the enforcement of such obligations (<20115>Proverbs 11:15; 17:18; 22:26), and recommend great caution (6 sq.) in view of the fact that the security was treated quite as severely as the debtor (comp. the Mishna, *Baba Bathra,* 10:7) in whose stead he was held (<20206>Proverbs 20:16; 22:27). A somewhat milder sentiment is expressed in the Apocrypha (Sir. 29:17), yet not without a warning to prudence (8 16; 29:21 [24]). *SEE SURETY*.

Bailey, Jacob

a "frontier missionary" of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Rowley, Mass., 1731. He graduated at Harvard in 1755, and in 1758 was licensed to preach by the Congregational Association at Exeter, N. H. In 1759 he left the Congregational Church, and embarked for England, to be ordained for the ministry in the Church of England. In March of the following year he was ordained, and appointed a missionary of the "Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts" to Pownalboro', Me. He immediately returned and entered on his duties. Taking the side of England in the Revolution, he escaped to Halifax, N. S., in 1779, and labored as a missionary there and at Cornwallis until his death, July 26, 1808. See Bartlet, *Life of Rev. Jacob Bailey* (N. Y. 8vo). — Sprague, *Annals,* v. 204.

Bailey, John

Congregational minister, was born in Lancashire, England, Feb. 24, 1644, studied under Dr. J. Harrison, and entered the ministry at Chester, 1666. As a Nonconformist, he was imprisoned in Lancashire jail for some time, and after his release he went to Limerick, Ireland, where he labored faithfully as pastor for 14 years. The office of chaplain to the Duke of Ormond, with the promise of a deanery and bishopric, was tendered to him on condition of conforming to the Established Church, but he refused. He was finally imprisoned, and only released on a promise to leave the

country. About 1684 he came to New England, and was ordained minister of the Congregational Society at Watertown, October 6, 1686, with his brother, Thomas Bailey, as his assistant. He removed to Boston in 1692, and became assistant to Mr. Allen, of the First Church, in 1693. Here he labored, as his failing health would allow, till his death, December 12, 1697. He was a man of eminent piety and exemplary life. A volume of his discourses was published in 1689. — Sprague, *Annals*, 1:201.

Baillet, Adrian

a Romanist writer of repute, was born at Neuville, near Beauvais, June 13th, 1649, and was educated at a Franciscan convent. He afterward studied at Beauvais, and in 1676 was admitted to holy orders. For a time he served a cure; but, feeling himself to be unsuited for this kind of life, he left it, and took the charge of the library of M. de Lamoignon, the advocate general, with whom he passed the remainder of his days, and died January 21st, 1706. His works are: *Jugement des Savans* (4 vols.). The work was to have consisted of seven parts; the first is a kind of preface to the other, and gives general rules for forming a sound judgment of a work; the other six parts were to have contained his own opinions and the judgments of others concerning works of every kind; but he only finished a small part of his design. This work was reprinted, revised, at Paris (7 vols. 4to, 1722); and Amsterdam (1725, 17 vols. 12mo): — *Life of Descartes* (1692): — *Treatise on Devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary* (1693). This work was condemned at Rome in 1695, and denounced to the Sorbonne as soon as it appeared as derogating from the worship due to the Virgin: — *Les Vies des Saints*, his most celebrated work, printed in 1701, in 3 vols. fol. and in 12 vols. 8vo; and reprinted in 1704 and 1708 with the addition of the *Histoire des Fetes Mobiles* and *Les Vies des Saints de l'Ancien Testament*, in 4 vols. fol. and 17 vols. 8vo. These last editions are the most highly esteemed. Baillet also published several less important works, and left thirty-five folio volumes in MS., containing the catalogue of the library of Lamoignon. During the twenty-six years that he was librarian to that gentleman, he only went out once a week; all the rest of his time he spent in reading or conversing with the savans. He slept only five hours, and most frequently in his clothes. — Biog. *Univ.* 3, 226; Landon, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v.

Baillie (Or Bailey), Robert

a Scotch theologian, was born at Glasgow, April 30, 1602, and educated at the university of that town. During the rebellion he was an active opponent of Episcopacy, and he obtained much credit for his refusal in 1C37 to preach before the General Assembly in favor of the liturgy and canons, which the king was desirous to introduce into Scotland. In 1638 he was appointed a member of the assembly held at Glasgow, where the *Covenant* was agreed upon, and in 1640 he was deputed to London to carry the accusations of the lords of the covenant against Laud. In 1642 he was appointed professor of divinity in the University of Glasgow. In 1643 he was sent as one of the commissaries of the Scotch Presbyterians to the assembly at Westminster. He execrated the murder of the king, and denounced it as a horrible parricide, and was always faithful to the house of Stuart. Charles II would have made him bishop, but, true to his principles, Baillie refused this. He was said to know twelve or thirteen languages, and wrote very pure Latin. In 1661 he was appointed principal of the university. In 1662 he died. Of Baillie's works, the most important are, *Dissuasive from the Errors of the Time* (4to, *Lond.* 1645): — *Anabaptism, the true Fountain of Independency, Brownism, Antinomy, Familism,* etc. (a second part of the *Dissuasive,* 4to, Lond. 1647): — *Appendix Practica ad Joannis Buxtorfii Epitomen Grammaticae Hebroeae* (8vo, Edinb. 1653):*Operis Historici et Chronologici Libri Duo* (fol. Amst. 1663, and Basil, 1669). He also published several sermons and other short tracts. But of all the produce of his pen, by far the most interesting part consists of his *Letters,* written to various friends, which throw much light on the history of the times. A complete edition was produced under the care of David Laing, Esq. (in 3 vols. crown 8vo, Edinb. 1841-42), with annotations and a life of Baillie. See Hetherington, *Church of Scotland,* 2:135.

Bainbridge Or Bambridge, Christopher

archbishop of York, and cardinal-priest of the Roman Church, was born at Hilton, in Westmoreland, and educated at Queen's College, Oxford, of which he became provost in 1495. He was afterward a liberal benefactor to his college. In 1503 he became dean of York; in 1505 dean of Windsor. In 1507 he was advanced to the see of Durham, and was translated the next year to the archbishopric of York. Bainbridge distinguished himself chiefly by his embassy from King Henry VIII to Pope Julius II, who created him cardinal of St. Praxede in March, 1511. His letter to King Henry VIII

concerning the pope's bull, giving him the title of Most Christian King, is extant in Rymer's *Faedera* (edit. 1704-1735, 13:376). Cardinal Bainbridge died at Rome, July 14, 1514. His death was caused by poison administered by Rinaldo de Modena, a priest whom he had employed in menial offices, and who, after confessing that he was suborned to this act by Sylvester de Giglis, bishop of Worcester, who was at that time envoy from King Henry VIII to Rome, committed suicide. See *Engl. Cyclop.* s.v.; *Biog. Britan.* ed. 1778, 1:515; Wood, *Athenae Oxon.* ed. Bliss, 2:702.

Baines, Ralph

was born in Yorkshire, and educated at St. John's College, Cambridge: he was eminent as a Hebraist, and was made regius professor of Hebrew at Paris. In 1554 he was made bishop of Lichfield and Coventry; in 1559 he was ejected by Quean Elizabeth, and very shortly after died at Islington. He wrote a *Commentary on the Proverbs,* 1555, and a few Hebrew works. — Godwin, *De Procs. Angliae,* p. 324.

Baird, Robert

D.D., an eminent Presbyterian minister and philanthropist, was born in Fayette Co., Penn., October 6, 1798. After academical training at Uniontown, he entered Washington College, and passed thence to Jefferson College, where he graduated in 1818. After spending a year as a teacher in Bellefonte, where he was a frequent newspaper contributor, he entered the theological seminary at Princeton, where he studied for three years, officiating one year as tutor in the college. In 1822 he was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of New Brunswick, and in the same year took charge of an academy in Princeton, which position he held for five years. In 1828 he was ordained to the work of the Gospel ministry. In 1827 he entered upon the great field of all his subsequent labors — "the extension of Protestantism and the evangelization of the world, in connection with the great religious and benevolent societies." He took a leading part in the movement made by the New Jersey Bible Society to supply every destitute family in New Jersey with the Scriptures. This plan was carried into execution successfully. Next, as agent of the New Jersey Missionary Society, Dr. Baird did much to lay the foundation of public education in that state, and originated the first system of common schools established in the state, which, with few modifications, still remains in force. In 1829 he became agent of the American Sunday-school Union, and for five years he

held meetings all over the country, doing much to advance the influence of the society, and adding largely to its funds. In 1835 Dr. Baird went to Europe, and resided in Paris and Geneva, with the exception of a few months, for the next eight years. His primary object was to ascertain what the American churches could do to revive the Protestant faith where it had lost its vitality, and to convert the Roman Catholics. Among the results of his labors was the formation of the Foreign Evangelical Society, since merged into the American and Foreign Christian Union, of which he was one of the founders. In the Scandinavian countries, in Russia and in Germany, he met with extraordinary success in giving an impulse to the temperance reform. His exertions in behalf of the Bible and Tract Societies were confined to no single country of Europe, while his intercessions for the persecuted were put forth alike in Protestant Sweden and in Roman Catholic France. The recent translation and publication of the Sacred Scriptures in the modern Russ, under the auspices of the imperial government, are believed to have been greatly attributable to Dr. Baird's strenuous personal efforts. To the cause of Protestantism, of temperance, and of education, Dr. Baird was enthusiastically devoted. Possessed of a fine personal appearance, an amiable disposition, and rare affability of manner, an accomplished linguist, and a man of broad information, Dr. Baird had a large personal acquaintance among the great and good men of America and Europe. He was admitted to interviews and discussions with all the monarchs that rule the destinies of the Old World. His thorough honesty and sincerity, his pure religious character, and his unbounded charity, stamped him as a man who could give counsel to kings, and who had access by right to every source of influence and power. In 1843 he returned to America, continuing to be corresponding secretary of the Foreign Evangelical Society and of the American and Foreign Christian Union (with slight interruption, and making several visits to Europe) to the time of his death, March 15, 1863.

This brief sketch suffices to show Dr. Baird as an indefatigable laborer. His sympathies were eminently catholic, and his activities were cosmopolitan. His name, and even his person, were known to all Protestant branches of the church throughout the United States and Europe. Amid his incessant missionary labors and travels he found time also for a large literary activity. Besides numerous reports for the benevolent societies with which he was connected, and many contributions to newspapers, magazines, and reviews, he wrote *A View of the Valley of the Mississippi* (Phila. 1832, 12mo);

Memoir of Anna Jane Linnard (Phila. 1835, 18mo); *Memoir of the Rev. Joseph Sanford* (Phila. 1836, 12mo); *Histoire des Societes de Temperance des Etats-Unis d'Amerique* (Paris, 1836, 12mo; translated into German, Dutch, Danish, Finnish, Russ, and Swedish — the latter translation by order of Bernadotte); *L' Union de l'Eglise et de l'Etat dans la Nouvelle Angleterre* (Paris, 1837, 18mo); *Visit to Northern Europe* (N. Y. 1841, 2 vols. 12mo); *Religion in America* (Glasgow and Edinburgh, 1842, 8vo; translated into German, Dutch, French, Swedish, etc.; revised ed. N. Y. 1844; enlarged and rewritten, N. Y. 1856); *Protestantism in Italy* (Boston, 1845, 12mo); 2d. ed. 1847); *Christian Retrospect and Register* (N. Y. 1851, 12mo, in part). — See *Life of Dr. Baird*, by his son, Prof. H. M. Baird (N. Y. 1866); Allibone, *Dict. of Authtors*, 1:142; *Princeton Review*, 1843, p. 489; *Christian Intelligencer* (newspaper); Wilson, *Presb. Almanac*, 1864; Sprague, *Sermon on Dr. Baird* (Albany, 1863).

Baius, Or De Bay, Michael

a Romanist writer of eminence, was born at Melin in 1513, and studied at Louvain. In 1551 he was appointed professor of theology at Louvain, as substitute for Professor Tapper, a delegate to the Council of Trent. The lectures which he delivered in this capacity gave great offense, and when Tapper and Ravenstein returned, they denounced eighteen propositions taken from his lectures and writings to the faculty of theology at Paris as heretical. In 1560 a censure was issued by that body, whereby three of these dogmas were declared to be erroneous, and fifteen either wholly or partly heretical. The following propositions and the corresponding censures may be cited:

"**Proposition 4.** Free-will is in itself sinful; and every act of the free-will, left to itself, is either mortal or venial sin. — *Censure.* This proposition is heretical in both its parts.

Proposition 5. Man sins in every thing that depends on himself, and cannot avoid sinning. *Censure.* This proposition is heretical.

Proposition 7. Man's free-will cannot avoid sin without God's special grace; whence it follows that all the actions of unbelievers are sinful. — *Censure.* That the second part of this proposition is not properly deduced from the first, and is false.

Proposition 9. A schismatic or a heretic, or a man who is not purely an infidel, may sometimes merit eternal life by merit of condignity. — *Censure.* This proposition is heretical.

Proposition 11. Contrition does not remit sin without the sacrament of baptism or that of penance, except in cases of martyrdom or necessity. — *Censure.* This proposition is heretical.

Proposition 12. If a sinner does all that is ordered him, neither his contrition nor his confession avail to the remission of his sin, unless the priest gives him absolution, even though the priest refuse absolution out of malice, or unreasonably. — *Censure.* This proposition is heretical.

Proposition 14. Grace is never given to those who oppose it, and the same holds of the first justification; for justification is faith itself, and it is through faith that the sinner is made righteous. — *Censure.* The first two parts are heretical, and the last false.

Proposition 16. No one is without original sin, save Jesus Christ only; and, accordingly, the Blessed Virgin died owing to the sin which she had contracted in Adam; and all her sufferings in this life were, like those of all the other righteous, the penalty of actual or original sin. — *Censure.* This proposition is heretical in all its parts, and injurious to the Blessed Virgin and all the saints."

The Franciscans appealed against the doctrines of Baius to the Cardinal Granvella, governor of the Low Countries, but he refused to receive the appeal, and enjoined silence on all parties. Baius and John Hessels were sent, in 1563, to the Council of Trent by Granvella as deputies of the University of Louvain. At the council the learning and talent of Baius gained him general admiration. On his return he published several works on the controverted points, viz. *De Meritis Operum* (1561): — *De Prima Hominis Justitia et Virtutibus Impiorum* (1565): — *De Sacramentis in Genere contra Calvinurn* (1565): — *De Libero Hominis Arbitrio, de Charitate et Justifcatione* (1566). The controversy was bitterly renewed, and on the 1st of October, 1567, Pius V issued a bull condemning seventy-six dogmas, but without naming Baius, for whom he had great regard; and to this Baius, after having written to the pope, was compelled to yield, which he did before Morillon, the grand vicar of the Cardinal Granvella, and afterward before Cardinal Tolet. In 1577 he was made inquisitor-general of Holland. He died September 16th, 1589. His doctrine (called

Baianism) was afterward taken up by the Jansenists. His works were edited by Quesnel and Gerberon (Colon. 1606, 2 vols. 4to): the edition was condemned at Rome, 1697. — *Biog. Univ.* 3, 245; Duchesne, *Histoire du Bajanisme* (Douay, 1731); Bayle, *Dictionary*, s.v.; Kuhn (R. C.), *Dogmatik*, p. 480 sq.; answered by Schazler (R. C.), *Dogma v. der Gnade* (Mainz, 1865, 8vo); Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s.v. The bull of Pius V is given in Dens, *Theologia*, 8:199.

Ba'jith

(Heb. with the art. *hab-ba'yith*, תיַבַּה, *the house*), taken by some to be the name of a city in Moab, where there may have been a celebrated idol temple. It occurs in the prophecy against Moab (Isaiah 15:2): "He is gone up to Bajith and to Dibon, the high places, to weep," which passage is thus interpreted by Bishop Lowth: *"He* is used for the people of Moab. Bajith and Dibon are in the Chaldee and Syriac versions made into the name of one place, *Beth-Dibon. Beth* [i.e. *Bajith*] may signify the house or temple of an idol." The Sept. has Λυπεῖσθε ἐφ ἑαυτούς, Vulg. *Ascendit domus.* Gesenius (*Comment. zu Jesa.* in loc.) understands it as referring, not to a place of this name, but to the "temple" of the false gods of Moab, as opposed to the "high places" in the same sentence (comp. 16:12). The allusion has been supposed to be to Beth-Baalmeon, or Beth-diblathaim, which are named in Jeremiah 48:22, as here, with Dibon and Nebo. In this view Henderson (*Comment.* in loc.) coincides. *SEE BAMOTH*.

Baka

SEE MULBERRY.

Bakar

SEE OX.

Bakbak'kar

(Heb. *Bakbakkar'*, רַקַּבַּקַּבַּ, prob. from רַקַבּ, reduplicated, *admirable* or *searcher*, perhaps i. q. רַהֲאַקְבֹּקַבַּ, *wasting of* the *mount;* Sept. Βακβακάρ), one of the Levites inhabiting the villages of the Netophathites, who were carried captive to Babylon (1 Chronicles 9:15). B.C. 588.

Bak'buk

(Heb. *Bakbuk'*, QWBqB; *a bottle;* Sept. Βακβούκ), the head of one of the families of the Nethinim that returned from Babylon (<15251>Ezra 2:51; <16053>Nehemiah 7:53). B.C. ante 536.

Bakbuki'ah

(Heb. *Bakbukyah'*, hyqBqB; prob. *wasting of Jehovah;* Sept. Βακβακίας, βοκχείας, but other copies omit), a Levits, "second among his brethren," who dwelt at Jerusalem on the return from Babylon (<16117>Nehemiah 11:17; 12:9, 25, where the identity is proved by the associated names). B.C. post 536.

Bake

Picture for Bake

hpa; *aphah'*). This domestic operation was usually, among the ancient Israelites, committed to the females or slaves of the family (<01806>Genesis 18:6; <03556>Leviticus 26:26; <09863>1 Samuel 8:13; 28:24; <10308>2 Samuel 13:8; <40333>Matthew 13:33; comp. <24718>Jeremiah 7:18; 44:19; see the Mishna, *Challah,* 2:7; Thilo, *Cod. apocryph.* 1:96; Pliny, 18:28; Arvieux, *Voyages,* 3, 226; v. 418; Burckhardt, 2:1003; Russell, *Aleppo,* 1:146; Robinson, 2:180), but later they had regular bakers (µypa; *ophin'*, <28704>Hosea 7:4, 6; comp. Joseph. *Ant.* 15:9, 2), and in Jerusalem (<24721>Jeremiah 37:21) there was a special "Bakers' Street" (*bazaar,* forum pistorium). *SEE MECHANIC*. The dough (qxB; *batsek'*, Sept. σταῖς) was made of wheat, barley, or spelt flour (Mishna, *Shebuoth,* 3, 2), and every family took care to bake their own supply in small quantities fresh daily (comp. Arvieux, 1:69; 3, 227; Tavernier, 2:280; Harmer, 3, 474), prepared in a wooden bowl or trough (trav;mæ; *mishe'reth,* <02328>Exodus 12:28; comp. Shaw, *Trav.* p. 231; Rosenmüller, Morgenl. 1:303 sq.), leavened (an act denoted by the verb /mx; *chanets'*) properly (Pliny 18:26), and kneaded (an operation designated by vWl, *lush*). The ferment was omitted whenever it was necessary to bake in haste (<01808>Genesis 19:3; <02234>Exodus 12:34 sq., 39; <07069>Judges 6:19; <09824>1 Samuel 28:24; comp. Pliny 18:27), and the modern Bedouins scarcely use leaven at all (Arvieux, 3, 227; Robinson, 3, 76); and even in cities, for the most part, bread is baked unfermented in the East

(Rippell, *Abyss.* 1:199). *SEE PASSOVER*; *SEE LEAVEN*. The bread is made in the form of long or round cakes (µj,l,t/rK]Kakikkeroth' *le'chem*, <022923>Exodus 29:23; <091026>1 Samuel 2:36; <070805>Judges 8:5; Sept. κολλυρὶς ἄρτου), of the size of a plate and the thickness of the thumb (Korte, *Reis.* p. 436; Russell, *Aleppo*, 1:146; Harmer, *Obs.* 3, 60 sq.; Robinson, 2:496); hence in eating they were not cut, but broken (<235707>Isaiah 57:7; <401419>Matthew 14:19; 26:26; <442011>Acts 20:11; comp. Xenoph. *Anab.* 7:3, 22; Plaut. *Pan.* 3, 5, 19; Curt. 4:2, 14; Robinson, 2:497). *SEE MEAL*. The proper oven (rWNTi *tannur'*, comp. <280704>Hosea 7:4, 6), which in Oriental cities is sometimes public (Shaw, *Trav.* p. 202; Harmer, 1:246), differs little from ours (Arvieux, 3, 229). But, besides these, use was principally made of large stone jars, open at the mouth, about three feet high, with a fire made inside (regularly with wood, comp. <234415>Isaiah 44:15, but on occasion also of dry dung, <260412>Ezekiel 4:12; comp. Arvieux, 3, 228 sq.; Korte, p. 438; *SEE FUEL*), for baking bread and cakes, as soon as the sides were sufficiently heated, by applying the thin dough to the exterior (according to others, to the interior surface likewise), the opening at the top being closed (comp. Arvieux, 3, 227; Niebuhr, *Beschr.* p. 57; Tavernier, 1:280; Rippell, *ut sup.*). Such a pot is still called *tanur* by the Arabs (Michaelis, *Orient. Bibl.* 7:176). Another mode of baking, which is still very common in the East, consists either in filling a shallow pit with red-hot gravel-stones, which, as soon as they have imparted their heat to the hole, are taken out and the cakes of dough laid in their place (Tavernier, 1:64); or a jar is half filled with hot pebbles and the dough spread on the surface of these (Arvieux, 3, 229). This preparation of bread is probably denoted by the µypæ[r]t/G[,*uggoth' retsaphim'* ("cakes baken on the coals"), of <111906>1 Kings 19:6. That baked regularly in the oven, on the other hand, is called rWGTihpeaJni, *naapheh' tannur'* ("baken in the oven," <030204>Leviticus 2:4). Still another kind was baked in the ashes (comp. Robinson, 2:496). *SEE ASH-CAKE*. The Israelites doubtless became early acquainted with the finer method of preparing bread practiced among the Egyptians (comp. Rossellini, II, 2:464). *SEE COOK*. The operations are delineated on the annexed cut, taken from the representations on the tombs of Rameses III at Thebes (Wilkinson's *Anc. Egyptians*, abridgm. 1:174 sq.). *SEE BREAD*.

Bake-meats

(hpadhcejmi lkajmi, *maikal' madseh' opheh', food* the *work of* the *baker*), baked provisions (Genesis 40:17). *SEE BAKE*.

Baker

SEE BAKE.

Baker, Charles

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Scituate, R. I., April 7, 1798. In 1821 he was received into the New England Conference on probation, and subsequently labored for thirty-six consecutive years chiefly in Maine and Massachusetts. After eight years of superannuation, he died, in triumph, at Somerville, Mass., August 16, 1864. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 1865, p. 61.

Baker, Daniel

D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Midway, Ga., Aug. 17, 1791, and studied at Hampden Sidney College, and at Princeton, where he graduated A.B. in 1815. He studied theology with Mr. Hill, pastor of the Presbyterian church in Winchester, Va., and was ordained pastor of the church in Harrisburg, Va., March 5, 1818. Finding himself called to a missionary career, he resigned his charge in 1821; and from 1822 to 1828 was pastor in Washington, D. C. Here John Quincy Adams was one of his hearers, and several acts of great kindness on the part of that eminent man are recorded in his life. Here he wrote *A Scriptural View of Baptism*, afterward expanded into a work with the quaint title, *Baptism in a Nutshell*. In 1830, his great success as a revivalist having been noised abroad, he began to travel among the churches, and the remainder of his life was chiefly spent in this way. His travels extended throughout the Southern States, and even to Texas, where he finally settled. Here, among other labors, he founded Austin College, of which he was the first president. He died at Austin, Dec. 10, 1857. — *Memoirs of Daniel Baker, by his Son* (Philadelphia, 1859, 12mo).

Bakers

one of the scurrilous names given by the heathen to the early Christians. In Minucius Felix (*Octavius*, c. 14), the heathen interlocutor calls the

Christians *Plautinae prosapiae homines et pistores;* “men of the race of Plautus, bakers.” Jerome says that Plautus was so poor that, in a time of famine, he was compelled to hire himself out to a baker to grind in his mill (*Chron.* an. 1. Olymp. 145). Such sort of men Caecilius says the Christians were in the dialogue above cited from Minucius. — Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. *i*, ch. 2, § 12.

Baking

SEE BAKE.

Ba’laam

(Heb. *Bilam’*, μ[;lB; Sept. and N.T. and Philo, Βαλαάμ, Josephus, Βάλαμος). The name is derived by Vitringa from l[Bi and μ[; q.d. *lord of the people;* but by Simonis from [lB, and μ[; *destruction of the people* — an allusion to his supposed supernatural powers; Gesenius derives it from lBi *not*, and μ[; in the sense *of foreigner;* First does not decide which etymology to prefer. His father’s name, *Beor*, comes likewise from a root which means *to consume* or *devour*. It is deserving of notice that Bela (q.v.), the first king of the Edomites, was also the son of a *Beor* (<013632>Genesis 36:32). In <610215>2 Peter 2:15, Balaam is called the son of *Bosor*, which Gesenius attributes to an early corruption of the text; but Lightfoot considers it to be a Chaldaism, and infers from the apostle’s use of it that he was then resident at Babylon (*Works*, 7:80; *Sermon on the way of Balaam*). *SEE BILEAM*. In the other passage of the New Testament (<661214>Revelation 2:14, 15), the sect of the Nicolaitans is described as following the doctrine or teaching of Balaam; and it appears not improbable that this name is employed symbolically, as Nicolaus (Νικόλαος, *people-conquering*) is equivalent in meaning to Balaam.

The first mention of this remarkable person is in <042205>Numbers 22:5, where we are informed that Balak “sent messengers unto Balaam, the son of Beor, to Pethor, which is by the river of the land of the children of his people.” B.C. 1619. He belonged to the Midianites, and perhaps, as the prophet of his people, possessed the same authority that Moses did among the Israelites. At any rate, he is mentioned in conjunction with the five kings of Midian, apparently as a person of the same rank (<043108>Numbers 31:8; cf. 31:16). He seems to have lived at Pethor, which is said at <052304>Deuteronomy 23:4, to have been a city of Mesopotamia (μyrha μyhla).

He himself speaks of being "brought from Aram out of the mountains of the East" (Numbers 23:7). The reading, therefore, ˆ/M[iynB] instead of; /M[iynB]which at Numbers 22:5, is found in some MSS., and is adopted by the Samaritan, Syriac, and Vulgate versions, need not be preferred, as the Ammonites do not appear to have ever extended so far as the Euphrates, which is probably the river alluded to in this place. If the received reading be correct, it intimates that Pethor was situated in Balaam's native country, and that he was not a mere sojourner in Mesopotamia, as the Jewish patriarchs-were in Canaan. In Joshua 13:22, Balaam is termed "the Soothsayer," at µsQa word which, with its cognates, is used almost without exception in an unfavorable sense. Josephus calls him *an eminent diviner* (μάντις ἄριστος, *Ant.* iv, ,6, 2); and what is to be understood by this appellation may be perhaps best learned from the following description by Philo: "There was a man at that time celebrated for divination who lived in Mesopotamia, and was an adept in all the forms of the divining art; but in no branch was he more admired than in augury; to many persons and on many occasions he gave great and astounding proofs of his skill. For to some he foretold storms in the height of summer; to others drought and heat in the depth of winter; to some scarcity succeeding a fruitful year, and then again abundance after scarcity; to others the overflowing and the drying up of rivers; and the remedies of pestilential diseases, and a vast multitude of other things, each of which he acquired great fame for predicting" (*Vita Moysis,* § 48). Origen speaks of Balaam as famous for his skill in magic, and the use of noxious incantations, but denies that he had any power to bless, for which he gives the following reason: "*For magic, like daemons, is unable to bless*". (*In Num. Hom.* 13). Balak's language, "I wot he whom thou blessest is blessed" (Numbers 22:6), he considers as only designed to flatter Balaam, and render him compliant with his wishes. (See Berr, *La prophetie de Balaam,* Par. 1832.)

Balaam is one of those instances which meet us in Scripture of persons dwelling among heathens, but possessing a certain knowledge of the one true God. He was endowed with a greater than ordinary knowledge of God; he was possessed of high gifts of intellect and genius; he had the intuition of truth, and could see into the life of things — in short, he was a poet and a prophet. Moreover, he confessed that all these superior advantages were not his own, but derived from God, and were his gift. And thus, doubtless, he had won for himself, among his contemporaries far

and wide, a high reputation for wisdom and sanctity. It was believed that he whom he blessed was blessed, and he whom he cursed was cursed. Elated, however, by his fame and his spiritual elevation, he had begun to conceive that these gifts *were* his own, and that they might be used to the furtherance of his own ends. He could make merchandise of them, and might acquire riches and honor by means of them. A custom existed among many nations of antiquity of devoting enemies to destruction before entering upon a war with them. At this time the Israelites were marching forward to the occupation of Palestine; they were now encamped in the plains of Moab, on the east of Jordan by Jericho. Balak, the king of Moab, having witnessed the discomfiture of his neighbors, the Amorites, by this people, entered into a league with the Midianites against them, and despatched messengers to Balaam with the rewards of *divination* in their hands. We see from this, therefore, that Balaam was in the habit of using his wisdom as a trade, and of mingling with it devices of his own by which he imposed upon others and perhaps partially deceived himself. When the elders of Moab and Midian told him their message, he seems to have some misgivings as to the lawfulness of their request, for he invited them to tarry the night with him, that he might learn how the Lord would regard it. These misgivings were confirmed by the express prohibition of God upon his journey. Balaam reported the answer, and the messengers of Balak returned. The King of Moab, however, not deterred by this failure, sent again more and more honorable princes to Balaam, with the promise that he should be promoted to very great honor upon complying with his request. The prophet again refused, but, notwithstanding, invited the embassy to tarry the night with him,. that he might know what the Lord would say unto him farther; and thus, by his importunity, he extorted from God the permission he desired, but was warned at the same time that his actions would be overruled according to the Divine will. Balaam therefore proceeded on his journey with the messengers of Balak. But God’s anger was kindled at this manifestation of determined self-will, and the angel of the Lord stood in the way for an adversary against him. The words of the Psalmist, “Be ye not like to horse and mule which have no understanding, whose mouths must be held with bit and bridle, otherwise they will not come near unto thee” (¹⁹¹⁹Psalm 32:9), had they been familiar to Balaam, would have come home to him with most tremendous force; for never have they received a more forcible illustration than the comparison of Balaam’s conduct to his Maker with his treatment of his ass affords us. The wisdom with which the tractable brute was allowed to “speak with man’s voice,”

and “forbid” the untractable “madness of the prophet,” is palpable and conspicuous. He was taught, moreover, that even she had a spiritual perception to which he, though a prophet, was a stranger; and when his eyes were opened to behold the angel of the Lord, “he bowed down his head and fell flat on his face.” It is hardly necessary to suppose, as some do, that the event here referred to happened only in a trance or vision, though such an opinion might seem to be supported by the fact that our translators render the word נפל in 24:4, 16, *“falling into a trance,”* whereas no other idea than that. of simple *falling* is conveyed by it. The Apostle Peter refers to it as a real historical event: “The dumb ass, speaking with man’s voice, forbade the madness of the prophet” (2 Peter 2:16). We are not told *how* these things happened, but that they *did* happen, and that it pleased God thus to interfere on behalf of His elect people, and to bring forth from the genius of a self-willed prophet, who thought that his talents were his own, strains of poetry bearing upon the destiny of the Jewish nation and the Church at large, which are not surpassed throughout the Mosaic records. It is evident that Balaam, although acquainted with God, was desirous of throwing an air of mystery round his wisdom, from the instructions he gave Balak to offer a bullock and a ram on the seven altars he everywhere prepared for him; but he seems to have thought also that these sacrifices would be of some avail to change the mind of the Almighty, because he pleads the merit of them (23:4), and after experiencing their impotency to effect such an object, “he went no more,” we are told, “to seek for enchantments” (24:1). His religion, therefore, was probably such as would be the natural result of a general acquaintance with God not confirmed by any covenant. He knew Him as the fountain of wisdom; how to worship Him he could merely guess from the customs in vogue at the time. Sacrifices had been used by the patriarchs; to what extent they were efficient could only be surmised. There is an allusion to Balaam in the Prophet Micah (Micah 6:5), where Bishop Butler thinks that a conversation is preserved which occurred between him and the King of Moab upon this occasion. But such an opinion is hardly tenable, if we bear in mind that Balak is nowhere represented as consulting Balaam upon the acceptable mode of worshipping God, and that the directions found in Micah are of quite an opposite character to those which were given by the son of Beor upon the high-places of Baal. The prophet is recounting “the righteousness of the Lord” in delivering His people out of the hand of Moab under Balak, and at the mention of his name the history of Balaam comes back upon his

mind, and he is led to make those noble reflections upon it which occur in the following verse. “The doctrine of Balaam” is spoken of in <66214>Revelation 2:14, where an allusion has been supposed to the founder of the sect of the Nicolaitans, mentioned in v. 15. See NICOLAITANS. Though the utterance of Balaam was overruled so that he could not curse the children of Israel, he nevertheless suggested to the Moabites the expedient of seducing them to commit fornication. The effect of this is recorded in ch. 25. A battle was afterward fought against the Midianites, in which Balaam sided with them, and was slain by the sword of the people whom he had endeavored to curse (<043108>Numbers 31:8). B.C. 1618. (Comp. Bishop Butler’s *Sermons,* serm. 7; Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel,* 2:277; Stanley, *Jewish Ch.* 1:209 sq.)

Of the numerous paradoxes which we find in “this strange mixture of a man,” as Bishop Newton terms him, not the least striking is that with the practice of an art expressly forbidden to the Israelites (“there shall not be found among you one that useth divination” [<051810>Deuteronomy 18:10], “for all that do these things are an abomination to the Lord,” ver. 12) he united the knowledge and worship of Jehovah, and was in the habit of receiving intimations of his will: “I will bring you word again as the Lord (Jehovah) shall speak unto me” (<042208>Numbers 22:8). The inquiry naturally arises, by what means did he become acquainted with the true religion? Dr. Hengstenberg suggests that he was led to renounce idolatry by the reports that reached him of the miracles attending the Exodus; and that, having experienced the deceptive nature of the soothsaying art, he hoped, by becoming a worshipper of the God of the Hebrews, to acquire fresh power over nature, and a clearer insight into futurity. Yet the sacred narrative gives us no reason to suppose that he had any previous knowledge of the Israelites. In <042211>Numbers 22:11, he merely repeats Balak’s message, “Behold, there is a people come out of Egypt,” etc., without intimating that he had heard of the miracles wrought on their behalf. The allusion in <042322>Numbers 23:22, might be prompted by the divine afflatus which he then felt. And had he been actuated in the first instance by motives of personal aggrandizement, it seems hardly probable that he would have been favored with those divine communications with which his language, in <042208>Numbers 22:8, implies a familiarity. Since, in the case of Simon Magus, the offer to “purchase the gift of God with money” (<440820>Acts 8:20) called forth an immediate and awful rebuke from the apostles, would not Balaam’s attempt to obtain a similar gift, with a direct view to personal emolument

and fame, have met with a similar repulse? Dr. Hengstenberg supposes, indeed, that there was a mixture of a higher order of sentiments, a sense of the wants of his moral nature, which led him to seek Jehovah, and laid a foundation for intercourse with him. In the absence of more copious and precise information, may we not reasonably conjecture that Jacob's residence for twenty years in Mesopotamia contributed to maintain some just ideas of religion, though mingled with much superstition? To this source, and the existing remains of patriarchal religion, Balaam was probably indebted for that truth which he unhappily "restrained by unrighteousness" (<45 01 18>Romans 1:18). (See Onder, De *Bileamo,* Jen. 1715.)

On the narrative contained in <04 22 22>Numbers 22:22-35, a difference of opinion has long existed, even among those who fully admit its authenticity. The advocates for a literal interpretation urge that, in a historical work and a narrative bearing the same character, it would be unnatural to regard any of the occurrences as taking place in vision, unless expressly so stated; that it would be difficult to determine where the vision begins and where it ends; that Jehovah's "opening the mouth of the ass" (<04 22 28>Numbers 22:28) must have been an external act; and, finally, that Peter's language is decidedly in favor of the literal sense: "The dumb ass, speaking with a man's voice, reproved the madness of the prophet" (<61 02 16>2 Peter 2:16). Those who conceive that the speaking of the ass and the appearance of the angel occurred in vision to Balaam (among whom are Maimonides, Leibnitz, and Hengstenberg) insist upon the fact that dreams and visions were the ordinary methods by which God made himself known to the prophets (<04 12 06>Numbers 12:6); they remark that Balaam, in the introduction to his third and fourth prophecies (24:3, 4, 15), speaks of himself as "the man who had his eyes shut," and who, on falling down in prophetic ecstasy, had his eyes opened; that he expressed no surprise on hearing the ass speak; and that neither his servants nor the Moabitish princes who accompanied him appear to have been cognizant of any supernatural appearance. Dr. Jortin supposes that the angel of the Lord suffered himself to be seen by the beast, but not by the prophet; that the beast was terrified, and Balaam smote her, and then fell into a trance, and in that state conversed first with the beast and then with the angel. The angel presented these objects to his imagination as strongly as if they had been before his eyes, so that this was still a miraculous or preternatural operation. In dreaming, many singular incongruities occur without exciting our astonishment; it is therefore not wonderful if the prophet conversed

with his beast in vision without being startled at such a phenomenon (see Jortin's *Dissertation on Balaam,* p. 190-194). See Ass (*of Balaam*).

The limits of this article will not allow of an examination of Balaam's magnificent prophecies, which, as Herder remarks (*Geist der Ebraischen Poesie,* 2:221), "are distinguished for dignity, compression, vividness, and fullness of imagery. There is scarcely any thing equal to them in the later prophets, and" (he adds, what few readers, probably, of Deuteronomy 32, 33, will be disposed to admit) "nothing in the discourses of Moses." Hengstenberg has ably discussed the doubts raised by De Wette and other German critics respecting the antiquity and genuineness of this portion of the Pentateuch. A full discussion of the *Character and Prophecies of Balaam* may be found in the *Bib. Sac.* 1846, p. 347 sq.

See generally Moebius, *Hist. Bileami* (in his *Dissertt. theol.* p. 286 sq.); Benzel, *Dissertt.* 2:37 sq.; Richter, *De Bil. incantatore* (Viteb. 1739); Liderwald, *Gesch. Bil. erklart* (Helmst. 1781); Geer, *Diss. de Bileamo* (Utrecht, 1816); Tholuck, in the *Lit. Anzeig.* 1832, No. 78-80; 1833, 1 (also in his *Verm. Schrfit.* 1); Hoffmann, in the *Hall. Encyclop.* 10:184 sq.; Steudel, in the *Tubing. Zeitschr.* 1831, 2:66 sq.; Hengstenberg *Gesch. Bileams* (Berl. 1842; *History and Prophecies of Balaam,* transl. by Ryland, in Clark's ed. of his *Authenticity of Daniel* Edinb. 1847); Wolff, *De mode vaticinandi Bileam* (Lips. 1741); Niemeyer, *Charakt.* 3, 373 sq.; Less, *Verm. Schrift.* 1:130 sq.; Justi, *Diss. de Bileami asina* (Marb. 1774); Bauer, *Hebr. Mythologie,* 1:306 sq.; Hartmann, *Exc. zu Micha,* p. 255 sq.; also Kjerner, *Circa hist. Bileami* (Gryph. 1786); Rungius, *Abhandl. f. Freunde d. Bibel* (Lpz. 1786-1789), 2; Geer, *De Bileamo* (Traj. a. R. 1816); Jortin, *Hist. and Character of Balaam* (in the *Brit. Theol. Mag.* I, 1:72 sq.; also in his *Dissertations,* p. 127); Ward, *Character of Balaam* (*ib.* 4:574 sq.); Butler, *id.* (*ib.* I, 2:36 sq.); Benner, *D. Esel Bileams* (Giess. 1759); Schutte, *Vaticin. Bilea*mi (in the *Bibl. Hagan.* 1, 1:2); Origen, *Opp.* 2:316, 325; Saurin, *Dissert.* p. 597; Deyling, *Observatt.* 3, 102; Sherlock, *Works, v; Essays* (*Lond.* 1753); Newton, *Prophecies,* 1:66; Bryant, *Observatiens,* 1; Hunter, *Sacred Biog.* 3, 226; Horsley, *Bib. Criticsm,* 2:407, 449; Robinson, *Script. Characters,* 1; Evans, *Script. Biog.* 2:28; Williams, *0. T. Characters,* p. 136; Simeon, *Works,* 2:131,136,141; Cowie, *Hulsean Lect* (1853), p. 25; Noel, *Hist. Eccles.* 2:413; Collyier, *Script. Prophecy,* p. 172; Kitto, *Daily Bible Illust.* 2:201, 206; Buddaei *Hist. V. T.* 1:753; Witsii *Miscell.* 1:143 sq. Wolf, *De exemplis Bibl.* 2:13 sq.; De Wette, *Kritik,* 1:363, 365; Vater, *Comment. iub. Pentat.* 3, 119; Ranke,

Pentat. 2:234; Jahn, *Einleit.* 2:132; Havernick, *Einleit.* 1, 2:505; comp. Mosch. *Idyll.* 2:149 sq.; Plutarch, *Flav.* 1:6; *A*Elian, *Anim.* 12:3; Val. Max. 1:6, 5; *Jour. Asiatique* (1843), 1:216; Bochart, *Hieroz.* 1:161; Fabricii *Cod. Pseudepgigr.* V. T. 1:801; Thilo, *Apocr.* p. 307; Talmud, *Pirke Aboth,* v. 19; *Targum* of Jonathan, in loc.; Wetstein, *N.T.* 2:707.

Ba'laq

(Βαλάκ), another method of Anglicizing (<66102>Revelation 2:2) the name BALAK *SEE BALAK* (q.v.).

Bal'adan

(Heb. *Baladan',* ˆdÒlÒB; *Bel* is his *lord;* Sept. Βαλαδάν), a name used in a double capacity. First observes (*Heb. Handw. s.v.*) that, if of Shemitic origin, it corresponds to the Phoenician *Baal-Adonis* (ˆdo;l[B; *Ba'al-Adon'* of coins, Numid. v. 1); but as the associate name Merodach (q.v.) is prob. not Shemitic, we may perhaps better derive Baladan from the Sanscrit *bala* (*strength*) and *dhana* (*riches*), with the sense of *valiant and wealthy.*

1. The father of the Babylonian king Merodach. baladan (<12012>2 Kings 20:12; <23901>Isaiah 39:1). B.C. ante 711. See MERODACH-BALADAN.

2. A surname of MERODACH-BALADAN (<23901>Isaiah 39:1), or BERODACH-BALADAN *SEE BERODACH-BALADAN* (<12012>2 Kings 20:12) himself (q.v.).

Ba'lah

(Heb. *Balah',* hlB; a contraction of the name *Baalah* or *Bilhah;* Sept. Βαλά v. r. Βωλά), a city in the tribe of Simeon, mentioned in connection with Hazar-shual and Azem (<061903>Joshua 19:3). It seems to have been the same with that elsewhere called BIHAH (<130429>1 Chronicles 4:29) or BAALAH (<061529>Joshua 15:29), and, if so, it must have been transferred to Judah, or so ac. counted in later times, like many other cities of this region. *SEE BIZJOTHJAH.*

Ba'lak

(Heb. *Balak',* qlB; *empty;* Sept. and N.T. Βαλάκ, Josephus, Βάλακος, *Ant.* 4:6, 2), son of Zippor, and king of the Moabites (<042202>Numbers 22:2,

4); he was so terrified at the approach of the victorious army of the Israelites, who, in their passage through the desert, had encamped near the confines of his territory, that he applied to Balaam, who was then reputed to possess great influence with the higher spirits, to curse them. B.C. 1618. But his hostile designs (Joshua 24:9) were frustrated. *SEE BALAAM*. From Judges 11:25, it is clear that Balak was so certain of the fulfillment of Balaam's blessing, "Blessed is he that blesseth thee, and cursed is he that curseth thee" (Numbers 24:9), that he never afterward made the least military attempt to oppose the Israelites (comp. Micah 6:5; Revelation 2:14).

Bal'amo

(rather *Bel'amon*, Βελαμών, v. r. *Bal'amon*, Βαλαμών), a place named in the Apocrypha (Jud. 8:3) as not far from Dothaim (Dothar), and usually supposed to be the same as the *Belmen* of Judith 4:4, and the ABEL-MAIM *SEE ABEL-MAIM* (q.v.) of Scripture. Reland (*Palest.* p. 615, 622) inclines, however, to identify it with the *Belemoth* (Βελεμώθ) stated by Epiphanius (*Vit. Prophetarum*, p. 244) to have been the native place of the prophet Hosea, and called *Belemon* (Βελεμών) in the *Pachal Chronicle.*

Balances

Picture for Balances

(Heb. in the dual µyaeÞaom, *mozena'yim, i.e. two poisers;* and so the Chald. equivalent, ^yaeÞaom, *mozena'yin*, Daniel 5:27; once the Hebrews hnÛq; *kaneh'*, prop. a *branch*, as of "cane," used in the sing. Isaiah 46:6, the rod or beam of a *steel-yard;* in Revelation 6:5, ζύγος, a *yoke*, hence a "*pair* of balances"). In the early periods of the world gold and silver were paid by weight, so that persons employed in traffic of any kind carried with them a pair of scales or balances and different weights (generally stones of different sizes) in a pouch or bag. Fraudulent men would carry two sorts of weights, the lighter to sell with and the other to buy with (Micah 6:11). Balances or scales of various forms are frequently seen upon the most ancient Egyptian monuments, and were also used for dividing the spoil by the ancient Assyrian warriors (Bonomi, *Nineveh*, p. 163, 268); they bear a general resemblance to those now in use, and most likely they are similar to those used by the ancient Hebrews (Leviticus 19:36).

Among the Egyptians large scales were generally a flat wooden board, with four ropes attached to a ring at the extremity of the beam; and those of smaller size were of bronze, one and a half inch in diameter, pierced near the edge in three places for the strings. The principle of the common balance was simple and ingenious: the beam passed through a ring suspended from a horizontal rod, immediately above and parallel to it, and when equally balanced, the ring, which was large enough to allow the beam to play freely, showed when the scales were equally poised, and had the additional effect of preventing the beam tilting when the goods were taken out of one and the weights suffered to remain in the other scale. To the lower part of the ring a small plummet was fixed, and this being touched by the hand, and found to hang freely, indicated, without the necessity of looking at the beam, that the weight was just. The figure of a baboon was sometimes placed upon the top, as the emblem of the god Thoth, the regulator of measures, of time, and of writing, in his character of the moon; but there is no appearance of the goddess of justice being connected with the balance, except in the judgment scenes of the dead. The pair of scales was the ordinary and, apparently, only kind of balance used by the Egyptians, no instance of the steel-yard being met with in the paintings of Thebes or of Beni Hassan; and the introduction of the latter is confined to a Roman era. The other kind of balance, whose invention has been ascribed by Pliny to Daedalus, is shown to have been known and applied in Egypt at least as early as the time of the Osirtasens. One kind of balance used for weighing gold, *SEE GOLDSMITH*, differed slightly from those of ordinary construction, and was probably more delicately formed. It was made, as usual, with an upright pole, rising from a broad base or stand, and a cross-beam turning on a pin at its summit; but instead of strings suspending the scales was an arm on either side, terminating in a hook, to which the gold was attached in small bags (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* abridg. 2:151, 152). *SEE WEIGHT*.

A pair of scales is likewise a well-known symbol of a strict observation of justice and fair dealing. It is thus used in several places of Scripture, as (18)31:6Job 31:6; (19)62:9Psalm 62:9; (20)11:1Proverbs 11:1, and 16:11. But *balance,* joined with symbols denoting the sale of corn and fruits by weight, becomes the symbol of scarcity; *bread by weight* being a curse in (03)26:26Leviticus 26:26, and in (26)4:16Ezekiel 4:16, 17. So in (66)6:5Revelation 6:5, “He that sat upon him had a pair of balances in his hand.” Here the balance

is used to weigh corn and the necessaries of life, in order to signify great want and scarcity, and to threaten the world with famine. *SEE SCALES*.

Balas

SEE ALEXANDER.

Balas'amus

(or rather *Baal'samus*, Βαάλσαμος; comp. *Belsamen* in the art. BAAL-), the last named of those that stood at the right hand of Ezra while reading the law (1 Esdras 9:43); but the corresponding name in the true text (<160804>Nehemiah 8:4) is MAASEIAH *SEE MAASEIAH* (q.v.).

Bald

(prop. חַרְעַ; *kare'ach*, naturally bare of hair on the top or *back* of the head; Sept. φαλακρός; different was the גִּבָּחַת, *gibbe'ach*, diseased loss of hair on *forehead*, <031341>Leviticus 13:41; Sept. ἀναφάλαντος). There are two kinds of baldness, viz., artificial and natural, The latter seems to have been uncommon, since it exposed people to public derision, and is perpetually alluded to as a mark of squalor and misery (<120223>2 Kings 2:23; <230324>Isaiah 3:24, "instead of well-set hair, baldness, and burning instead of beauty." <231502>Isaiah 15:2; <244705>Jeremiah 47:5; <260718>Ezekiel 7:18, etc.). For this reason it seems to have been included under the "scab" and "scurf" (<032120>Leviticus 21:20, perhaps i.q. *dandruff*), which were disqualifications for priesthood (Mishna, *Berachoth*, 7:2). In <031329>Leviticus 13:29 sq., very careful directions are given to distinguish the *scall* (בֹהַ, *bohak'*, freckled spot," ver. 39), described as "a plague (גַּעֶנֶ, *ne'ga, stroke*) upon the head and beard" (which probably is the *Mentagra* of Pliny, and is a sort of leprosy), from mere natural baldness which is pronounced to be clean, v. 40 (Jahn, *Bibl. Arch.* 189). *SEE LEPROSY*. But this shows that even natural baldness subjected men to an unpleasant suspicion. It was a defect with which the Israelites were by no means familiar, since the Egyptians were very rarely subject to it, according to Herodotus (in, 12); an immunity which he attributes to their constant shaving. They adopted this practice for purposes of cleanliness, and generally wore wigs, some of which have been found in the ruins of Thebes. Contrary to the general practice of the East, they only let the hair grow as a sign of mourning (Herod. 2:36), and shaved themselves on all joyous occasions; hence in <014144>Genesis 41:44, we have an

undesigned coincidence. The same custom obtains in China and among the modern Egyptians, who shave off all the hair except the *shoosheh,* a tuft on the forehead and crown of the head (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* 3, 359 sq.; Lane, *Mod. Egypt.* 1, ch. 1). Baldness was despised both among Greeks and Romans. In Homer (*Il.* 2:219) it is one of the defects of Thersites; Aristophanes (who was probably bald himself, *Par,* 767; *Eq.* 550) takes pride in not joining in the ridicule against it (*Nub.* 540). Caesar was said to have had some deformity of this sort, and he generally endeavored to conceal it (Suet. *Caes.* 45; comp. *Dom.* 18).

Artificial baldness marked the conclusion of a Nazarite's vow (<441818>Acts 18:18; <040609>Numbers 6:9), and was a sign of mourning (Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* 3, 26). It is often alluded to in Scripture, as in <330101>Micah 1:16; <330810>Amos 8:10; <244705>Jeremiah 47:5, etc.; and in <051401>Deuteronomy 14:1, the reason for its being forbidden to the Israelites is their being "a holy and peculiar people" (comp. <031927>Leviticus 19:27, and <240926>Jeremiah 9:26, marg.). The practices alluded to in the latter passages were adopted by heathen nations (e.g. the Arabs, etc.) in honor of various gods. The Abantes and other half-civilized tribes shaved off the forelocks, to avoid the danger of being seized by them in battle (Herod. 2:36; 1:82). *SEE HAIR.*

Baldachin Or Baldaquin

(*umbraculum*),

(1.) the *ciborium,* or canopy, overhanging the altar, imitating a roof supported by pillars.

(2.) The canopy which is borne over the host, or over the head of the pope, on days of ceremony. The name itself is an ancient French term, signifying the richest kind of silks and tissues, especially of gold thread; so called, perhaps, because imported from Baldak, the mediaeval name of Babylon in Persia. — Ducange, *Gloss.* s.v.

Balde, Johann Jacob

surnamed by his contemporaries "the German Horace," was born at Ensisheim, near Colmar, Alsace, in 1603, and was educated at the University of Ingolstadt. He entered the order of Jesuits in 1624, became in 1638 court preacher at Munich, and afterward confessor of Philip William, duke of Bavaria. He died Aug. 9th, 1668. His principal writings, all of which are written in classic Latin, are — *Carmina lyrica libri IV, Epodon*

liber, Sylvae lyrico, De vanitate mundi: — Solatium podagricorum (Cologne, 1660): — Opera *poetica* (Munich, 1726, 8 vols.), etc. His *Uranie victorieuse* was rewarded by Alexander VII with a gold medal. A selection of his works was published by Orelli (Zurich, 2d ed. 1818) and by Cleska (Augsbg. 1829, 2 vols.); a biography by Cleska (Numbers 1842).

Bald Locust

SEE LOCUST.

Baldness

SEE BALD.

Baldwin

(styled *Thomas Devonius*), was born at Exeter, where he received a liberal education. He became archdeacon of Exeter, but soon resigned, and became a monk in the Cistercian abbey of Ford, in Devonshire, of which in a few years he was elected abbot. In 1181 he was made bishop of Worcester, and in 1184 Henry II translated him to the see of Canterbury. Urban III afterward made Baldwin his legate for the diocese of Canterbury. On September, 3,1189, Baldwin performed the ceremony of crowning Richard I at Westminster; and in the same year, when that king's natural brother, Geoffrey, was translated from the see of Lincoln to York, he successfully asserted the pre-eminence of the see of Canterbury, forbidding the bishops of England to receive consecration from any other than the Archbishop of Canterbury. In 1190 he made a progress into Wales to preach the Crusade; and in the same year, having held a council at Westminster, he followed King Richard I to the Holy Land. He embarked at Dover March 25,1191, abandoning the important duties of his station, and, after suffering many hardships on his voyage, arrived at Acre during the siege, where he died, November 20, in the same year, and where his body was interred. Bishop Tanner has given a list of a great many treatises by Archbishop Baldwin, which remain in manuscript, and has noticed the different libraries in which they are deposited. The most important were collected by Bertrand Tissier, and published, in 1662, in the fifth volume of the "Scriptores Biblioth. Cisterciensis." See *Engl. Cyclopedia;* Godwin, *De Pros. Ang.* p. 79; Collier, *Eccl. Hist.* 2:374 sq.

Baldwin, Ebenezer

a Congregational minister, was born at Norwich, Conn., July 3,1745. He graduated at Yale in 1763, and became tutor there in 1766. In 1770 he was ordained minister of the first Cong, church in Danbury. In the Revolution he was an ardent Whig, and, as chaplain in the army, contracted the disease of which he died, Oct. 1, 1776. — Sprague, *Annals,* 1:645.

Baldwin, Elihu Whittlesey

D.D., a Presbyterian minister, born in Greene Co., N. Y., Dec. 25,1789, and educated at Yale and Andover, was licensed to preach in 1817, and by his labors established the Seventh Presb. Church in New York, of which he became pastor in 1820. In 1835 he became president of Wabash College, at that time a very arduous post, on account of the pecuniary difficulties in which the institution was involved. In 1839 Mr. Baldwin received the degree of D.D. from Indiana College. He died Oct. 15, 1840, having published several tracts and sermons. Sprague, *Annals,* 4:572.

Baldwin, Thomas

D.D., a Baptist minister, was born at Bozrah, Conn., Dec. 23, 1753, and died at Waterville, Me., Aug. 29, 1826. Though educated among Pedobaptists, he adopted Baptist views, and was baptized by immersion in 1781. In the following year he began to preach, and was ordained in 1783 pastor of the Baptist church in Canaan, N. H., where he was residing. In 1790 he removed to Boston, taking charge of the Second Baptist Church in that place. In 1794 he received the degree of A.M. from Brown University, and in 1803 that of D.D. from Union College. From the latter year till his death he was the chief editor of the “Mass. Bapt. Miss. Magazine,” published in Boston. Dr. Baldwin published several pamphlets on baptism and communion, besides “A Series of Letters in Answer to the Rev. Samuel Worcester,” published in 1810, and various tracts and sermons. — Sprague, *Annals,* 6:208; *Mass. Bapt. Miss. Mag. v.*

Bale, John

(*Balaeus*), bishop of Ossory, an English historian and theologian, was born at Cove Hithe, in Suffolk, Nov. 21, 1495, and was educated at Jesus College, Cambridge, where he early gained a reputation for letters and opposed the Reformation. He attributes his conversion to Lord

Wentworth, and soon began to write against Romanism; and although protected for a time by the Earl of Essex, he was, after the death of Cromwell, obliged to retire into Flanders. He returned under Edward VI, and received the living of Bishopstoke, in Hampshire. On Feb. 2,1553, he was made bishop of Ossory. When Edward died he took refuge at Basle, where he remained till 1559, when he returned into England, and, refusing to resume his bishopric (which he at first did not desire), he was made prebend of the Church of Canterbury, and died there, Nov. 1563. His chief work is his *Illustrium majoris Britanniae Scriptorum Summarium,* first printed at Ipswich in 1549. This edition contained only five centuries of writers; but an enlarged edition was published at Basle in 1557, etc., containing nine centuries, under the following title: *Scriptorum Illustrium M. Britanniae, quam nunc Angliam et Scotiam vocant, Catalogus, a Japheto per* 3618 *annos usque ad annum hunc Domini* 1557, *ex Beroso, Gennadio, Beda, etc... collectus;* — and in 1559 a third edition appeared, containing five more centuries. He was a very voluminous writer; a long list of his printed works is given by Fuller, and also in the *Engl. Cyclopoedia* (s.v. *Bale*). His works were placed on the prohibitory *Index,* printed at Madrid in 1667, as those of a heretic of the first class. No character has been more variously represented than Bale's. Gesner, in his *Bibliotheca,* calls him a writer of the greatest diligence, and Bishop Godwin gives him the character of a laborious inquirer into British antiquities. Similar praise is also bestowed upon him by Vogler (*Introd. Universal. in Notit. Scriptor.*). Anthony A Wood, however, styles him "the foul-mouthed Bale." Hearne (*Pref. to Heminof.*) calls him "Balaeus in multis mendax." And even Fuller (*Worthies,* last edit. 2:332) says "Biliosus Balaeus passeth for his true character." He inveighed with much asperity against the pope and papists, and his intemperate zeal, it must be acknowledged, often carried him beyond the bounds of decency and candor. Fuller, in his *Church History* (cent. 9, p. 68), pleads for Bale's railing against the papists. "Old age and ill usage," he says, "will make any man angry. When young, he had seen their superstition; when old, he felt their oppression." The greatest fault of Bale's book on the British writers is its multiplication of their works by frequently giving the heads of chapters or sections of a book as the titles of distinct treatises. A selection from his works was published by the *Parker Society* (Cambridge, 1849, 8vo). See Strype, *Memorials of Cranmer,* p. 206, 360; Collier, *Eccl. Hist.* v. 500; *Penny Cyclop.* s.v.

Balfour, Walter

was born at St. Ninian's, Scotland, 1776, and educated in the Scotch Church at the expense of Mr. Robert Haldane. After some years' preaching he came to America, and became a Baptist about 1806. In 1823 he avowed himself a Universalist, and labored, both as preacher and writer, in behalf of Universalism until his death at Charlestown, Mass., Jan. 3, 1852. He published *Essays on the intermediate State of the Dead* (Charlestown, 1828, 12mo). See Whittemore, *Memoir of Rev. W. Balfour* (Bost. 1830).

Balguy, John

an English divine, was born at Sheffield in 1686, and educated at Cambridge, where he passed M.A. in 1726. In the Bangorian controversy (q.v.) he maintained the views of Bishop Hoadley, and wrote, in 1718, 1719, several tracts on the dispute. In 1726, in view of the infidel principles of Lord Shaftesbury, he published *A Letter to a Deist*, and *The Foundation of Moral Virtue.* These, with others, are given in *A Collection of Tracts*, by the Rev. J. Balguy (Lond. 1734, 8vo). His *Sermons* (2 vols. 8vo) had reached a third edition in 1790. Balguy was a "latitudinarian" (q.v.) in theology. He died in 1748.

Balguy, Thomas

D.D., son of John, was born in Yorkshire in 1716, and educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, where in 1741 he became M.A., and in 1758 D.D. In 1757, under the patronage of Hoadley, he was made prebendary of Winchester, and afterward archdeacon of Salisbury and Winchester. He abandoned Hoadley's "latitudinarianism," and brought his sound scholarship to the "defense of the Christian religion and of the English Church." He wrote a number of excellent sermons and charges, which may be found in his *Discourses on various Subjects,* edited by Drake, with a Memoir of Balguy (Cambridge, 1822, 2 vols. 8vo). He wrote, also, *Divine Benevolence vindicated from the Reflections of Sceptics* (Lond. 2d ed. 1803, 12mo). He died unmarried, Jan. 19, 1795. See Hook, *Eccl. Biog.* 1:477; Rose, *Biog. Dict. s.v.*

Ball

Picture for Ball

(rWD, *dur*), well known as being used in various sports and games from the earliest times, several kinds of which are depicted on the Egyptian monuments (Wilkinson, 1:198 sq. abridg.). The word occurs in this sense in <22218>Isaiah 22:18, but in a subsequent chapter (29:3) it is employed of a ring or circle, and translated "round about" in the prophecy of the siege of Jerusalem. In <26405>Ezekiel 24:5, in the symbol of the same event, it is translated "burn," but probably means *heap,* as in the margin.

Among the Egyptians the balls were made of leather or skin, sewed with string, crosswise, in the same manner as our own, and stuffed with bran or husks of corn; and those which have been found at Thebes are about three inches in diameter. Others were made of string, or of the stalks of rushes platted together so as to form a circular mass, and covered, like the former, with leather. They appear also to have a smaller kind of ball, probably of the same materials, and covered, like many of our own, with slips of leather of an elliptical shape, sewed together longitudinally, and meeting in a common point at both ends, each alternate slip being of a different color; but these have only been met with in pottery (Wilkinson, 1:200).

Ball, John

a Roman priest, who seems to have imbibed Wickliffe's doctrines, and who was (previously to 1366) excommunicated repeatedly for preaching "errors, and schisms, and scandals against the pope, archbishops, bishops, and clergy." He preached in favor of the rebellion of Wat Tyler, and was executed at Coventry in 1381. See Collier, *Eccl. Hist.* 3, 148 sq.

Ball, John

a Puritan divine, was born in 1585, at Cassington, in Oxfordshire. He studied at Brazennose College, Oxford, and was admitted to holy orders, and passed his life in poverty on a small cure at Whitmore, Staffordshire, to which was united the care of a school. He died in 1640. His *Catechism* had gone through fourteen editions before the year 1632, and has had the singular lot of being translated into Turkish. His *Treatise on Faith* (Lond. 1632, 4to) also passed through many editions. He published also *The*

Power of Godliness and other treatises (Lond. 1657, fol.) See Rose, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Allibone, 1:108.

Balle, Nikolai Edinger

a distinguished Lutheran theologian of Denmark, was born in 1744 in Zealand became in 1772 Professor of Theology at Copenhagen, and in 1783 bishop of Zealand. He died in 1816. He wrote, *Theses theologicae* (Copenh. 1776), and *A Manual of Religious Doctrines* (Copenh. 1781); he was also the editor of a magazine for modern church history of Den. mark (*Magazin for den nyere danske Kirkehistorie,* Copenh. 1792-94, 2 vols.).

Ballerini, Peter And Jerome

brothers, priests of Verona, distinguished for their learning. Peter was born in 1698, Jerome in 1702. They lived and studied together, and published, in conjunction and separately, many important works on jurisprudence and theology. Among these were, *The Works of Cardinal Norris,* containing, among other matters, a Life of the Writer; a History of the various Congregations held for the Reform of the Calendar, at which the cardinal presided: a History of the Donatists, in 2 parts, Supplements, and an Appendix (Verona, 1732, 4 vols. fol.): *Sancti Antonini Archiep. Florentini Summa Theologiae,* etc. (Verona. 1740-41, 2 vols. fol.); *S. Raimundi de Pennaforte Summa Theologicalis,* etc. (Verona, 1744). Among the works edited by them may be mentioned the Sermons of Zeno, bishop of Verona, 1739; the works. of John Mathew Gibert, bishop of Verona, 1736; the works of Pope St. Leo, in 3 vols. folio, containing works of that pope which are not to be found in Quesnel's edition. Peter wrote several treatises in behalf of the papacy, especially *De Potes. tate s. Pontif.* etc. (1765), and *De Vi ac ratione prima. tus Pontif.* (1766). — *Biog. Universelle.*

Ballimathias

(*wanton dances,* from βαλλίζειν), is generally understood to refer to those wanton dances which were practiced at marriage festivals, but sometimes indicates the practice of playing on cymbals and other musical instruments. The word βαλλίζειν means to throw the legs and feet about rapidly; hence to dance a certain lively dance peculiar to Magna Graecia and Sicily. The words *ballet* and *ball* are from this root. The Council of Laodicea, and the third Council of Toledo, forbade the promiscuous and

lascivious dancing of men and women together under this name, which is generally interpreted *wanton* dances associated with lascivious songs. Ambrose, Chrysostom, and others of the fathers, are faithful in condemning the practices which were adopted in their day at marriage ceremonies, many of which were highly disgraceful. See Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.*bk. 16, ch. 11, §16.

Ballon, Hosea

a Universalist minister, was born April 30th, 1771, at Richmond, N. H. At an early age he joined the Baptist Church, of which his father was a minister, but was soon after expelled on account of his embracing Universalist and Unitarian opinions. At the age of twenty-one he became an itinerant preacher of the then new doctrines he had adopted. His ability and eloquence attracting attention, he was invited in 1794 to a permanent charge at Dana, Mass., which he accepted. In 1802 he removed to Barnard, Vt.; in 1807, to Portsmouth, N. H.; and in 1815, to Salem, Mass. Two years later he accepted the charge of the Second Universalist Society at Boston, which he held till his death, June 7th, 1852. Mr. Ballon was an industrious writer. In 1819 he commenced the *Universalist Magazine*, and in 1831 the *Universalist Expositor* (now the *Universalist Quarterly*). He published *The Doctrine of future Retribution* (1834), and numerous other controversial works, besides *Notes on the Parables; A Treatise on the Atonement;* and several volumes of *Sermons.* See Whittemore, *Life of the Rev. H. Ballou.*

Balm

Picture for Balm

(for the original term, see below), a production more particularly ascribed to Gilead (<01375>Genesis 37:25; <24812>Jeremiah 8:2?). *Balm* or *balsam* is used as a common name for many of those oily, resinous substances which flow spontaneously or by incision from certain trees or plants, and are of considerable use in medicine and surgery. Kimchi and some of the modern interpreters understand the Hebrews word rendered “balm” to be that particular species called opobalsamum, or balm of Gilead, so much celebrated by Pliny, Strabo, Diodorus Siculus, Tacitus, Justin, and others, for its costliness, its medicinal virtues, and for being the product of Jud-ea only; and which Josephus says grew in the neighborhood of Jericho, the tree, according to tradition, having been originally brought by the Queen of

Sheba as a present to King Solomon. On the other hand, Bochart strongly contends that the balm mentioned <24822>Jeremiah 8:22, could not possibly be that of Gilead, and considers it as no other than the resin drawn from the terebinth or turpentine tree. Pliny says, “The trees of the opobalsamum have a resemblance to fir-trees, but they are lower, and are planted and husbanded after the manner of vines. On a particular season of the year they sweat balsam. The darkness of the place is, besides, as wonderful as the fruitfulness of it; for, though the sun shines nowhere hotter in the world, there is naturally a moderate and perpetual gloominess of the air.” Mr. Buckingham observes upon this passage, that “the situation, boundaries, and local features of the valley of Jericho are accurately given in these details, though darkness, in the sense in which it is commonly understood, would be an improper term to apply to the gloom. At the present time there is not a tree of any description, either of palm or balsam, and scarcely any verdure or bushes to be seen, but the complete desolation is undoubtedly rather to be attributed to the cessation of the usual agricultural labors, and to the want of a proper distribution of water over it by the aqueducts, the remains of which evince that they were constructed chiefly for that purpose, rather than to any radical change in the climate or the soil.” The balsam, carried originally, says Arab tradition, from Yemen by the Queen of Sheba, as a gift to Solomon, and planted by him in the gardens of Jericho, was brought to Egypt by Cleopatra, and planted at Ain-Shemesh, now Matara, in a garden which all the old travelers, Arab and Christian, mention with deep interest. The balsam of Jericho, or true balm of Gilead, has long been lost (De Sacy).

Balsam, at present, is procured in some cases from the fruit of a shrub which is indigenous in the mountains between Mecca and Medina. This shrub was cultivated in gardens in Egypt in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and that this was also the case in Palestine, in very early times, appears from the original text in <01431>Genesis 43:11, and <24611>Jeremiah 46:11. The balsam of Mecca has always been deemed a substance of the greatest value; though it is not the only one possessing medicinal properties, yet it is, perhaps, more eminently distinguished for them than other balsamic plants of the same genus, of which sixteen are enumerated by botanists, each exhibiting some peculiarity. There are three species of this balsam, two of which are shrubs, and the other a tree. In June, July, and August they yield their sap, which is received into an earthen vessel. The fruit, also, when pierced with an instrument, emits a juice of the same kind, and in

greater abundance, but less rich. The sap extracted from the body of the tree or shrub is called the opobalsamum; the juice of the balsam fruit is denominated carpobalsamum, and the liquid extracted from the branches when cut off, the xylobalsamum (Jahn, *Bibl. Archaeol.* 1, § 74). According to Bruce, "The balsam is an evergreen shrub or tree, which grows to about fourteen feet high, spontaneously and without culture, in its native country, Azab, and all along the coast to Babelmandeb. The trunk is about eight or ten inches in diameter, the wood light and open, gummy, and outwardly of a reddish color, incapable of receiving a polish, and covered with a smooth bark, like that of a young cherry-tree. It is remarkable for a penury of leaves. The flowers are like those of the acacia, small and white, only that three hang upon three filaments or stalks, where the acacia has but one. Two of these flowers fall off, and leave a single fruit. After the blossoms follow yellow fine-scented seed, inclosed in a reddish-black pulpy nut, very sweet, and containing a yellowish liquor like honey." A traveler, who as sumed the name of Al Bey, says that "there is no balsam made at Mecca; that, on the contrary, it is very scarce, and is obtained principally in the territory of Medina. As the repute of the balsam of Mecca rose, the balm of Gilead disappeared; though in the era of Galen, who flourished in the second century, and travelled into Palestine and Syria purposely to obtain a knowledge of this substance, it grew in Jericho and many other parts of the Holy Land. The cause of its total decay has been ascribed, not without reason, to the royal attention being withdrawn from it by the distractions of the country. In more recent times its naturalization seems to have been attempted in Egypt; for Prosper Alpinus relates that forty plants were brought by a governor of Cairo to the garden there, and ten remained when Belon traveled in Egypt, nearly two hundred and fifty years ago; but, whether from not agreeing with the African soil or otherwise, only one existed in the last century, and now there appears to be none. (See also Thomson, *Land and Book,* 2:193, 457.) *SEE GILEAD, BALM OF*.

The word *balm* occurs frequently in the Authorized Version, as in Genesis 37:25; 43:11; Jeremiah 8:22; 46:11; 51:8; and Ezekiel 28:17. In all these passages the Hebrew text has ṣrî or ṣrî((*tsori'* or *tseri'*, Sept. ῥητίνη), which is generally understood to be the true balsam, and is considered a produce of Gilead, a mountainous district, where the vegetation is that of the Mediterranean region and of Europe, with few traces of that of Africa or of Asia. Lee (*Lex.* p. 520) supposes it to be *mastich,* a gum obtained from the *Pistaccia Lentiscus;* but Gesenius

defends the common rendering, balsam. It was the gum of a tree or shrub growing in Gilead, and very precious. It was one of the best fruits of Palestine (<01431>Genesis 43:11), exported (<01375>Genesis 37:25; <26717>Ezekiel 27:17), and especially used for healing wounds (<24822>Jeremiah 8:22; 46:11; 51:8). The balsam was almost peculiar to Palestine (Strab. 16:2, p. 763; Tac. *Hist.* v. 6; Pliny 12:25, § 54; 32, § 59), distilling from a shrub like the vine and rue, which in the time of Josephus was cultivated in the neighborhood of Jericho and of the Dead Sea (*Ant.* 14:4, 1; 15:4, 2), and still grows in gardens near Tiberias (Burckhardt, *Syria,* p. 323). In <26717>Ezekiel 27:17, the Auth. Vers. gives in the margin *rosin.* The fact that the *tsori* grew originally in Gilead does not forbid us to identify it with the shrub mentioned by Josephus as cultivated near Jericho. The name *balsam* is no doubt derived from the Arabic *balasan,* which is probably also the origin of the βάλσαμον of the Greeks. Forskal informs us that the balsam-tree of Mecca is there called *abusham,* i.e. "very odorous." The word *basham,* given by him, is the name of a fragrant shrub growing near Mecca, with the branches and tufts of which they clean the teeth, and is supposed to refer to the same plant. These names are very similar to words which occur in the Hebrew text of several passages of Scripture, as in the Song of Solomon, 5:1, "I have gathered my myrrh with my spice" (*basam*)*;* ver. 13, "His cheeks are as a bed of spices" (*basam*)*;* and in 6:2, "gone down into his garden to the beds of spices" (*basam*). The same word is used in <02558>Exodus 35:28, and in <111010>1 Kings 10:10, "There came no more such great abundance of spices (*basam*) as those which the Queen of Sheba gave to King Solomon." In all these passages *basam'* or *bo'sem* (µcB; and µcBn), though translated "spices," would seem to indicate the' balsam-tree, if we may infer identity of plant or substance from similarity in the Hebrew and Arabic names. But the word may indicate only a fragrant aromatic substance in general. The passages in the Song of Solomon may with propriety be understood as referring to a plant cultivated in Judaea, but not to spices in the general sense of that term. Queen Sheba might have brought balsam or balsam-trees, as well as spices, for both are the produce of southern latitudes, though far removed from each other. (On the balsams of modern commerce, see the *Penny Cyclopedia,* s.v. Balsamineae et sq.) *SEE BALSAM.*

Balmes, Jaime Lucio

a Spanish theologian, born Aug. 28, 1810, at Vich in Catalonia, died there July 9,1848. He was for some time teacher of mathematics at Vich, was exiled under the regency of Espartero, and founded in 1844, at Madrid, a political weekly, *El Pensamiento de la Nacion*, as an organ of the Conservative or Catholic party. In 1847 a pamphlet in favor of the political reforms of Pius IX (*Pio IX*, Madrid and Paris, 1847) brought him into conflict with his party. His principal works are a comparison of the relation of Protestantism and Roman Catholicism to European civilization (*El Protestantismo comparado con el Catolicismo en sus relaciones con la civilisacion Europea*, 3 vols. 8vo, Madrid, 1848; Engl. transl. London, 1849, 8vo); a *Filosofia fondamental* (Barcelona, 1846, 4 vols.; translated into French, 3 vols. 1852; into English, by H. F. Brownson, 2 vols. New York, 1857); and a *Curso de Filosofia Elemental* (Madrid, 1837). See A. de Blanche-Raffin, *Jacques Balmes, sa vie et ses ouvrages* (Paris, 1850); *North British Review*, May, 1852, art. 4.

Balnu'us

(Βαλνοῦος), one of the "sons" of Addi that divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (1 Esdras 9:31); evidently the BINNUI *SEE BINNUI* (q.v.) of the true text (Ezra 10:30).

Balsac

SEE BOLSEC.

Balsam

Picture for Balsam

(Gr. βάλσαμον, i.e. *opobalsamum*, Arab. *balasan*), the fragrant resin of the balsam-tree, possessing medicinal properties; according to Pliny (12:54), indigenous only to Judaea, but known to Diodorus Sic. (3:46) as a product of Arabia also. In Palestine, praised by other writers also for its balsam (Justin, 36:3; Tacit. *Hist.* v. 6; Plutarch, *Vita Anton.* c. 36; Florus, 3, 5, 29; Dioscor. 1:18), this plant was cultivated in the environs of Jericho (Strabo, 16:763; Diod. Sic. 2:48; 19:98), in gardens set apart for this use (Pliny 12:54; see Joseph. *Ant.* 14:4, 1; 15:4, 2; *War*, 1:6, 6); and after the destruction of the state of Judaea, these plantations formed a lucrative source of the Roman imperial revenue (see Diod. Sic. 2:48). Pliny

distinguishes three different species of this plant; the first with thin, capillaceous leaves; the second a crooked scabrous shrub; and the third with smooth rind and of taller growth than the two former. He tells us that, in general, the balsam plant, a shrub, has the nearest resemblance to the grapevine, and its mode of cultivation is almost the same. The leaves, however, more closely resemble those of the rue, and the plant is an evergreen. Its height does not exceed two cubits. From slight incisions made very cautiously into the rind (Joseph. *Ant.* 14:4, 1; *War,* 1:6, 6) the balsam trickles in thin drops, which are collected with wool into a horn, and then preserved in new earthen jars. At first it is whitish and pellucid, but afterward it becomes harder and reddish. That is considered to be the best quality which tiickles before the appearance of the fruit. Much inferior to this is the resin pressed from the seeds, the rind, and even from the stems (see Theophrast. *Plantt.* 9:6; Strabo, 16:763; Pausan. 9:28, 2). This description, which is not sufficiently characteristic of the plant itself, suits for the most part the Egyptian balsam-shrub found by Belon (Paulus, *Samml.* 4:188 sq.) in a garden near Cairo (the plant, however, is not indigenous to Egypt, but the layers are brought there from Arabia Felix; Prosp. Alpin. *De balsamo,* 3; *Plant. Eg.* 14:30, with the plate; Abdollatif, *Memoirs,* p. 58). Forskal found between Mecca and Medina a shrub, *abusham* (Niebuhr, *Reis.* 1:351), which he considered to be the genuine balsam-plant, and he gave its botanical description under the name *Amyris opobalsamum,* in his *Flora Egypt. Arab.* p. 79 sq., together with two other varieties, *Amyris kataf* and *Amyris kafal.* There are two species distinguished in the Linnsean system, the *Amyris Gileadensis* (Forsk. "A. opobals.") and *A. opobals.* (the species described by Belon and Alpin); see Linne's *Vollst. Pflanzensyst.* 1:473 sq., plates; Plenck, *Plantt. Med.* pl. 155; *Berlin. Jahrb. d. Pharmac.* 1795, pl. 1; Ainslie, *Mater. Indica,* 1:26 sq. More recent naturalists have included the species *Amnyr's Gilead.* in the genus *Protium;* see Wight and Walker (Arnott), *Prodromn. flore peninsulae India Orient.* (London, 1834), 1:177; Lindley, *Flora Medica* (London, 1838, 8vo), p. 169. This tree, from which the Mecca balsam is gained in very small quantity (Pliny 12:54, "succus e plaga manat ... sed tenui gutta plorata"), which never reaches us unadulterated, grows only in a single district of Yemen; of late, however, it was discovered in the East Indies also. See generally Prosp. Alpin. *Dial. de balsalmo* (Venet. 1591; as also, in several editions of his work *De Plantt.* fAq. p. 1592; and in Ugolini, *Thesaur.* 11, with plates); Veiling, *Opobalsami veterib. cogniti indclcice,* p. 217 sq.; Bochart, *Hieroz.* 1:628 sq.; Michaelis, *Suppl.* 2142

sq.; Le Moyne, *Diss. Opobalsam. declaratzum* (Upsal. 1764); Wildenow, in the *Berl. Jahrb. d. Pharmac.* 1795, p. 143 sq., with plates; Oken, *sehrb. d. Botanik*, II, 2:681 sq.; Martins, *Pharmakogn.* p. 343 sq.; Sprengel, *Zu Dioscor.* 2:355 sq.

Our only reason for mentioning all this is of course the presupposition that the Palestinian balsam is named in the Bible also, and, indeed, the *bosem* (μcBo, <2153>Song of Solomon 5:13), also *basam* (μcB; v. 1; comp. Arab. *bashaums*), which in both passages appear to be names of garden plants, must be taken for the balsam-shrub (the ancient translators consider the word as a name). It is more difficult to determine whether the resin of the balsam tree is mentioned also in the books of the O.T. The *tseri* or *tsori* (yrix]or yrix) is commonly taken for such. This name is given to a precious resin found in Gilead (<0137>Genesis 37:25; <2461>Jeremiah 46:11), and circulated as an article of merchandise by Arab and Phoenician merchants (<0137>Genesis 37:25; <2617>Ezekiel 27:17). It was one of the principal products of Palestine which was thought to be worthy to be offered as a gift even to Egyptian princes (<0143>Genesis 43:11), and was considered a powerful salve (<2082>Jeremiah 8:22; 46:11; 51:8). Hebrew commentators understand, in fact, balsam by *tseri.* The ancient translators render it mostly by *gum.* Others, however (Oedmann, *Sanml.* 3, 110 sq.; Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* IV, 1:168 sq.), take it to be the oil of the *Myrobalanus* of the ancients (Pliny 12:46 sq.) or the *Elaeagnus angustifolia* of Linnaeus. The fruit of this plant resembles the olive, and is of the size of a walnut. It contains a fat, oily kernel, from which the Arabs press an oil highly esteemed for its medicinal properties, especially for open wounds (Maundrell, in Paulus, *Samml.* 1, 110; Mariti, *Trav.* p. 415; Troilo, *Trav.* p. 107A. That this tree grows in Palestine, especially in the environs of Jericho, we are told not only by modern travelers (Hasselquist, *Voyages*, p. 150; Arvieux, 2:155; Pococke, *East*, 2:47 sq.; Volney, *Voyages*, 2:240; Robinson, 2:291), but even by Josephus (*War*, 4:8, 3). We must admit, however, that the Hebrew name *tseri* seems to imply rather a resin trickling from some plant than a pressed oil, and that the arguments of Rosenmüller in favor of his statement, that the Mecca balsam is a mere perfume and not a medicine, have not much weight (see Gesenius, *Thes.* 3, 1185). Our physicians make, indeed, no medicinal use of it; but we can never obtain the genuine Mecca balsam. The ancients certainly ascribed medicinal powers to the balsam (see Dioscor. ut sup.), and it is considered even at present as a medicine of well-attested quality, especially if applied externally (Prosp. Alpin. *Rer. Eg.*

3, 15, p. 192; Hasselquist, p. 565, “rescivi quod vulnerarium Turcis sit excellentissimum et palmarium, dum in vulnera recens inflicta guttas aliquot infundunt quo continuato brevissimo tempore vulnera maximi momenti persanant”). The *tseri*, therefore, *might* have been the balsam, and if so, the shrub, which originally grew in Gilead, may have been transplanted and cultivated as a garden-plant on the plains of Jericho, and preserved only there. We greatly doubt, however, whether the balsam shrub ever grew wild anywhere but in Arabia, and it seems to us more probable that it was brought from Arabia to Palestine, though, perhaps, not by the Queen of Sheba (Josephus, *Ant.* 8:6, 6). Besides the *tseri* (יְרִי), another word, *nataph* (נָטָף), mentioned in Exodus 30:34, as an ingredient of the holy incense, is taken by Hebrew commentators for opobalsamum; this, however, is perhaps rather STACTE *SEE STACTE* (q.v.). *SEE MASTICK*; *SEE AROMATICS*.

Balsamon, Theodore

an eminent canonist of the Greek Church, was born at Constantinople in the I twelfth century; was made chancellor and librarian of the church of St. Sophia, and about 1186 became patriarch of Antioch, without, however, being able to go there to discharge the functions of the office since the city was occupied by the Latins, who had intruded a bishop of their own. He died about 1200. His first work (which he undertook at the wish of the Emperor Manuel Communes and the patriarch Michael Anchialus) was *Photii Nomocanon Canones SS. Apostolorum*, etc. (with a Commentary on the Canons of the Apostles and the general and particular Councils, and on the Canonical Epistles of the Fathers), printed at Paris; 1615, fol.; also a Commentary on the *Syntagma of Photius*, given in Beveridge, *Synodicon, sive Pandectai Canonum* (Oxon. 1672-82, 2 vols. fol.). For an account of Balsamon and his works, see Beveridge’s *Synodicon,* Prolegomena to vol. 1. — Cave, *Hist. Lit.* anno 1180; Hoefer, *Biog. Generale*, 4:311.

Baltha’sar

(Βαλτάσαρ), a Graecized form (Baruch 1:11, 12) of the name of the Babylonian king BELSHAZZAR *SEE BELSHAZZAR* (q.v.).

Balthasar

the name given in the Romish legends, without any foundation, to one of the magi who came to adore our Lord Jesus Christ. *SEE MAGI*.

Baltus, Jean François

a Jesuit, born at Metz, June 8th, 1667. He became a Jesuit in 1682, and in 1717 was called to Rome to examine the books written by the members of his company. Returning to France, he was, in succession, rector of several colleges of his order, and died at Rheims, librarian of the college, March 19th, 1743. He wrote, *Reponse a Histoire des Oracles de' M. Fontenelle* (Strasb. 1707 and 1709, 8vo): — *Defense des Saints Peres accuses de Platonisme* (Paris, 1711, 4to); new ed. under the title *Purete du Christianisme* (Paris, 2 vols. 8vo, 1838)*: — Defense des Propheties de la Religion Chretienne* (1737, 3 vols. 12mo), with other *works. — Biog. Universelle.*

Baluze, Etienne

an eminent canonist and historian, was born at Tulle, in Limousin, December 24th, 1630. He studied first among the Jesuits at Tulle, and in 1646 was sent to the college of the company at Toulouse, where he remained for eight years. He soon acquired a high reputation in ecclesiastical history and the canon law. Not wishing to serve as a priest, but desirous of opportunity to pursue his studies quietly, he received the tonsure, and put himself under the patronage of Peter de Marca, who brought him to Paris in 1656, and made him the associate of his labors. Upon the death of De Marca in 1662, the chancellor of France, Le Tellier, took Baluze under his protection; built in 1667 he attached himself to Colbart, who made him his librarian, and it was by his care that the library of that eminent man acquired its richest treasures, and attained to such great celebrity among the learned. He left the family of Colbert in 1670, and afterward Louis XIV made him director of the royal college, with a pension. This situation he held until his eightieth year, when he was banished for having published the "Genealogical History of the House of Auvergne," in 2 vols. fol. (170-), by order of the Cardinal de Bouillon, who had fallen into disgrace at court. He obtained a recall in 1713, after the peace of Utrecht, without, however, recovering his appointments, and died July 28th, 1718. His library, when it was sold after his death, contained 1500 MSS., which were purchased for the Bibliotheque Royale. Baluze left

as many as forty-five published works, of which the most important *are-Regnum, Francorum Capitularia* (1677, 2 vols. fol.; also, edited by Chiniac in 1780, 2 vols. fol. a superb *edition*)*: — Epistole Innocentii Papa III* (1682, 2 vols. fol. This collection is incomplete, owing to the unwillingness of the Romans at the time to give him free access to the pieces in the Vatican library. Brequiny and De la Porte du Theil, in their *Diplomatca, Charta,* etc., 1791, have given the letters which Baluze could not obtain): — *Conciliorum Nova Collectio* (1683, vol. 1, fol. This work was intended to embrace all the known councils which Labbe has omitted in his collection, and would have filled many volumes; but Baluze abandoned his first design, and limited himself to one volume): — *Vitae Paparum Avinionensium* (" Vies des Papes d'Avignon," 1693, 2 vols. 4to, an admirable refutation of the ultramontane pretensions. He maintains that the holy see is not necessarily fixed at Rome): — *Miscellanea* (7 vols. 8vo. A new edition, considerably enlarged and improved, was published by Mansi at Lucca in 1761, in 4 vols. fol.). A complete list of his works may be found at p. 66 of the *Capitularia.* See Dupin, *Eccl. Writers,* 17th cent.; *Vie de Baluze,* written by himself, and continued by Martin.

Ba'ma

(Heb. *Bamah',* hmB; *a height;* Sept. Ἀβαμά), an eminence or high-place, where the Jews worshipped their idols, occurs as a proper name, Ezekiel 20:29. In other passages it is usually translated "high place;" and in Ezekiel 36:2, such spots are termed '" ancient high places, "or ancient heights. *SEE BAMOTH*. On such high places the Hebrews made oblations to idols, and also to the Lord himself, before the idea obtained that unity of place for the divine worship was indispensable. The Jewish historians, therefore, for the most part, describe this as an unlawful worship, in consequence of its being so generally associated with idolatrous rites. *SEE HIGH-PLACE*. The above passage in Ezekiel is very obscure, and, full of the paronomasia so dear to the Hebrew poets, so difficult for us to appreciate: "What is the high place (hmBh) whereunto ye hie (µyaBh)? and the name of it is called Bamah (hmB) unto this day." Ewald (*Propheten,* p. 286) pronounces this verse to be an extract from an older prophet than Ezekiel. The name here, however, seems to refer, not to a particular spot, but to any such locality individualized by the term (see Henderson, *Comment.* in loc.).

Bambas, Neophytos

an archimandrite of the Greek Church, and one of the principal prose writers of modern Greece, was born upon the island of Chios, and died at Athens in Feb. 1855. He studied at the College of Chios and at the University of Paris, reorganized, after his return from Paris, the College of Chios, and remained its president until the war of independence in 1821. In 1824 he became Professor of Philosophy at the University of Corfu, afterward director of the college at Syra, and, at last, Professor of Philosophy and Rhetoric at the University of Athens. On account of his extensive learning, the British and Foreign Bible Society confided to him the task of translating, in union with Rev. Mr. Lowndes, and Mr. Nicolaides of Philadelphia in Asia Minor, the Bible into modern Greek. During the latter years of his life, Mr. Bambas attached himself, however, to the Russian or Napaean party, which is hostile to the reformation of the Church. He wrote a manual of sacred eloquence (Ἐγχειρίδιον τ ς τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἀμβῶνος ῥητορικῆς, Athens, 1851), a manual of ethics (Ἐγχειρίδιον τῆς ἠθικῆς, Athens, 1853), and other works on philosophy, ethics, and rhetoric, and several Greek grammars. See Baird, *Modern Greece,* p. 80, 330 (N. Y. 1856).

Bambino

the name of the swaddled figure of the infant Savior, which, surrounded by a halo, and watched over by angels, occasionally forms the subject of altar-pieces in Roman Catholic churches. The *Santissimo Bambino* in the church of the Ara Caeli at Rome is held in great veneration for its supposed miraculous power of curing the sick. It is carved in wood, painted, and richly decorated with jewels and precious stones. The carving is attributed to a Franciscan pilgrim, out of a tree that grew on Mount Olivet, and the painting to the evangelist Luke. The festival of the *Bambino,* which occurs at the Epiphany, is attended by great numbers of country people, and the Bambino is said to draw more in the shape of fees than the most successful medical practitioner in Rome. — Chambers's *Encyclopaedia, s.v.*

Bambridge

SEE BAINBRIDGE.

Ba'moth (Heb. *Bamoth',* t/mB; *heights;* Sept. Βαμώθ), the forty-seventh station of the Israelites, on the borders of Moab (⁰⁴²¹⁹Numbers 21:19, 20);

according to Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v. Βαβώθ, Bamoth), a city near the river Arnon. As it was the next encampment before reaching Pisgah (usually identified with Jebel Attarus, *SEE NEBO*), it may not improbably be identified with *Jebel-Humeh,* immediately east, a position which seems to agree with the circumstances of all the notices. Kruse, however (in Seetzen's *Reise,* 4:225), thinks it the place now called *Waleh,* on the wady of the same name. It is probably the same place elsewhere called BAMOTH-BAAL (<06137>Joshua 13:17).

Ba'moth-ba'al

(Heb. *Bamoth'- Ba'al,* tl/mB; l [Bi *heights of Baal;* Sept. Βαμὼθ Βάαλ v.r. Βαιμὼν Βάαλ, and αἱ στέλαι τοῦ Βάαλ), or, as the margin of our version reads, "the high places of Baal", *SEE BAAL*, a place given to the tribe of Reuben, and situated on the river Arnon, or in the plain through which that stream flows, east of the Jordan (<06137>Joshua 13:17; comp. <042128>Numbers 21:28; 22:41; not <243235>Jeremiah 32:35). It is probably the same place elsewhere (<042119>Numbers 21:19) called simply BAMOTH *SEE BAMOTH* (q. v). Knobel (*Comment.* in loc.) identifies it with the modern *Jebel Attarus,* a site marked by stone-heaps observed both by Seetzen (2. 342) and Burckhardt (*Syria,* p. 370); but this is rather the summit of Nebo.

Bampton Lectures

a course of eight sermons preached annually at the University of Oxford, under the will of the Rev. John Bampton, canon of Salisbury, who died in 1751. According to the directions in his will, they are to be preached upon any of the following subjects: To confirm and establish the Christian faith, and to confute all heretics and schismatics; upon the divine authority of the holy Scriptures; upon the authority of the writings of the primitive fathers as to the faith and practice of the primitive Church; upon the divinity of our LORD and SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST; upon the divinity of the HOLY GHOST; upon the articles of the Christian faith, as comprehended in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds. For the support of this lecture he bequeathed his lands and estates. The lecturer must have taken the degree of master of arts in Oxford or Cambridge, and must never preach the sermons twice. When the lectures were commenced in 1780, the income of the estate was £120 per annum. A list of the Bampton Lectures, as far as published in 1854, is given by Darling, *Cyclopoedia Bibliographica,* 1:166. More than seventy volumes (8vo) of the Bampton lectures are now before the public, and one

is added annually. The most remarkable are the following: Those delivered in 1784, on Christianity and Mohammedanism, by Dr. White, who was accused of having obtained assistance in their composition from Dr. Parr and Dr. Badcock; those by Dr. Tatham in 1790, on the Logic of Theology; those of Dr. Nott in 1802, on Religious Enthusiasm — this series was directed against Wesley and Whitefield; those of Dr. Mant in 1812; those of Reginald Heber in 1815; Whately in 1822; Milman in 1827; Burton in 1829, on the Heresies of the Apostolic Age; Soames in 1830, on the Doctrines of the Anglo-Saxon Church. But of the whole series, none have caused greater controversy than those by Dr. Hampden in 1832, on *The Scholastic Philosophy considered in its Relation to Christian Theology.* They were attacked on all sides, but especially by the leaders of the Oxford Tract Association. When Hampden was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity in 1836, a petition against his appointment was sent up to the throne, and upon this being rejected, a censure was passed upon him in convocation by a large majority, declaring his teaching to be unsound, and releasing undergraduates from attendance at his lectures. In spite of this clerical persecution, he was raised to the see of Hereford in 1847. A recent course of Bampton Lectures, delivered by Mansel in 1858, on *The Limits of Religious Thought,* has caused a less bitter, but scarcely less interesting controversy. The main position which he takes up is, "That the human mind inevitably, and by virtue of its essential constitution, finds itself involved in self-contradictions whenever it ventures on certain courses of speculation," i.e. on speculations concerning the infinite nature of God. He maintains that all attempts to construct an objective or metaphysical theology must necessarily fail, and that the attainment of a philosophy of the infinite is utterly impossible, under the existing laws of human thought-the practical aim of the whole course being to show the "right use of reason in religious questions." Mr. Mansel has been accused by his critics of condemning *all* dogmatic theology (e.g. all creeds and articles), and of making revelation itself impossible. The Bampton Lectures for 1859 were delivered by Geo. Rawlinson, the subject being *The Historical Evidences of the Truth of the Scripture Records, stated anew, with Special Reference to the Doubts and Discoveries of Modern Times.* The volume for 1862 was Farrar's *Critical History of Free Thought* (N. Y. 1863, 12mo). — Chambers, *Encyclopaedia, s.v.; Methodist Quarterly,* 1863, p. 687.

Ban

(*bannus, bannum*), in ancient jurisprudence, a declaration, especially a declaration of outlawry; in ecclesiastical law, a declaration of excommunication (q.v.). According to the canon law of the Roman Church the authority to decree the *ban* lies in the pope for the whole church, in the bishop for his diocese, in the apostolic legate for his legation, and in the prior of an order for his subordinates. Priests had formerly an independent right of excommunication, but can now exercise that right only by authority of the bishop. The ban covers all Christians, whether heretics or not, under the jurisdiction of the administrator (*Conc. Trident.* Sess. 25, cap. 3). *SEE EXCOMMUNICATION*.

For *Banns of Marriage*, *SEE BANNS*.

Ban

(τοῦ Βάν v. r. Βαενάν; Vulg. *Tubal*), given as the name of one of the priestly families that had lost their pedigree after the exile in a very corrupt passage (1 Esdras 5:37); it doubtless stands for TOBIAH *SEE TOBIAH* (q.v.), i.e. הטביה in the parallel lists of Ezra (Ezra 2:60) and Nehemiah (Nehemiah 7:62).

Banai’as

(Βαναίας), the last named of the “sons of Ethma” among the Israelites who had taken foreign wives after the captivity (1 Esdras 9:35); evidently the BENAIAH *SEE BENAIAH* (q.v.) of the genuine list (Ezra, 10:43).

Bancroft, Aaron

D.D., was born at Reading, Penn., 1755, and graduated at Harvard College. In 1785 he became pastor of the Congregational Church of Worcester, Mass., where he remained until his death. He was educated a Calvinist, but became an Arian in middle life. In 1808 he published a *Life of Washington*, which was well received, and has been often reprinted (last ed. N. Y., 2 vols. 12mo). In 1822 he published a volume of Sermons. — *Allibone; New Am. Encycl.*

Bancroft, Richard

archbishop of Canterbury, was born at Farnworth in 1544, and entered at Christ's College, Cambridge. In 1584 he was made rector of St. Andrew's in Holborn. When chaplain to Archbishop Whitgift, he delivered a sermon at St. Paul's Cross, in which he strongly warned the Parliament against the Puritans. In 1597 he was made bishop of London through the influence of the archbishop, and was sent by Queen Elizabeth in 1600 to Embden, to put an end to the differences which existed between the English and Danes, but his mission was unsuccessful. He attended the Hampton Court Conference in 1604, and in March in that year was appointed by the king's writ president of convocation, the see of Canterbury being vacant. In the eleventh session, held May 2d, he presented the Book of Canons now in force, which he had selected out of the articles, injunctions, and synodical acts passed in the two previous reigns. After this he was promoted to the see of Canterbury, and his primacy is distinguished for the commencement of the now authorized version of the Scriptures. He was a strenuous High-Churchman, and a bitter opponent of the Puritans. He was the first Anglican divine who publicly maintained the *divine right* of bishops. This was in a sermon preached at St. Paul's Cross, February, 1588-9, in which he maintained that "bishops were, as an order, superior to priests and deacons; that they governed by divine appointment; and that to deny these truths was to deny a portion of the Christian faith." On the effect produced by this sermon, see Heylin, *Aerius Redivivus*, p. 284. He died at Lambeth in 1610, leaving his books to his church. His principal published works were, *Discovery of the Untruths and Slanders against Reformation* (sermon preached February, 1588)*: — Survey of the pretended Holy Discipline* (Lond. 1593, 4*to*)*: — Dangerous Positions and Proceedings published under the Pretence of Reformation, for the Presbyterial Discipline* (Lond. 1595, 8vo). See *Biog. Brit.* vol. 1; Neal, *Hist. of Puritans*, 1:449; Lathbury, *Hist. of Convocation* (Lond. 1842, 8vo); Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, 1:506.

Band

the representative of several Hebrews and Gr. words, and in the N.T. especially of σπεῖρα, a COHORT *SEE COHORT* (q- v.).

Band

a part of clerical dress, said to be a relic of the ancient *amice* (q.v.). It belongs to the full dress of the bar and university in England. “In Scotland it distinguishes ordained ministers from licentiates or probationers, and is said to be a remnant of the old cravat worn universally by the clergy a hundred years ago.” — (*Eadie.*) It is worn in the Church of England, in the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, and by the Protestant ministers of the Continental churches of Europe generally. *SEE CLERGY, Dress of the.*

Band (Societies)

SEE BANDS.

Bandinel, James

D.D., was educated at Jesus College, Oxford; became M.A. in 1758, D.D. in 1777, and died at Winchester in 1804. He was rector of Netherby, Dorsetshire, for many years. He published *Eight Sermons on the peculiar Doctrines of Christianity*, being the Bampton Lectures for 1780 (Oxford, 1780, 8vo), which are marked by ingenuity and critical talent.

Bands

small societies instituted by Wesley to promote personal holiness and good works among the early Methodists. The first rules of the band societies,” drawn up December 25, 1738, may be found in Emory, *History of the Methodist Discipline*, p. 200. These societies were more select than class-meetings (q.v.), and admitted only persons of the same sex, all married or all single, who were put in charge of a “band-leader.” They have nearly gone out of use in America, the article relating to them in the Discipline having been struck out by the General Conference of 1856. They still may be found in England, though not very numerous. See Emory, *History of the Discipline*, p. 200 sq.; Grindrod, *Compendium of Laws of Methodism*, 174 sq.; Porter, *Compendium of Methodism*, 50, 460; Stevens, *History of Methodism*, 1:122; 2:455; Wesley, *Works*, v. 183.

Banduri Manuscript

SEE MONTFAUCON’S MANUSCRIPT.

Bangius Or Bang, Peter

a Swedish theologian, was born at Helsingfors in 1633, was made professor of theology in the University of Abo, and bishop of Wiborg. He died in 1696, having published a *Commentarius in Hebraeos*, and a *Historia Ecclesiastica.*

Bangor

(*Bangertium*), an episcopal see in Wales, in Caernarvonshire. The foundation of this see is altogether involved in obscurity. The cathedral is dedicated to St. Daniel, its first bishop, and the chapter consists of a dean, treasurer, precentor, two archdeacons, five canons, and two minor canons. The diocese comprises Anglesea, and parts of Caernarvonshire, Denbigh, Montgomery, and Merionethshire, containing one hundred and seventy parishes, of which thirty-seven are impropriated. The present (1889) incumbent is James Colquhoun Campbell, D.D., consecrated in 1859.

Bangorian Controversy

a title derived from the bishop of Bangor (Hoadley), who, in the reign of George I, wrote "A Preservative against the Principles and Practices of Non-Jurors;" and afterward preached and published a sermon from the passage, "My kingdom is not of this world" (John 18:36), in which he maintained the supreme authority of Christ as king in his own kingdom; and that he had not delegated his power, like temporal lawgivers during their absence from their kingdom, to any persons as his vicegerents and deputies. The publication of this sermon by order of the king led to the controversy above named, in which Dr. Snape and Dr. Sherlock, the king's chaplains, took a prominent part as the opponents of Hoadley, maintaining that there were certain powers distinctly vested in the church by Christ, its king, of which the ministers of the church were the constitutionally-appointed executive. This controversy lasted many years, and led to the discontinuance of the Convocation. The pamphlets on the subject are very numerous; one of the most important is, William Law, *Three Letters to Bishop Hoadley*, to be found in Law's *Scholar Armed*, 1:279, and also in Law's *Complete Works* (Lond. 1762), vol. 1. *SEE ENGLAND, CHURCH OF*; *SEE HOADLEY*.

Bangs, John

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Stratford, Conn., in 1781, commenced preaching in 1806, entered the itinerant ministry in N. Y. Conference in 1819, became supernumerary in 1835, ,and died in great peace, Feb. 4,1849. His youth was vain and profane, but from his conversion he was full of holy zeal and love for souls. “He preached holiness to others, and enjoyed its exalted felicity himself,” and about three thousand conversions were the fruit of his labors. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 4:328.

Bangs, Nathan

D.D., an eminent minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born May 2, 1778, near Bridgeport, Conn. When he was about thirteen, the family removed to Stamford, Delaware Co., N. Y., and here, on the home farm, the boy grew up, receiving the common school education of the time, by which he profited so well that at eighteen he was capable of teaching such a school himself. In 1799 he went to Canada, and spent three years there in teaching and in surveying land. In 1800 he was converted, and in 1802 was admitted into the New York Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which then embraced Canada. The next six years he spent in arduous labors in Canada, going from village to village as an itinerant minister, often through virgin forests, guided only by the ‘‘marks” of the wood-cutter or the hunter. In 1808 he was returned to the state of New York, being appointed by the bishop to Delaware Circuit. Such had been his rapid rise in influence that his brethren sent him to the General Conference of this year, and so commanding were his subsequent services that he was a delegate in every session after, except that of 1848, down to 1856, when his advanced years justified his release from such responsibilities. In 1810 he was sent to New York City, which was ever after the headquarters of his labors and influence for his denomination. Methodism here was then still in its youthful struggles; it consisted of one circuit, with five preaching-places. The city population was below one hundred thousand. The city and its suburbs now (1865) comprise a million of people, and more than twice as many Methodist preachers as the whole Conference then reported, though it swept over much of Connecticut, Massachusetts, Vermont, and over Eastern New York, up the Hudson into Canada to even Montreal and Quebec! What a history for one life! In 1813 he was appointed presiding elder of the Rhinebeck District; from 1817 to

1820 he was pastor in New York; and in 1820 he was elected "Book Agent," and assumed the charge of the Methodist Book Concern, then a small business, and deeply involved in debt. Under his skillful management (from 1820 to 1828) the Concern rapidly recovered from its embarrassments, and its business was immensely extended. In 1826 the "Christian Advocate" was established, and the editorial matter from 1826 to 1828 was chiefly furnished by Dr. Bangs, though he was still discharging the arduous duties of senior book-agent. During the whole period of his agency (1820-1828) he was also editor of the *Methodist Magazine.* Such an amount of labor would have worn out any man not endowed with great intellectual and bodily vigor-qualities which, in Dr. Bangs, were supplemented by indomitable industry and perseverance. In 1828 he was appointed editor of the *Advocate,* including, also, the editorial labors of the *Magazine.* In 1832 the General Conference appointed him editor of the *Methodist Quarterly Review,* a new form of the *Methodist Magazine.* His office comprised also the editorial charge of the books of the general catalogue. He had no paid assistance in the labors of the two periodicals, no appropriation being made for contributions; but the variety and vigor of his own articles imparted continued freshness and power to their pages.

His services to the missionary cause were perhaps the most important of all his vast and varied labors. He was one of the founders of the Methodist Missionary Society; he framed its original Constitution; he wrote its first "Circular Address" to the church. During sixteen years prior to the organization of the secretary-ship as a special and salaried function, he labored indefatigably and gratuitously for the society as its vice-president, secretary, or treasurer. He wrote in these years all its annual reports. In 1836 he was appointed "Missionary Secretary." He now devoted his entire energies to the Missionary Society, conducting its correspondence, seeking missionaries for it, planning its mission-fields, pleading for it in the pulpits, and representing it in the Conferences until 1841, when he accepted the presidency of the Wesleyan University at Middletown, Conn. In 1842 he returned to pastoral work in New York. and remained in active service until 1852. The remainder of his life was passed in quiet literary labor, with occasional preaching as his health served. Much of the literary labor of his later years was devoted to the exposition of the doctrine of entire sanctification. In his eightieth year he preached with vigor, and his writings of that period are luminous and powerful. His last sermon was on the certain triumph of the Gospel. He died in great peace May 3, 1862.

Dr. Bangs was a man of vigor and force — a fighter, when need be, to the last. “No man could show a nobler indignation against anything unrighteous or mean; no man could speak more unflinchingly or directly to the very face and teeth of a pretentious, an evasive, or disingenuous disputant, but no man ever had a more genial heart, a more instinctive sympathy with whatever is generous, heroic, or tender. His friendships were as steadfast as adamant. Unlike most old men, he was, to the last, progressive in his views. He sympathized with all well-considered measures for the improvement of his church, but its old honor was dearer to him than life, and woe to the man that dare impeach it in his presence. To him its history was all providential, and the very necessity of changes was the gracious summons of Providence for it to arise and shine still brighter. This hearty, resolute love of his friends and his cause, was one of the strongest, noblest traits of the war-worn old hero. It made him lovable as he was loving. His old age seemed to mellow rather than wither his generous dispositions. He was always deeply devout, but with advanced years he seemed to attain advanced heights of Christian experience and consolation. The Pauline doctrine of sanctification, as defined by Wesley, became his habitual theme of interest and conversation. He delighted to attend social gatherings for prayer on this subject, and during several late years he presided over one of the most frequented assemblies of this kind in New York. He seemed to take increasingly cheerful views of life, and of the prospects of the kingdom of God in the world, as he approached the end of his career. There was no querulousness in his temper, no repining in his conversation, at the changes which were displacing him from public view.”

His writings alone would have made him an historical character of his church. His editorial productions in the *Advocate,* the *Magazine,* and the *Quarterly Review* would fill scores of volumes. His Annual Missionary Reports would make no small library of missionary literature. His more substantial publications are more numerous than those of any other American Methodist. As early as 1809 he began his career as an author by a volume against “Christianism,” an heretical sect of New England. Three years later the General Conference appointed him chairman of a committee to collect the historical materials of the denomination, and thus began the researches which resulted in his *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church.* Before the appearance of this, his most important production, he published *Errors of Hopkinsianism* (1815, 12mo); *Predestination examined* (1817, 12mo); *Reformer Reformed* (1818, 12mo); *Methodist*

Episcopacy (1820, 12mo); *Life of the Rev. Freeborn Garrettson,* one of the best of our biographies, and an essential collection of data for the history of the church. In 1832 appeared his *Authentic History of the Missions under the care of the Methodist Episcopal Church,* a volume which has aided much the missionary enterprise of the denomination. In 1835 he published *Letters to a Young Preacher,* full of excellent counsels on ministerial habits, on books, study, preaching, etc.; and in 1836, *The Original Church of Christ* (12mo). In 1839 appeared the first volume of his *History of the M. E. Church.* In three years the remaining three volumes were issued. It was a book for the times, if not for all time. His other publications are an *Essay on Emancipation* (1848, 8vo); *State and Responsibilities of the Methodist Episcopal Church* (1850, 12mo); *Letters on Sanctification* (1851, 12mo); *Life of Arminius* (18mo); and numerous occasional sermons. His scheme of "Emancipation" is substantially that recommended in the message of the President of the United States to Congress, 1862. "Let Congress," he says, "make a proposition to the 1 several slave states that so much per head shall be allowed for every slave that shall be emancipated, leaving it to the state Legislatures respectively to adopt their own measures to effect the object." Thus did this sagacious old man anticipate by several years the best suggestion which our national leaders were able to utter on our greatest national problem before its final solution by the sword. It is elaborated with skillful and intrepid ability, and fortified by decisive proofs from facts and figures. It has been said of his concluding "array of motives to emancipation," that they "are strong enough, one would think, to rouse all but the dead to the importance of the task." See Stevens, *Life and Times of Nathan Bangs, D.D.* (N. Y. 1863, 12mo); *Ladies' Repository,* June, 1859; *The Methodist,* May 10,1862; *Methodist Quarterly,* January, 1864, p. 172.

Bangs, Stephen Beekman,

a prominent young Methodist preacher, son of the Rev. Heman Bangs, was born in New York, March 25, 1823, graduated at the N.Y. University in 1843, and was licensed to preach in the following year, joining the N. Y. Conference. His style of preaching excited strong anticipations of great usefulness, which were, however, disappointed by his early death, March 20,1846. — Magruder, *Memoir of S. B. Bangs* (New York, 1853); *Minutes of Conferences,* 4:31.

Bangs, William M'Kendree

son of the Rev. Nathan Bangs, D.D., was born in New York, December i5, 1810, and graduated at 19 years of age at the University of Ohio with the highest honors. He was immediately offered a professorship in Augusta College, Ky., which he held for only one year, being impressed with the duty of entering the Christian ministry. In 1831 he entered the N. Y. Conference of the M. E. Church, and continued to labor, except when his feeble health compelled him to desist, till his death, Sept. 5, 1852. His logical powers were of the highest order, and his command of language rarely equalled. "Whether conversing familiarly with his friends, discussing some difficult abstract question, or preaching to a congregation, his style was remarkably adapted to the subject and the occasion. His sermons were clear, systematic, easy to be understood, neither encumbered by extraneous matter, nor disfigured by learned pedantry. They were characterized by a beautiful simplicity, and always bore the impress of a great mind." As a controversial writer he excelled greatly; his articles in the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, especially those of 1836 and 1837, in reply to the "*Christian Spectator*," and his reviews of Watson's *Theological Institutes*, are fine specimens of analytical as well as comprehensive thinking. — *Minutes of Conferences*, v. 211; Sprague, *Annals*, 7:773.

Ba'ni

(Heb. *Bani'*, ynB; *built;* Sept. usually Βανί, sometimes Βουνί or Βανουΐ, etc.), the name of at least five men.

1. A Levite, son of Shamer, and father of Amzi, of the family of Merari (<1366>1 Chronicles 6:46). B.C. long ante 1043.

2. A Gadite, one of David's thirty-seven warriors (<1023>2 Samuel 23:36). B.C. 1046.

3. A descendant of Pharez, and father of Imri, one of whose descendants returned from Babylon (<1304>1 Chronicles 9:4). B.C. long ante 536.

4. One of the heads of families whose retainers to the number of 642 returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (<1510>Ezra 2:10; 10:29, 34; <1610>Nehemiah 10:14; 1 Esdras 5:12). He is elsewhere (<1607>Nehemiah 7:15) called BINNUI *SEE BINNUI* (q.v). *SEE BANID*. He was himself one of those who divorced their heathen wives (<1510>Ezra 10:38). Others consider

this last a different person, and identify him with some of those referred to below. B.C. 536-410.

5. A Levite, whose son Rehum repaired a portion of the (branch) wall of Jerusalem skirting the brow of Mount Zion on the east (Nehemiah 3:17). Apparently the same Bani was among those who were conspicuous in all the reforms on the return from Babylon (Nehemiah 8:7; 9:4 twice, 5; 10:13). He had another son named Uzzi, who was appointed overseer of the Levites at Jerusalem; his own father's name was Hashabiah (Nehemiah 11:22). B.C. 446-410. *SEE CHENANI*.

Ba'nid

(Βανίας v. r. Βανί; Vulg. *Bania*), the ancestor or family-head of one of the parties (that of Assalimoth, son of Josa, with 160 retainers) that returned from Babylon with Ezra (1 Esd. 8:36). This represents a name, BANI *SEE BANI* (q v.), which has apparently escaped from the present Hebrew text (Ezra 8:10).

Banish

(found in the Auth. Vers. only in the forms "banished," Hebrews jDiNi *niddach'*, 2 Samuel 14:13,14, *outcast*, as elsewhere; and "banishment," Hebrews µyjiWDmi *madduchim'*, "causes of ban.," Lamentations 2:14, rather *seauctions;* Chald. Wvrv] or yvirv] *sheroshu' or sheroshi'*, lit. a *rooting out*, Ezra 7:26). This was not a punishment enjoined by the Mosaic law; but after the captivity, both exile and forfeiture of property were introduced among the Jews; and it also existed under the Romans, by whom it was called *diminutio capitis*, because the person banished lost the rights of a citizen, and the city of Rome thereby lost a head. But there was another description of exile termed *disportatio*, which was a punishment of greater severity. The party banished forfeited his estate, and, being bound, was put on board ship and transported to some island specified by the emperor, there to be confined in perpetual banishment (see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. Banishment). In this manner the apostle John was exiled to the little island of Patmos (Revelation 1:9). *SEE EXILE*.

Bank

In Luke 19:23, the Greek word τράπεζα, *table*, is rendered "bank" in the modern sense of the term, which, by a similar appropriation, is derived

from the same root as *bench*. In <40212>Matthew 21:12; <41115>Mark 11:15; and <43215>John 2:15, it is employed literally, and denotes the "table" of the money-changer (q.v.), at which he sat in the market-place, as is still the custom in the East, and also in the outer court of the Temple. In other passages it denotes an ordinary table for food.

The term "bank," hl;lÞs,*solelah'*, also occurs in <101015>2 Samuel 20:15; <121932>2 Kings 19:32; <233733>Isaiah 37:33, as the name of the *mound* raised against a besieged city; it is elsewhere rendered "mount" in the same sense. *SEE SIEGE*.

The "bank" or *shore* of a river or sea is designated by the Hebrews term hdˆ;or hydÞi *gadah'* or *gidyah'*, and hpc; *saphah'*, a *lip*.

Bann

SEE BANNS.

Bannai'a

(Σαβανναῖος v. r. Βανναίος, Vulg. *Bannus*), one of the "sons of Asom" that renounced their Gentile wives after the captivity (1 Esdras 9:33); apparently a corruption for ZABAD *SEE ZABAD* (q.v.) of the genuine text (<150133>Ezra 10:33).

Banner, Or Standard, Or Ensign, Or Signal

Picture for Banner

(q.v. severally). These words are probably used indiscriminately by the sacred writers. Some of the rabbins suppose that the ancient Hebrew tribe-standards were flags bearing figures derived from the comparisons used by Jacob in his final prophetic blessing on his sons. Thus they have Judah represented by a lion, Dan by a serpent, Benjamin by a wolf, etc. (<014901>Genesis 49:1-28). Sir Thomas Brown, indeed, observes (*Vulgar Errors*, v. 10), "The escutcheons of the tribes, as determined by these ingenious triflers, do not in every instance correspond with any possible interpretation of Jacob's prophecy, nor with the analogous prophecy of Moses when about to die." However, there may be some truth in the rabbinical notion after all. And as the tribe of Judah was represented by a lion, may not its motto have been, "Who shall rouse him up?" Thus the banner of the royal tribe would be an interesting prediction of the

appearance and universal triumph of Christ, who is called "the lion of the tribe of Judah" (<28514>Hosea 5:14; <66505>Revelation 5:5). The four following Hebrew words signify banner, standard, ensign, flag, or signal:

1. DE'GEL (לֶגֶד, as being *conspicuous, flag, banner,* or *standard* of a larger kind, serving for three tribes together, one of which pertained to each of the four general divisions. The four standards of this name were large, and ornamented with colors in white, purple, crimson, and dark blue. The Jewish rabbins assert (founding their statement on <01493>Genesis 49:3, 9, 17, 22, which in this case is very doubtful authority) that the first of these standards, that of Judah, bore a *lion;* the second, or that of Reuben, bore a *man;* that of Ephraim, which was the third, displayed the figure of a *bull:* while that of Dan, which was the fourth, exhibited the representation of *cherubim.* The standards were worked with embroidery (<04152>Numbers 1:52; 2:2, 3, 10, 18, 25; Sol, Song 2:4; 6:4, 10). *SEE CAMP*.

2. OTH (תֹּאַר, a *sign*), an *ensign* or *flag* of a smaller kind. It belonged to each single tribe; and perhaps to the separate classes of families. Most likely it was originally merely a pole or spear, to the end of which a bunch of leaves was fastened, or something similar. Subsequently it may have been a shield suspended on the elevated point of such pole or spear, as was sometimes done among the Greeks and Romans. The Targumists, however, believe that the banners were distinguished by their colors, the color for each tribe being analogous to that of the precious stone for that tribe in the breast-plate of the high-priest; and that the great standard (*degel*) of each of the four camps combined the three colors of the tribes which composed it. They add that the names of the tribes appeared on the standards, together with a particular sentence from the law, and were moreover charged with appropriate representations, as of the lion for Judah, etc. Most modern expositors seem to incline to the opinion that the ensigns were flags distinguished by their colors, or by the name of the tribe to which each belonged (Number 2:2, 34). *SEE FLAG*.

3. NES (נֵס, from its *loftiness*), a *lofty signal,* a *standard.* This standard was not, like the others, borne from place to place. It appears from <04218>Numbers 21:8, 9, that it was a long pole fixed in the earth; a flag was fastened to its top, which was agitated by the wind, and seen at a great distance. In order to render it visible as far as possible, it was erected on lofty mountains, chiefly on the irruption of an enemy, in order to point out to the people a place of rendezvous. It no sooner made its appearance on

such an elevated position than the war-cry was uttered, and the trumpets were blown (<19604>Psalm 60:4; <23526>Isaiah 5:26; 11:12; 13:2; 18:3; 30:17; 49:22; 62:10; <24006>Jeremiah 4:6, 21; 51:12, 27; <26707>Ezekiel 27:7; in this last passage it is the standard or flag of a ship, not the sail). *SEE WAR*.

4. MASETH' (תַּאֶמ, from its *elevation*), a *sign, a signal* given by fire. Some writers have supposed that this signal was a long pole, on the top of which was a grate not unlike a chafing-dish, made of iron bars, and supplied with fire, the size, height, and shape of which denoted the party or company to whom it belonged (<24601>Jeremiah 6:1). *SEE BEACON*.

There appear to be several allusions in Scripture to the banners, standards, or ensigns of ancient nations; a proper knowledge of them might aid us in understanding more clearly many of the sacred predictions. In Daniel, the various national symbols or standards are probably referred to instead of the names of the nations, as the he-goat with one horn was the symbol of Alexander the Great and the Macedonian people, and the ram with two horns Media and Persia, etc. (<27083>Daniel 8:3-9). *SEE MACEDON*. The banners and ensigns of the Roman army had idolatrous, and, therefore, abominable images upon them, hence called "the abomination (q.v.) of desolation;" but their principal standard was an *eagle*. Among the evils threatened to the Hebrews in consequence of their disobedience, Moses predicted one in the following terms: "The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flieth" (Deuteronomy 38:49; compare also <24043>Jeremiah 4:13). In <40248>Matthew 24:28; <42737>Luke 17:37, the Jewish nation, on account of its iniquity, is compared to a dead body, exposed in the open field, and inviting the Roman army, whose standard often bore the figure of an eagle, to come together and devour it. *SEE EAGLE*.

It was customary to give a defeated party a banner as a token of protection, and it was regarded as the surest pledge of fidelity. God's lifting or setting up a banner is a most expressive figure, and imports his peculiar presence, protection, and aid in leading and directing his people in the execution of his righteous will, and giving them comfort and peace in his service (<19005>Psalm 20:5; 60:4; Sol. Song 2:4; see the dissert. on the latter passage by Lowe, in Eichhorn's *Bibl.* 2:184 sq.). *SEE STANDARD-BEARER*.

Banns Of Matrimony

(*bannum nuptiale*), a phrase that has been for many ages used to signify the public announcement in church of the intention of two parties to become united in matrimony. Ignatius, in his *Ep. to Polycarp,* cap. 5, says that it becomes those who marry to do so with the consent or direction of the bishop. And Tertullian (*ad Uxorem,* lib. 2, cap. 2 and 9; *De Pudicitia,* cap. 4) implies that the Church, in the primitive ages, was forewarned of marriages. The earliest existing canonical enactment on the subject in the English Church is that in the 11th canon of the synod of Westminster, A.D. 1200, which enacts that "no marriage shall be contracted without banns thrice published in the church." It is supposed by some that the practice was introduced into France as early as the ninth century; and it is certain that Odo, bishop of Paris, ordered it in 1176. The council of Lateran, in 1215, prescribed it to the whole Latin Church; and the 62d canon of the synod of London, 1603-4, forbids the celebration of marriage "except the banns of matrimony have been first published three several Sundays or, holy-days in the time of divine service in the parish churches or chapels where the parties dwell," on pain of suspension for three years. Marriage without the publication of banns is valid in England, but the parties so married offend against the spirit of the laws. The principal motives which led to the order for the publication of banns were to prevent clandestine marriages, and to discover whether or no the parties have any lawful hindrance. The Church of England enacts that the banns shall be published in church immediately before the sentences for the offertory. If the parties dwell in different parishes, then banns must be published in both. In the Roman Church the banns are ordered to be published at the parochial mass, at sermon-time, upon some three Sundays or festivals of observance. With regard to dispensations of banns, the council of Lateran speaks of nothing of the kind. The council of Trent (*De Reform.* sess. 24, cap. 1) permits them in certain cases. Such dispensations have been granted by bishops in England ever since Archbishop Meopham's time at least, who died in 1333, which power of dispensing was continued to them by the statute law, viz. the Act 25. Hen. VIII, cap. 21, by which all bishops are allowed to dispense as they were wont to do. Before publishing the banns it was the custom for the curate anciently to affiance the two persons to be married in the name of the Blessed Trinity; and the banns were sometimes published at vespers, as well as during the time of mass. See Bingham, *Or. Eccl.* lib.

22, cap. 2, § 2; Martene, *De Ant. Rit.* lib. 2, cap. 9, art. v, p. 135, 136; Landon, s.v.

Ban’nus

(Βαννούς), one of the “sons of Maani” who renounced his Gentile wife after the return from Babylon (1 Esdras 9:34); apparently either the BANI *SEE BANI* or BINNUI *SEE BINNUI* (q.v.) of the true text (<15108>Ezra 10:38).

Banquet

Picture for Banquet 1

(hTvmi *mishteh’, a feast;* and so rendered except on the formal occasions in Esther 5, 6, 7; in <610413>1 Peter 4:3, πότος, from the *drinking* prevalent among the heathen on such occasions). The entertainments spoken of in Scripture, however large and sumptuous, were all provided at the expense of one individual; the ἔρανος, *pic-nic,* of the Greeks, to which every guest present contributed his proportion, being apparently unknown to the Jews, or at least practiced only by the humbler classes, as some suppose that an instance of it occurs in the feast given to our Lord, shortly before his Passion, by his friends in Bethany (<402602>Matthew 26:2; <411401>Mark 14:1; comp. with <381212>John 12:2). Festive meetings of this kind were held only toward the close of the day, as it was not till business was over that the Jews freely indulged in the pleasures of the table; and although, in the days of Christ, — these meals were, after the Roman fashion, called *suppers,* they corresponded exactly to the dinners of modern times, the hour fixed for them varying from five to six o’clock P.M., or sometimes later. *SEE MEAL*.

Picture for Banquet 2

On occasions of ceremony the company were invited a considerable time previous; and on the day and at the hour appointed, an express by one or more servants, according to the number and distance of the expected guests, was dispatched to announce that the preparations were completed, and that their presence was looked for immediately (<402208>Matthew 22:8; <421417>Luke 14:17). (Grotius, in *loc.;* also Morier’s *Journey,* p. 73.) This custom obtains in the East at the present day; and the second invitation, which is always verbal, is delivered by the messenger in his master’s name,

and frequently in the very language of Scripture (<40224>Matthew 22:4). It is observable, however, that this after summons is sent to none but such as have been already invited, and have declared their acceptance; and as, in these circumstances, people are bound by every feeling of honor and propriety to postpone all other engagements to the duty of waiting upon their entertainer, it is manifest that the vehement resentment of the grandee in the parable of the great supper (<42146>Luke 14:16 sq.), where each of the guests is described as offering to the bearer of the express some frivolous, apology for absence, was, so far from being harsh and unreasonable, as infidels have characterized it, fully warranted and most natural according to the manners of the age and country. By accepting his invitation they had given a pledge of their presence, the violation of which on such trivial grounds, and especially after the liberal preparations made for their entertainment, could be viewed in no other light than as a gross and deliberate insult.

At the small entrance-door a servant was stationed to receive the tablets or cards of those who were expected; and as curiosity usually collected a crowd of troublesome spectators, anxious to press forward into the scene of gayety, the gate was opened only so far as was necessary for the admission of a single person at a time, who, on presenting his invitation-ticket, was conducted through a long and narrow passage into the receiving-room; and then, after the whole company was assembled, the master of the house shut the door with his own hands-a signal to the servant to allow himself to be prevailed on neither by noise nor by importunities, however loud and long-continued, to admit the by-standers. To this custom there is a manifest reference in <42134>Luke 13:24, and <40250>Matthew 25:10 (see Morier's *Journey,* p. 142).

One of the first marks of courtesy shown to the guests, after saluting the host, was the refreshment of water and fragrant oil or perfumes; and hence we find our Lord complaining of Simon's omission of these customary civilities (<42744>Luke 7:44; see also <40704>Mark 7:4). *SEE ANOINTING*. But a far higher, though necessarily less frequent attention paid to their friends by the great was the custom of furnishing each of the company with a magnificent habit of a light and showy color, and richly embroidered, to be worn during the festivity (<21908>Ecclesiastes 9:8; <660304>Revelation 3:4, 5). The loose and flowing style of this gorgeous mantle made it equally suitable for all; and it is almost incredible what a variety of such sumptuous garments the wardrobes of some great men could supply to equip a numerous party.

In a large company, even of respectable persons, some might appear in a plainer and humbler garb than accorded with the taste of the voluptuous gentry of our Lord's time, and where this arose from necessity or limited means, it would have been harsh and unreasonable in the extreme to attach blame, or to command his instant and ignominious expulsion from the banquet-room. But where a well-appointed and sumptuous wardrobe was opened for the use of every guest, to refuse the gay and splendid costume which the munificence of the host provided, and to persist in appearing in one's own habiliments, implied a contempt both for the master of the house and his entertainment, which could not fail to provoke resentment; and our Lord therefore spoke in accordance with a well-known custom of his country when, in the parable of the marriage of the king's son, he describes the stern displeasure of the king on discovering one of the guests without a wedding garment, and his instant command to thrust him out (<4022211>Matthew 22:11).

At private banquets the master of the house of course presided, and did the honors of the occasion; but in large and mixed companies it was anciently customary to elect a governor of the feast (<4002008>John 2:8; see also Ecclesiasticus 32:1), who should not merely perform the office of chairman, ἀρχιτρίκλινος, in preserving order and decorum, but take upon himself the general management of the festivities. As this office was considered a post of great responsibility and delicacy, as well as honor, the choice, which among the Greeks and Romans was left to the decision of dice, was more wisely made by the Jews to fall upon him who was known to be possessed of the requisite qualities a ready wit and convivial turn, and at the same time firmness of character and habits of temperance. *SEE ARCHITRICLINUS*. The guests were scrupulously arranged either by the host or governor, who, in the case of a family, placed them according to seniority (<0142333>Genesis 42:33), and in the case of others, assigned the most honorable (comp. <0090222>1 Samuel 9:22) a place near his own person; or it was done by the party themselves, on their successive arrivals, and after surveying the company, taking up the position which appeared fittest for each. It might be expected that among the Orientals, by whom the laws of etiquette in these matters are strictly observed, many absurd and ludicrous contests for precedence must take place, from the arrogance of some and the determined perseverance of others to wedge themselves into the seat they deem themselves entitled to. Accordingly, Morier informs us "that it is easy to observe, by the countenances of those present, when any one has

taken a higher place than he ought." "On one occasion," he adds, "when an assembly was nearly full, the Governor of Kashan, a man of humble mien, came in, and had seated himself at the lowest place, when the host, after having testified his particular attentions to him by numerous expressions of welcome, pointed with his hand to an upper seat, which he desired him to take" (*Second Journey*). As a counterpart to this, Dr. Clarke states that "at a wedding feast he attended in the house of a rich merchant at St. Jean d'Acre, two persons who had seated themselves at the top were noticed by the master of ceremonies, and obliged to move lower down" (see also Joseph. *Ant.* 15:24.) The knowledge of these peculiarities serves to illustrate several passages of Scripture (Proverbs 25:6, 7; Matthew 23:6; and especially Luke 14:7, where we find Jesus making the unseemly ambition of the Pharisees the subject of severe and merited animadversion).

In ancient Egypt, as in Persia, the tables were ranged along the sides of the room, and the guests were placed with their faces toward the walls. Persons of high official station were honored with a table apart for themselves at the head of the room; and in these particulars we trace an exact correspondence to the arrangements of Joseph's entertainment to his brethren. According to Lightfoot (*Exercit. on* *John* 13:23), the tables of the Jews were either wholly uncovered, or two thirds were spread with a cloth, while the remaining third was left bare for the dishes and vegetables. In the days of our Lord the prevailing form was the triclinium, the mode of reclining at which is described elsewhere. *SEE ACCUBATION*. This effeminate practice was not introduced until near the close of the Old Testament history, for among all its writers prior to the age of Amos, בּוֹשׁ, *to sit*, is the word invariably used to describe the posture at table (1 Samuel 16, margin, and Psalm 128:3, implying that the ancient Israelites sat round a low table, cross-legged, like the Orientals of the present day), whereas ἀνακλίνω, signifying a recumbent posture, is the word employed in the Gospels. And whenever the word "sit" occurs in the New Testament, it ought to be translated "lie," or *recline*, according to the universal practice of that age.

The convenience of spoons, knives, and forks being unknown in the East, or, where known, being a modern innovation, the hand is the only instrument used in conveying food to the mouth; and the common practice, their food being chiefly prepared in a liquid form, is to dip their thin, wafer-like bread in the dish, and, folding it between their thumb and two fingers,

enclose a portion of the contents. It is not uncommon to see several hands plunged into one dish at the same time. But where the party is numerous, the two persons near or opposite are commonly joined in one dish; and accordingly, at the last Passover, Judas, being close to his master, was pointed out as the traitor by being designated as the person “dipping his hand with Jesus in the dish.” The Apostle John, whose advantageous situation enabled him to hear the minutest parts of the conversation, has recorded the fact of our Lord, in reply to the question, “Who is it?” answering it by “giving a sop to Judas when he had dipped” (<43B127>John 13:27.) It is not the least among the peculiarities of Oriental manners that a host often dips his hand into a dish, and, lifting a handful of what he considers a dainty, offers the ψωμίον or sop to one of his friends, and to decline it would be a violation of propriety and good manners (see Jowett’s *Christian Researches*). In earlier ages, a double or a more liberal portion, or a choice piece of cookery, was the form in which a landlord showed his respect for the individual he delighted to honor (<014334>Genesis 43:34; <090104>1 Samuel 1:4; 9:23; <201515>Proverbs 31:15; see Voller’s *Grec. Ant.* 2:387; Forbes, *Orient. Mem.* 3, 187.)

While the guests reclined in the manner described above, their feet, of course, being stretched out behind, were the most accessible parts of their person, and accordingly the woman with the alabaster box of ointment could pay her grateful and reverential attentions to Jesus without disturbing him in the business of the table. Nor can the presence of this woman, uninvited and unknown even as she was to the master of the house, appear at all an incredible or strange circumstance, when we consider that entertainments are often given in gardens, or in the outer courts, where strangers are freely admitted, and that Simon’s table was in all likelihood accessible to the same promiscuous visitors as are found hovering about at the banquets and entering into the houses of the most respectable Orientals of the present day (Forbes, *Orient. Mem.*). In the course of the entertainment servants are frequently employed in sprinkling the head and person of the guests with odoriferous perfumes, which, probably to counteract the- scent of too copious perspiration, they use in great profusion, and the fragrance of which, though generally too strong for Europeans, is deemed an agreeable refreshment (see <194508>Psalm 45:8; 23:5; 123:2).

The various items of which an Oriental entertainment consists, bread, flesh, fish, fowls, melted butter, honey, and fruits, are in many places set on the

table at once, in defiance of all taste. They are brought in upon trays — one, containing several dishes, being assigned to a group of two, or at most three persons, and the number and quality of the dishes being regulated according to the rank and consideration of the party seated before it. In ordinary cases four or five dishes constitute the portion allotted to a guest; but if he be a person of consequence, or one to whom the host is desirous of showing more than ordinary marks of attention, other viands are successively brought in, until, if every vacant corner of the tray is occupied, the bowls are piled one above another. The object of this rude but liberal hospitality is, not that the individual thus honored is expected to surfeit himself by an excess of indulgence in order to testify his sense of the entertainer's kindness, but that he may enjoy the means of gratifying his palate with greater variety; and hence we read of Joseph's displaying his partiality for Benjamin by making his "mess five times so much as any of theirs" (<01434>Genesis 43:34). The shoulder of a lamb, roasted, and plentifully besmeared with butter and milk, is regarded as a great delicacy still (Buckingham's *Travels,* 2:136), as it was also in the days of Samuel. But according to the favorite cookery of the Orientals, their animal food is for the most part cut into small pieces, stewed, or prepared in a liquid state, such as seems to have been the "broth" presented by Gideon to the angel (<07069>Judges 6:19). The made-up dishes are "savory meat," being highly seasoned, and bring to remembrance the marrow and fatness which were esteemed as the most choice morsels in ancient times. As to drink, when particular attention was intended to be shown to a guest, his cup was filled with wine till it ran over (<19235>Psalm 23:5), and it is said that the ancient Persians began their feasts with wine, whence it was called "a banquet of wine' (Esther 5:6). See Rinck, *De apparatu convivii regis Persarum* (Regiom. 1755); Kohler, *Observatt.* (Lips. 1763), p. 1 sq.

The hands, for occasionally both were required, besmeared with grease during the process of eating, were anciently cleaned by rubbing them with the soft part of the bread, the crumbs of which, being allowed to fall, became the portion of dogs (<40157>Matthew 15:27; <42162>Luke 16:21). But the most common way now at the conclusion of a feast is for a servant to go round to each guest with water to wash, a service which is performed by the menial pouring a stream over their hands, which is received into a strainer at the bottom of the basin. This humble office Elisha performed to his master (<12301>2 Kings 3:11). *SEE EWER*.

People of rank and opulence in the East frequently give public entertainments to the poor. The rich man in the parable, whose guests disappointed him, dispatched his servants on the instant to invite those that might be found sitting by the hedges and the highways — a measure which, in the circumstances, was absolutely necessary, as the heat of the climate would spoil the meats long before they could be consumed by the members of his own household. But many of the great, from benevolence or ostentation, are in the habit of proclaiming set days for giving feasts to the poor; and then, at the time appointed, may be seen crowds of the blind, the halt, and the maimed bending their steps to the scene of entertainment. This species of charity claims a venerable antiquity. Our Lord recommended his wealthy hearers to practice it rather than spend their fortunes, as they did, on luxurious living (<42142>Luke 14:12); and as such invitations to the poor are of necessity given by public proclamation, and female messengers are employed to publish them (Hasselquist saw ten or twelve thus perambulating a town in Egypt), it is probably to the same venerable practice that Solomon alludes in <20903>Proverbs 9:3. *SEE FEAST*.

Among the Hebrews banquets were not only a means of social enjoyment, but were a part of the observance of religious festivity. At the three solemn festivals, when all the males appeared before the Lord, the family also had its domestic feast, as appears from the place and the share in it to which "the widow, the fatherless, and the stranger" were legally entitled (<51611>Deuteronomy 16:11). Probably, when the distance allowed and no inconvenience hindered, both males and females went up (e.g. to Shiloh; <90109>1 Samuel 1:9) together to hold the festival. These domestic festivities were doubtless to a great extent retained, after laxity had set in as regards the special observance by the male sex (<16817>Nehemiah 8:17). Sacrifices, both ordinary and extraordinary, as among heathen nations (<12345>Exodus 34:15; <07163>Judges 16:23), included a banquet, and Eli's sons made this latter the prominent part. The two, thus united, marked strongly both domestic and civil life. It may even be said that some sacrificial recognition, if only in pouring the blood solemnly forth as before God, always attended the slaughter of an animal for food. The firstlings of cattle were to be sacrificed and eaten at the sanctuary if not too far from the residence (<09913>1 Samuel 9:13; <10609>2 Samuel 6:19; <02229>Exodus 22:29, 30; <03905>Leviticus 19:5, 6; <05217>Deuteronomy 12:17, 20, 21; 15:19-22). From the sacrificial banquet probably sprang the AGAPAE; as the Lord's Supper, with which it for a while coalesced, was derived from the Passover. Besides religious

celebrations, such events as the weaning a son and heir, a marriage, the separation or reunion of friends, and sheep-shearing, were customarily attended by a banquet or revel (<012108>Genesis 21:8; 29:22; 31:27, 54; <091252>1 Samuel 25:2, 36; <101323>2 Samuel 13:23). At a funeral, also, refreshment was taken in common by the mourners, and this might tend to become a scene of indulgence, but ordinarily abstemiousness seems on such occasions to have been the rule. The case of Archelaus is not conclusive, but his inclination toward alien usages was doubtless shared by the Herodianizing Jews (<241605>Jeremiah 16:5-7; <261747>Ezekiel 24:17; <280904>Hosea 9:4; Eccl. 7:2; Josephus, *War*, 2:1). Birthday-banquets are only mentioned in the cases of Pharaoh and Herod (<014020>Genesis 40:20; <401406>Matthew 14:6). A leading topic of prophetic rebuke is the abuse of festivals to an occasion of drunken revelry, and the growth of fashion in favor of drinking-parties. Such was the invitation typically given by Jeremiah to the Rechabites (<243505>Jeremiah 35:5). The usual time of the banquet was the evening, and to begin early was a mark of excess (<230511>Isaiah 5:11; <211016>Ecclesiastes 10:16). The slaughtering of the cattle, which was the preliminary of a banquet, occupied the earlier part of the same day (<200902>Proverbs 9:2; <232213>Isaiah 22:13; <402204>Matthew 22:4). The most essential materials of the banqueting-room, next to the viands and wine, which last was often drugged with spices (<200902>Proverbs 9:2; <220802>Song of Solomon 8:2), were garlands or loose flowers, exhibitions of music, singers, and dancers, riddles, jesting and merriment (<232801>Isaiah 28:1; Wisdom of Solomon 2:6; <101935>2 Samuel 19:35; <232506>Isaiah 25:6; 5:12; <071412>Judges 14:12; <160810>Nehemiah 8:10; <211009>Ecclesiastes 10:19; <402211>Matthew 22:11; <300605>Amos 6:5, 6; <421525>Luke 15:25). Seven days was a not uncommon duration of a festival, especially for a wedding, but sometimes fourteen (Tobias 8:19; <012927>Genesis 29:27; <071412>Judges 14:12); but if the bride were a widow, three days formed the limit (Buxtorf, *De Conviv. Hebr.*). The reminder sent to the guests (<421417>Luke 14:17) was probably only usual in princely banquets on a large scale, involving protracted preparation. There seems no doubt that the Jews of the O.T. period used a common table for all the guests. In Joseph's entertainment a ceremonial separation prevailed, but there is no reason for supposing a separate table for each, as is distinctly asserted in the Talmud (*Tosephot Berach.* c. 6) to have been usual, The latter custom certainly was in use among the ancient Greeks and Germans (Hem. *Od.* 23, 10 2:74; Tac. *Germ.* 22), and perhaps among the Egyptians (Wilkinson, 2:202, engravings). But the common phrase to "sit at table," or "eat at any ore's table," shows the originality of the opposite usage. The separation of the

woman's banquet was not a Jewish custom (Esther 1:9). Portions or messes were sent from the entertainer to each guest at table, and a special part was sometimes reserved for a late comer (1 Samuel 1:5; Genesis 43:34; 1 Samuel 9:23, 24). Portions were similarly sent to poorer friends direct from the banquet-table (Nehemiah 8:10; Esther 9:19, 22). The kiss on receiving a guest was a point of friendly courtesy (Luke 7:45). It was strictly enjoined by the rabbins to wash both before and after eating, which they called the "first water" and the "last water" (µyniv'ari µymi and µyniv'rj}ai µymi); but washing the feet seems to have been limited to the case of a guest who was also a traveler. *SEE ABLUTION*.

In religious banquets the wine was mixed, by rabbinical regulation, with three parts of water, and four short forms of benediction were pronounced over it. At the Passover four such cups were mixed, blessed, and passed round by the master of the feast (ἀρχιτρίκλινος). It is probable that the character of this official varied with that of the entertainment; if it were a religious one, his office would be quasi-priestly; if a revel, he would be the mere symposiarch (συμποσιάρχης) or *arbiter bibendi*. (See Smith's *Dict. of Class. Ant.* s.v. Symposium; Comissatio.) — Smith, s.v. *SEE ENTERTAINMENT*; *SEE EATING*; *SEE HOSPITALITY*, etc.

Ban'uas

(Βάννος, Vulg. *Bamis*), a name of a Levite occurring in the lists of those who returned from captivity (1 Esdras 5:26); this, with the following name, answers to HODAVIAH *SEE HODAVIAH* (q.v.) or Hodevah in the parallel lists of Ezra (2. 40) and Nehemiah (7. 43).

Baphomet

(Βαφὴ Μὴτεως, *baptism of Metis*, or of fire, the Gnostic baptism), is the name given to certain symbolic figures, half male and half female, carved in stone, etc., which are said by some to have belonged to the insignia of the Knight Templars. Specimens of them are to be found in the collections of antiquities of Weimar and Vienna. These figures have generally two heads or faces, one of which is bearded; they are surrounded by serpents, and bear various inscriptions and representations of the sun, moon, truncated crosses (otherwise called Egyptian key of life and death), etc. Some have considered them as images of the devil, others as representing *Mete* (Wisdom), the Gnostic divinity, and others, seeing in them busts of

Mohammed, considered them as proofs of the apostasy of the Templars. It seems more probable, however, that they were merely some alchemico-theosophical symbols. See Joseph von Hammer, *Fundgruben d. Orients* (6 vols.); Von Nell, *Baphometische Actenstiicke,* etc. (Vienna, 1819); Same, *Essay on a Cosmological Interpretation of the Pheenician Worship of the Cabiri,* etc.

Baptism

a rite of purification or initiation, in which water is used; one of the sacraments (q.v.) of the Christian Church. The word *baptism* is simply an Anglicized form of the Greek βαπτισμός, a verbal noun from βαπτίζω (likewise Anglicized "baptize"), and this, again, is a derivative from βάπτω, the predominant signification of which latter is to *whelm* or "dye," Lat. *tingo.* Not being a verb implying motion, βαπτίζω is properly followed in Greek by the preposition ἐν, denoting the *means* or method (with the "instrumental dative"), which has unfortunately, in the Auth. Engl. Vers., often been rendered by the ambiguous particle "in," whereas it really (in this connection) signifies only *with* or *by,* or at most merely designates the locality where the act is performed. The derivative verb and noun are sometimes used with reference to ordinary lustration, and occasionally with respect to merely secular acts; also in a figurative sense. In certain cases it is followed by the preposition εἰς, with the meaning "to," "for," or "unto," as pointing out the *design* of the act, especially in phrases (comp. πιστεύειν εἰς) expressive of the covenant or relation of which this rite was the seal. (In <40109>Mark 1:9, the εἰς depends upon ηλθεν preceding; and in <41420>Mark 14:20, there is a *constructio praegnans* by which some other verb of motion is to be supplied before the preposition.) On these and other applications of the Greek word, see Robinson's *Lex. of the N.T.* s.v.; where, however (as in some other Lexicons), the statement that the primary force of the verb is "to dip, immerse," etc., is not sustained by its actual usage and grammatical construction. This would always require ἐν, "into," after it; which occurs in 15 examples only out of the exhaustive list (175) adduced by Dr. Conant (*Meaning and Use of Baptizein,* N. Y. 1860); and a closer and more critical examination will show that it is only the context and association of the word that in any case *put* this signification upon it, and it is therefore a mere gloss or inference to assign this as the proper sense of the term. The significations "p plunge," "'submerge," etc., are here strictly *derived,* as cognates, from the more general and primitive one of that complete envelopment with a liquid which

a thorough wetting, saturation, or dyeing usually implies. In like manner, Dr. E. Beecher (in a series of articles first published in the *Am. Bib. Repos.* during 1840 and 1841) has mistaken the allied or inferential signification *of purification* for the primitive sense of the word, whereas it is only the result expected or attendant in the act of washing. See further below.

As preliminary to the theological discussion of this subject, it will be proper here to discuss, more fully than can be conveniently done elsewhere, the classical and Biblical uses of the word, and some subordinate topics, reserving the conitroverted points for later consideration.

I. *Philological Usage of the Word* βαπτίζειν. —

1. *By Classical Writers.* — No instance occurs in these writers of the use of βάπτισμα, and only one in a very late author (Antyllus) of the use of its equivalent βαπτισμός; but the verb occurs frequently, especially in the later writers. It is used to designate:

(1.) *The washing of an object by dipping it into water, or any other fluid, or quasi-fluid, for any purpose whatever:* as βάπτισον σεαυτὸν εἰς θάλασσαν, "bathe yourself by going into the sea" (Plut. *Maor.* p. 166 A.); βαπτίζειν τὸν Διόνυσον πρὸς τὴν θάλατταν (*Ibid.* p. 914).

(2.) *The plunging or sinking of an object:* as Οὐδὲ γὰρ τοῖς ἀκολύμβοις βαπτίζεσθαι συμβαίνει ξύλων τρὸπον ἐπιπολάζουσι, where βαπτίζεσθαι, in the sense of "submersed," is contrasted with ἐπιπολάζουσι, in the sense of "float;" ἐν ὕδασι γενέσθαι τὴν πορείαν συνέβη, μέχρι ὀμφαλοῦ βαπτιζομένων, *being* in water up to the navel (Strabo, *Geogr.* xiv, p. 667); μόλις ἕως τῶν μαστῶν ὅι πεζοὶ βαπτιζόμενοι διέβαινον (*Polyb.* in). So Pindar says (*Pyth.* 2:145), ἀβάπτιστός εἰμι, φελλὸς ς, where the cork of the fisherman is. styled unbaptized, in contrast with the net which sinks into the water. From this, by metonomy of cause for effect, is derived the sense *to drown,* as ἐβάπτιὸ εἰς τὸν οἶνον, "I whelmed him in the wine" (Julian *A*Egypt. *Anacreont.*).

(3.) *The covering over of any object by the flowing or pouring of a fluid on it;* and metaphorically (in the passive), the *being overwhelmed or oppressed:* thus the Pseudo-Aristotle speaks of places full of bulrushes and sea-weeds, which, when the tide is at the ebb, are not baptized (i.e. covered by the water), but at full tide are flooded over (*Mirabil. Auscult.* §

137, p. 50, in Westermann's edit. of the *Script. Rer. Mir. Gr.*); Diodorus Siculus (bk. 1) speaks of land animals being destroyed by the river overtaking them (διαφθείρεται βαπτιζόμενα); Plato and Athenaeus describe men in a state of ebriety as baptized (*Sympos.* p. 176 B.; and *Deipnos.v.*); and the former says the same of a youth overwhelmed with sophistry (*Euthyd.* 277 D.); Plutarch denounces the forcing of knowledge on children beyond what they can receive as a process by which the soul is baptized (*De Lib. educ.*); and he speaks of men as baptized by debts (*Galbae, c.* 21); Diodorus Siculus speaks of baptizing people with tears (bk. 1, c., 3); and Libanius says, "He who hardly bears what he now bears, would be baptized by a little addition" (*Epist.* 310), and "I am one of those baptized by that great wave" (*Ep.* 25).

(4.) *The complete drenching of an object, whether by aspersion or immersion;* as Ἀσκὸς βαπτίζῃ, δῦναι δὲ τοι οὐ θέμις ἐστι, "As a bladder thou shalt be washed (i.e. by the waves breaking over thee), but thou canst not go down" (*Orac. Sibyll. de Athenis,* ap. Plutarch, *Thesei*).

From this it appears that in classical usage βαπτίζειν is not fixed to any special mode of applying the baptizing element to the object baptized; all that is implied by the term is, that the former is closely in contact with the latter, or that the latter is wholly in the former.

2. *By the Septuagint.* — Here the word occurs only four times, viz. <120514>2 Kings 5:14: "And Naaman went down and baptized himself (ἐβαπτίσατο) seven times in the river Jordan," where the original Hebrew is לבטי from לבט; to *dip, plunge, immerse;* <232104>Isaiah 21:4, 6 Iniquity baptizes me" (ἡ ἀνομία με βαπτίζει), where the word is plainly used in the sense of *overwhelm,* answering to the Hebrews תעב; *to come upon suddenly, to terrify;* Judith 12:7, "She went out by night . . . and baptized herself (ἐβαπτίζετο) at the fountain;" and Ecclesiasticus 31:30, [Ecclesiasticus 34], "He who is baptized from a corpse" (βαπτιζομένος ἀπὸ νεκροῦ), etc. In these last two instances the word merely denotes *washed,* without indicating any special mode by which this was done, though in the former the circumstances of the case make it improbable that the act described was that of *bathing* (comp. <041919>Numbers 19:19).

In the Greek, then, of the Sept., βαπτίζειν signifies *to plunge, to bathe,* or *to overwhelm.* It is never used to describe the act of one who dips another object into a fluid, or the case of one who is dipped by another.

3. *In the New Testament.* — Confining our notice here simply to the philology of the subject, the instances of this usage may be classified thus:

(1.) *The verb or noun alone, or with the object baptized merely:* as βαπτισθῆναι, <40313>Matthew 3:13, 14; βαπτισθείς, <411616>Mark 16:16; βαπτίζων, <410104>Mark 1:4; βαπτίσωνται, 7:4; βαπτίξεις, <430125>John 1:25; ἐβάπτισα, <461417>1 Corinthians 1:14, etc.; βάπτισμα αὐτοῦ, <400307>Matthew 3:7; ν βάπτισμα, <490405>Ephesians 4:5; βάπτισμα, <510212>Colossians 2:12; <600321>1 Peter 3:21, etc.; βαπτισμοὺς ποτηρίων, <410704>Mark 7:4, 8; βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς, <580602>Hebrews 6:2; διαφόροις βαπτισμοῖς, 9:10.

(2.) *With addition of the element of baptism:* as ἐν ὕδατι, <400308>Mark 1:8, etc.; ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί, <400311>Matthew 3:11, etc.; ὕδατι, <420316>Luke 3:16, etc. The force of ἐν in such formulse has by some been pressed, as if it indicated that the object of baptism was in the element of baptism; but by most the ἐν is regarded as merely the *nota dativi,* so that ἐν ὕδατι means no more than the simple ὕδατι, as the ἐν πλοίῳ of <401443>Matthew 14:13, means no more than the πλοίῳ of <410632>Mark 6:32. (See Matthiae, sec. 401, obs. 2; Kuhner, sec. 585, Anm. 2.) Only in one instance does the accusative appear in the N.T., <410109>Mark 1:9, where we have εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην, and this can hardly be regarded as a real exception to the ordinary usage of the N.T., because εἰς here is local rather than instrumental. In connection with this may be noticed the phrases καταβαίνειν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ, and ἀποβαίνειν ἐκ or ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος. According to some, these decisively prove that the party baptized, as well as the baptizer, went down *into* the water, and came up *out* of it. But, on the other hand, it is contended that the phrases do not necessarily imply more than that they went to (i.e. to the margin of) the water and returned thence.

(3.) *With specification of the end or purpose for which the baptism is effected.* This is usually indicated by εἰς: as βαπτίζοντες εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, <402819>Matthew 28:19, and frequently; ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστόν . . . εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ, <450603>Romans 6:3, al.; εἰς τὸν Μωυσῆν ἐβαπτίσθησαν, <461002>1 Corinthians 10:3; εἰς ἕν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν, 12:13; βαπτισθήτω ἕκαστος . . . εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, <440238>Acts 2:38, etc. In these cases εἰς retains its proper significancy, as indicating the *terminus ad quem,* and tropically, *that for* which, or *with a view to* which the thing is done, modified according as this is a person or a thing. Thus, to be baptized for Moses, means to be baptized with a view to following or

being subject to the rule of Moses; to be baptized for Christ means to be baptized with a view to becoming a true follower of Christ; to be baptized for his death means to be baptized with a view to the enjoyment of the benefits of his death; to be baptized for the remission of sins means to be baptized with a view to receiving this; to be baptized for the name of any one means to be baptized with a view to the realization of all that the meaning of this name implies, etc. In one passage Paul uses ὑπὲρ to express the end or design of baptism, βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, <46152>1 Corinthians 15:29; but here the involved idea of *substitution* justifies the use of the preposition. Instead of a preposition, the genitive of object is sometimes used, as βάπτισμα μετανοίας <42303>Luke 3:3, al.= βάπτισμα εἰς μετανοίαν, the baptism which has μετανοία as its end and purpose.

(4.) *With specification of the ground or basis on which the baptism rests.* This is expressed by the use of ἐν in the phrases ἐν ὀνόματι τίνος, and once by the use of ἐπί with the dative, <44238>Acts 2:38: "to be baptized on the name of Christ, i.e. so that the baptism is grounded on the confession of his name" (Winer, p. 469). Some regard these formulae as identical in meaning with those in which εἰς is used with ὄνομα, but the more exact scholars view them as distinct.

The two last-mentioned usages are peculiar to the N.T., and arise directly from the new significancy which its writers attached to baptism as a rite.

II. *Non-ritual Baptisms mentioned in the N.T.* — These are:

1. The baptism of *utensils and articles of furniture*, <41704>Mark 7:4, 8.

2. The baptism of *persons*, <41703>Mark 7:3,4; <42138>Luke 11:38, etc.

These are the only instances in which the verb or noun is used in a strictly literal sense in the N.T. and there may be some doubt as to whether the last instance should not be remanded to the head of ritual baptisms. These instances are chiefly valuable as bearing on the question of the *mode* of baptism; they show that no special mode is indicated by the mere use of the word baptize, for the washing of cups, of couches, and of persons is accomplished in a different manner in each case: in the first by dipping, or immersing, or rinsing, or pouring, or simply wiping with a wet cloth; in the second by aspersion and wiping; and in the third by plunging or stepping into the bath.

3. *Baptism of affliction,* <41038>Mark 10:38, 39; <42250>Luke 12:50. In both these passages our Lord refers to his impending sufferings as a baptism which he had to undergo. Chrysostom, and some others of the fathers, understand this objectively, as referring to the purgation which his sufferings were to effect (see the passages in Suicer, *Thes.* s.v. βάπτισμα, 1:7); but this does not seem to be the idea of the speaker. Our Lord rather means that his sufferings were to come on him as a mighty overwhelming torrent (see Kuinol on <40222>Matthew 20:22, 23; Blomfield, *ibid.*). Some interpreters suppose there is an allusion in this language to submersion as essential to baptism (see Olshausen in *loc.;* Meyer on <41038>Mark 10:38); but nothing more seems to be implied than simply the being overwhelmed in a figurative sense, according to what we have seen to be' a common use of the word by the classical writers.

4. *Baptism with the Spirit,* <40311>Matthew 3:11; <41008>Mark 1:8; <42316>Luke 3:16; <43033>John 1:33; <44105>Acts 1:5; 11:16; <46213>1 Corinthians 12:13. In the first of these passages it is said of our Lord that he shall baptize with the Holy Spirit and with fire. Whether this be taken as a hendiadys = the Spirit as fire, or as pointing out two distinct baptisms, the one by the Spirit, the other by fire; and whether, on the latter assumption, the baptism by fire means the destruction by Christ of his enemies, or the miraculous endowment of his apostles, it does not concern us at present to inquire. Respecting the intent of baptism by the Spirit, there can be little room for doubt or difference of opinion; it is obviously a figurative mode of describing the agency of the Divine Spirit given through and by Christ, both in conferring miraculous endowments and in purifying and sanctifying the heart of man. By this Spirit the disciples were baptized on the day of Pentecost, when "there appeared unto them cloven tongues of fire, and it sat upon each of them; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they began to speak with tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance" (<44203>Acts 2:3, 4); by this Spirit men are saved when they are "born again of water and of the Spirit" (<43005>John 3:5); when they receive "the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost" (<56305>Titus 3:5); and when there is the putting away from them of the filth of the flesh, and they have the answer of a good conscience toward God (<60321>1 Peter 3:21); and by this Spirit believers are baptized for one body, when through his gracious agency they receive that Spirit, and those impulses by which they I are led to realize their unity in Christ Jesus (<46121>1 Corinthians 12:11). Some refer to the Spirit's baptism also, the apostle's expression, ν βάπτισμα,

⁴⁹⁰⁰⁵Ephesians 4:5; but the common and more probable opinion is that the reference here is to ritual baptism as the outward sign of that inner unity which the εἷς Κύριος and the μία πίστις secure and produce (see Alford, Ellicott, Meyer, Matthies, etc. etc. *in loc.*). In this figurative use of the term "baptism" the *tertium comparationis* is found by some in the Spirit's being viewed as the element *in* which the believer is made to live, and in which he receives the transforming influence; while others find it in the biblical representation of the Spirit as coming upon men, as poured upon them (²³²¹⁵Isaiah 32:15; ³⁸¹²⁰Zechariah 12:10; ²⁹¹²⁸Joel 2:28; ⁴⁴²¹⁷Acts 2:17), and as sprinkled on them like clean water (²⁶⁶²⁵Ezekiel 36:25).

5. *Baptism for Moses.* — In ⁴⁶¹⁰²1 Corinthians 10:2, the apostle says of the Israelites, "And they all received baptism ('the middle voice is selected to express a *receptive* sense,' Meyer) for Moses (εἰς τὸν Μωυσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο) in (or by, ἐν) the cloud, and in (or by) the sea." In the Syr. εἰς r. M. is translated "by the hand of Moses;" and this is followed by Beza and others. Some render *una cum Mose;* others, *aupiciis Mosis;* others, *in Mose*, i.e. "sub ministerio et ductu Mosis" (Calvin), etc. But all these interpretations are precluded by the proper meaning of εἰς. and the fixed significance of the phrase βαπτίζειν εἰς in the N.T. The only rendering that can be admitted is "for Moses," i.e. with a view to him, in reference to him, in respect of him. "They were baptized for Moses. i.e. they became bound to fidelity and obedience, and were accepted into the covenant which God then made with the people through Moses" (Ruckert *in loc.;* see also Meyer and Alford on the passage).

III. *The Types of Baptism.* —

1. The apostle Peter (⁶¹⁰²¹1 Peter 3:21) compares the deliverance of Noah in the Deluge to the deliverance of Christians in baptism. The apostle had been speaking of those who had perished "in the days of Noah when the ark was a-preparing, in which few, that is eight souls, were saved by water." According to the A.V., he goes on, "The like figure whereunto baptism doth now save us." The Greek, in the best MSS., is ̔Ὃ καὶ ἡμᾶς ἀντίτυπον νῦν σώζει βάπτισμα. Grotius well expounds ἀντίτυπον by ἀντίστοιχον, "accurately corresponding." The difficulty is in the relative ὅ. There is no antecedent to which it can refer except ὕδατος, "water;" and it seems as if βάπτισμα must be put in ap- position with ὅ, and as an explanation of it. Noah and his company were saved by water, "which water also, that is, the water of baptism, correspondingly saves us." Even if

the reading were ᾧ, it -would most naturally refer to the preceding ὕδατος. Certainly it could not refer to κιβωτοῦ, which is feminine. We must, then, probably interpret that, though water was the instrument for destroying the disobedient, it was yet the instrument ordained of God for floating the ark, and so for saving Noah and his family; and it is in correspondence with this that water also, viz. the water of baptism, saves Christians. Augustine, commenting on these words, writes that "the events in the days of Noah were a figure of things to come, so that they who believe not the Gospel, when the church is building, may be considered as like those who believed not when the ark was preparing; while those who have believed and are baptized (i.e. are saved by baptism) may be compared to those who were formerly saved in the ark by water" (*Epist.* 164, tom. 2, p. 579). "The building of the ark," he says again, "was a kind of preaching." "The waters of the deluge pre-signified baptism to those who believed — punishment to the unbelieving" (*ib.*).

It would be impossible to give any definite explanation of the words "baptism doth *save* us" without entering upon the theological question of baptismal regeneration. The apostle, however, gives a caution which no doubt may itself have need of an interpreter, when he adds, "not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer (ἐπερώτημα) of a good conscience toward God." Probably all will agree that he intended here to warn us against resting on the outward administration of a sacrament, with no corresponding preparation of the conscience and the soul. The connection in this passage between baptism and "the resurrection of Jesus Christ" maybe compared with <5012> Colossians 2:12.

2. In <4600> 1 Corinthians 10:1, 2, the passage of the Red Sea and the shadowing of the miraculous cloud are treated as types of baptism. In all the early part of this chapter the wanderings of Israel in the wilderness are put in comparison with the life of the Christian. The being under the cloud and the passing through the sea resemble baptism; eating manna and drinking of the rock are as the spiritual food which feeds the church; and the different temptations, sins, and punishments of the Israelites on their journey to Canaan are held up as a warning to the Corinthian Church. It appears that the Rabbins themselves speak of a baptism in the cloud (see Wetstein in loc., who quotes Pirke R. Eliezer, 44; see also Schottgen in loc.). The passage from the condition of bondmen in Egypt was through the Red Sea, and with the protection of the luminous cloud. When the sea was passed the people were no longer subjects of Pharaoh, but were, under

the guidance of Moses, forming into a new commonwealth, and on their way to the promised land, It is sufficiently apparent how this may resemble the enlisting of a new convert into the body of the Christian Church, his being placed in a new relation, under a new condition, in a spiritual commonwealth, with a way before him to a better country, though surrounded with dangers, subject to temptations, and with enemies on all sides to encounter in his progress.

3. Another type of, or rather a rite analogous to, baptism was circumcision. Paul (<51211>Colossians 2:11) speaks of the Colossian Christians as having been circumcised with a circumcision made without hands, when they were buried with Christ in baptism, in which they were also raised again with him (ἐν ᾧ περιετμήθητε . . . . συνταφέντες αυτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι. The aorist participle, as often, is contemporary with the preceding past verb." — Alford in loc.). The obvious reason for the comparison of the two rites is that circumcision was the entrance to the Jewish Church and the ancient covenant, baptism to the Christian Church and to the new covenant; and perhaps also that the spiritual significance of circumcision had a resemblance to the spiritual import of baptism, viz. "the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh," and the purification of the heart by the grace of God. Paul therefore calls baptism the circumcision made without hands, and speaks of the putting off of the sins of the flesh by Christian circumcision (ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ τοῦ Χριστο), i.e. by baptism.

4. Before leaving this part of the subject, we ought perhaps to observe that in more than one instance *death* is called a baptism. In <402022>Matthew 20:22; <411039>Mark 10:39, our Lord speaks of the cup which he had to drink, and the baptism that he was to be baptized with; and again, in <421250>Luke 12:50, "I have a baptism to be baptized with." It is generally thought that baptism here means an inundation of sorrows; that, as the baptized went down in the water, and water was to be poured over him, so our Lord meant to indicate that he himself had to pass through "the deep waters of affliction" (see Kuinol on <402022>Matthew 20:22; Schleusner, s.v. βαπτίζω). In after times martyrdom was called a baptism of blood. But the metaphor in this latter case is evidently different; and in the above words of our Lord baptism is used without any qualification, whereas in passages adduced from profane authors we always find some words explanatory of the mode of the immersion. Is it not then probable that some deeper significance attaches to the comparison of death, especially of our Lord's death, to

baptism, when we consider, too, that the connection of baptism with the death and resurrection of Christ is so much insisted on by Paul?

IV. *Names of Baptism.* —

1. "Baptism" (βάπτισμα*:* the word βαπτισμός occurs only three times, viz. <41708>Mark 7:8; <58602>Hebrews 6:2; 9:10). The verb βαπτίζειν from βάπτειν, to wet) is the rendering of לבט; to *plunge,* by the Sept. in <12514>2 Kings 5:14; and accordingly the Rabbins used , הלבט]for βάπτισμα. The Latin fathers render βαπτίζειν by *tingere* (e.g. Tertull. *adv. Prax.* c. 26, "Novissimo mandavit ut tingerent in Patrem Filium et Spiritum Sanctum"); by *mergere* (as Ambros. *De Sacramentis,* lib. 2, c. 7, "Interrogatus es, Credis in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem? Dixisti Credo; et mersisti, hoc est sepultus es"); by *mergztare* (as Tertullian, *De Corona Militis,* c. 3, "Dehinc ter mergitamur"); see Suicer, s.v. ἀναδυω. By the Greek fathers the word βαπτίζειν is often used figuratively for overwhelming with sleep, sorrow, sin, etc. Thus ὑπὸ μέθης βαπτιζόμενος εἰς ὕπνον, buried in sleep through drunkenness. So μυρίαις βαπτιζόμενος φρόντισιν, absorbed in thought (Chrysost.). Ταῖς βαρυτάταις ἁμαρτίαις βεβαπτισμενοι, steeped in sin (Justin M.). See Suicer, s.v. βαπτίζω.

2. "The Water" (τὸ ὕδωρ) is a name of baptism which occurs in <44047>Acts 10:47. After Peter's discourse, the Holy Spirit came visibly on Cornelius and his company; and the apostle asked, "Can any man forbid the water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost?" In ordinary cases the water had been first administered, after that the apostles laid on their hands, and then the Spirit was given. But here the Spirit had come down manifestly; before the administration of baptism; and Peter argued that no one could then reasonably withhold baptism (calling it "the water") from those who had visibly received that of which baptism was the sign and seal. With this phrase, τὸ ὕδωρ, "the water," used of baptism, compare "the breaking of bread" as a title of the Eucharist, <44242>Acts 2:42.

3. "The Washing of Water" (τὸ λουτρὸν τοῦ ὕδατος, "the bath of the water") occurs <49526>Ephesians 5:26. There appears clearly in these words a reference to the bridal bath; but the allusion to baptism is clearer still, baptism of which the bridal bath was an emblem, a type, or mystery, signifying to us the spiritual union betwixt Christ and his church. For as the bride was wont to bathe before being presented to the bridegroom, so

washing in the water is that initiatory rite by which the Christian Church is betrothed to the Bridegroom, Christ.

There is some difficulty in the construction and interpretation of the qualifying words, ἐν ῥήματι, "by the word." According to the more ancient interpretation, they would indicate that the outward rite of washing is insufficient and unavailing without the added potency of the Word of God (comp. 1 Peter 3:21), "Not the putting away the filth of the flesh," etc.); and as the λουτρὸν τοῦ ὕδατος had reference to the bridal bath, so there might be an allusion to the *words* of betrothal. The bridal bath and the words of betrothal typified the water and the words of baptism. On the doctrine so expressed the language of Augustine is famous: ''Detrahe verbum, et quid est aqua nisi aqua? Accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum" (*Tract.* 80 *ins Johan.*). Yet the general use of ῥῆμα in the New Testament and the grammatical construction of the passage seem to favor the opinion that the Word of God preached to the church, rather than the words made use of in baptism, is that accompaniment of the laver without which it would be imperfect (see Ellicott, in loc.).

4. "The washing of regeneration" (λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας) is a phrase naturally connected with the foregoing. It occurs Titus 3:5. All ancient and most modern commentators have interpreted it of baptism. Controversy has made some persons unwilling to admit this interpretation; but the question probably should be, not as to the significance of the phrase, but as to the degree of importance attached in the words of the apostle to that which the phrase indicates. Thus Calvin held that the "bath" meant baptism; but he explained its occurrence in this context by saying that "Baptism is to us the seal of salvation which Christ hath obtained for us." The current of the apostle's reasoning is this. He tells Titus to exhort the Christians of Crete to be submissive to authority, showing all meekness to all men: "for we ourselves were once foolish, erring, serving our own lusts; but when the kindness of God our Savior and His love toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we performed, but according to His own mercy He saved us by (through the instrumentality of) the bath of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost (διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως Πνεύματος ἁγίου), which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior, that, being justified by His grace, we might be made heirs of eternal life through hope (or according to hope, κατ᾽ ἐλπίδα). The argument is, that Christians should be kind to all men, remembering that they themselves had

been formerly disobedient, but that by God's free mercy in Christ they had been transplanted into a better state, even a state of salvation (ἔσωσεν ημᾶς), and *that* by means of the bath of regeneration and the renewal of the Holy Spirit. If, according to the more ancient and common interpretation, the laver means baptism, the whole will seem pertinent. Christians are placed in a new condition, made members of the Church of Christ by baptism, and they are renewed in the spirit of their minds by the Holy Ghost.

There is so much resemblance, both in the phraseology and in the argument, between this passage in Titus and <46611>1 Corinthians 6:11, that the latter ought by all means to be compared with the former. Paul tells the Corinthians that in their heathen state they had been stained with heathen vices; "but," he adds, "ye were washed" (lit. ye washed or bathed yourselves, ἀπελούσασθε), "but ye were sanctified, but ye were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by the Spirit of our God." It is generally believed that here is an allusion to the being baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ; though some connect "sanctified" and "justified," as well as "washed," with the words "in the name," etc. (see Stanley, in loc.). But, however this may be, the reference to baptism seems unquestionable.

Another passage containing very similar thoughts, clothed in almost the same words, is <44216>Acts 22:16, where Ananias says to Saul of Tarsus, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord" (ἀναστὰς βάπτισαι καὶ ἀπόλουσα τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου, ἐπικαλεσάμενος τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ). See Calvin's *Commentary* on this passage.

5. "Illumination" (φωτισμός). It has been much questioned whether φωτίζεσθαι, "enlightened," in <58604>Hebrews 6:4; 10:32, be used of baptism or not. Justin M., Clement of Alexandria, and almost all the Greek fathers, use φωτισμός as a synonym for *baptism.* The Syriac version, the most ancient in existence, gives this sense to the word in both the passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, and other Greek commentators so interpret it; and they are followed by Ernesti, Michaelis, and many modern interpreters of the highest authority (Wetstein cites from *Orac. Sibyll.* 1, ὕδατι φωτίζεσθαι). On the other hand, it is now very commonly alleged that the use is entirely ecclesiastical, not scriptural, and that it arose from the undue esteem for baptism in the

primitive church. It is impossible to enter into all the merits of the question here. If the usage be scriptural, it is to be found only in the two passages in Hebrews above mentioned; but it may perhaps correspond with other figures and expressions in the New Testament. The patristic use of the word may be seen by referring to Suicer, s.v. φωτισμός, and to Bingham (*E. A.* bk. 11, ch. 1, § 4). The rationale of the name, according to Justin Martyr, is, that the catechumens, before admission to baptism, were instructed in all the principal doctrines of the Christian faith, and hence "this laver is called illumination, because those who learn these things are illuminated in their understanding" (*Apol.* 2:94). But if this word be used in the sense of baptism in the Epistle to the Hebrews, as we have no mention of any training of catechumens in the New Testament, we must probably seek for a different explanation of its origin. It will be remembered that φωταγωγία was a term for admission into the ancient mysteries. Baptism was without question the initiatory rite in reference to the Christian faith (comp. τρία βαπτίσματα μιᾶς μυήσεως, *Can. Apost.* 1). Now that 'Christian faith is more than once called by Paul the Christian "mystery." The "mystery of God's will" (<490109>Ephesians 1:9), "the mystery of Christ" (<510403>Colossians 4:3; <490304>Ephesians 3:4), "the mystery of the Gospel" (<490619>Ephesians 6:19), and other like phrases, are common in his epistles. A Greek could hardly fail to be reminded by such language of the religious mysteries of his own former heathenism. But, moreover, seeing that "in Him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge," it seems highly probable that in three memorable passages Paul speaks, not merely of the Gospel or the faith, but of Christ himself as the great Mystery of God or of godliness.

(1) In <510127>Colossians 1:27, we read, "the glory of this mystery, which is Christ in you, τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου, ὅς ἐστιν Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν

(2) In <510202>Colossians 2:2, Lachmann, Tregelles, and Ellicott, as we think on good grounds, adopt the reading τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ, rightly compared by Bp. Ellicott with the preceding passage occurring only four verses before it, and interpreted by him "the mystery of God, even Christ."

(3) It deserves to be carefully considered whether the above usage in Colossians does not suggest a clear exposition of <540316>1 Timothy 3:16, τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον ὃς ἐφανερώθη κ. τ. λ: For, if Christ be the "Mystery of God," he may well be called also the "Mystery of godliness;"

and the masculine relative is then easily intelligible, as being referred to Χριστός understood and implied in μυστήριον; for, in the words of Hilary, “Dens Christus est Sacramentum.”

But, if all this be true, as baptism is the initiatory Christian rite admitting us to the service of God and to the knowledge of Christ, it may not improbably have been called φωτισμός, and afterward φωταγωγία, as having reference, and as admitting to the *mystery* of the Gospel, and to Christ himself, who is the *Mystery* of God.

V. We pass to a few of the more prominent passages, not already considered, in which baptism is referred to.

1. ⁴⁰John 3:5 — “Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God” — has been a well-established battle-field from the time of Calvin. Hooker states that for the first fifteen centuries no one had ever doubted its application to baptism (*Eccl. Pol.* v, 59). Zuinglius was probably the first who interpreted it otherwise. Calvin understood the words “of water and of the Spirit” as ἕν διὰ δυοῖν, “the washing or cleansing of the Spirit” (or rather perhaps “by the Spirit”), “who cleanses as water,” referring to ⁴⁰Matthew 3:11 (“He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire”), as a parallel usage. Stier (*Words of the Lord Jesus,* in loc.) observes that Licke has rightly said that we may regard this interpretation by means of a *hendiadys,* which erroneously appealed to ⁴⁰Matthew 3:11, as now generally abandoned. Stier, moreover, quotes with entire approbation the words of Meyer (on ⁴⁰John 3:5): “Jesus speaks here concerning a spiritual baptism, as in chap. vi, concerning a spiritual feeding; in both places, however, with reference to their visible auxiliary means.” That our Lord probably adopted expressions familiar to the Jews in this discourse with Nicodemus may be seen by reference to Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* in loc.

2. The prophecy of John the Baptist just referred to, viz. that our Lord should baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire (⁴⁰Matthew 3:11), has usually been interpreted by that rhetorical figure (*hendiadys*) which designates one thing by a double expression. Bengel thus paraphrases it: “*The Holy Spirit,* with which Christ baptizes, has a fiery force, and this was once even manifest to human sight” (⁴⁴Acts 2:3). The fathers, indeed, spoke of a threefold baptism with fire: first, of the Holy Ghost in the shape of fiery tongues at Pentecost; secondly, of the fiery trial of affliction and

temptation (<1 Peter 1:7); thirdly, of the fire which at the last day is to try every man's works (<1 Corinthians 3:13). It is, however, very improbable that there is any allusion to either of the last two in <Matthew 3:11. There is an antithesis in John the Baptist's language between his own lower mission and the divine authority of the Savior. John baptized with a mere earthly element, teaching men to repent, and pointing them to Christ; but He that should come after, ὁ ἐρχόμενος, was empowered to baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire. The water of John's baptism could but wash the body; the Holy Ghost, with which Christ was to baptize, should purify the soul as with fire. *SEE BAPTISM WITH FIRE*.

3. <Galatians 3:27: "For as many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." In the whole of this very important and difficult chapter Paul is reasoning on the inheritance by the Church of Christ of the promises made to Abraham. Christ — i.e. Christ comprehending his whole body mystical — is the true seed of Abraham, to whom the promises belong (ver. 16). The law, which came afterward, could not annul the promises thus made. The law was fit to restrain (or perhaps rather to *manifest*) transgression (ver. 23). The law acted as a pedagogue, keeping us for and leading us on to Christ, that he might bestow on us freedom and justification by faith in him (ver. 24). But after the coming of faith we are no longer, like young children, under a pedagogue, but we are free, as heirs in our Father's house (ver. 25; comp. ch. 4:1-5). "For ye all are God's sons (*filii emancipati*, not παῖδες, but υἱοί, Bengel and Ellicott) through the faith in Christ Jesus. For as many as have been baptized into Christ have put on (clothed yourselves in) Christ (see Schottgen on <Romans 13:14). In him is neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, neither male nor female; for all ye are one in Christ Jesus" (ver. 26-28). The argument is plain. All Christians are God's sons through union with the Only-begotten. Before the faith in him came into the world, men were held under the tutelage of the law, like children, kept as in a state of bondage under a pedagogue. But after the preaching of the faith, all who are baptized into Christ clothe themselves in him; so they are esteemed as adult sons of his Father, and by faith in him they may be justified from their sins, from which the law could not justify them (<Acts 13:37). The contrast is between the Christian and the Jewish Church: one bond, the other free; one infant, the other adult. The transition point is naturally when by baptism the service of Christ is undertaken and the promises of the Gospel are claimed. This is

represented as putting on Christ and in him assuming the position of full-grown men. In this more privileged condition there is the power of obtaining justification by faith, a justification which the law had not to offer.

4. <46123>1 Corinthians 12:13: "For by one Spirit (or in one spirit, ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι) we were all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free, and were all made to drink of one Spirit." The resemblance of this passage to the last is very clear. In the old dispensation there was a marked division between Jew and Gentile; under the Gospel there is one body in Christ. As in <48316>Galatians 3:16, Christ is the seed (τὸ σπέρμα), so here he is the body (τὸ σῶμα) into which all Christians become incorporated. All distinctions of Jew and Gentile, bond and free, are abolished. By the grace of the same Spirit (or perhaps "in one spirit" of Christian love and fellowship (comp. <49218>Ephesians 2:18), without division or separate interests) all are joined in baptism to the one body of Christ, his universal church. Possibly there is an allusion to both sacraments. "We were baptized into one body, we were made to drink of one Spirit" (ἕν Πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν: Lachm. and Tisch. omit εἰς). Both our baptism and our partaking of the cup in the communion are tokens and pledges of Christian unity. They mark our union with the one body of Christ, and they are means of grace, in which we may look for one Spirit to be present with blessing (comp. <46103>1 Corinthians 10:3, 17'; see Waterland *on the Eucharist*, ch. 10, and Stanley on <46123>1 Corinthians 12:13).

5. <45604>Romans 6:4, and <51212>Colossians 2:12, are so closely parallel that we may notice them together. As the apostle in the two last-considered passages views baptism as a joining to the mystical body of Christ, so in these two passages he goes on to speak of Christians in their baptism as buried with Christ in his death, and raised again with him in his resurrection. As the natural body of Christ was laid in the ground and then raised up again, so his mystical body, the church, descends in baptism into the waters, in which also (ἐν ᾧ, sc. βαπτίσματι, <51212>Colossians 2:12) it is raised up again with Christ, through "faith in the mighty working of God, who raised him from the dead." Probably, as in the former passages Paul had brought forward baptism as the symbol of Christian unity, so in those now before us he refers to it as the token and pledge of the spiritual death to sin and resurrection to righteousness; and moreover of the final victory over death in the last day, through the power of the resurrection of Christ. It is said that it was partly in reference to this passage in Colossians that

the early Christians so generally used trine immersion, as signifying thereby the three days in which Christ lay in the grave (see Suicer, s.v. ἀναδύω, II. a). — Smith, *Append.* s.v.

1. JEWISH BAPTISM. — Purifications by washing (q.v.) were very common among the Jews. *SEE ABLUTION*. In the language of the prophets, cleansing -with water is used as an emblem of the purification of the heart, which in the Messianic age is to glorify the soul in her innermost recesses, and to embrace the whole of the theocratic nation (<26625>Ezekiel 36:25 sq.; <38131>Zechariah 13:1).Of the antiquity of lustrations by water among the Jews there is no question, but it is still a disputed point whether baptism was practiced, *as an initiatory rite,* in connection with circumcision, before the coming of Christ. It is well established that, as early as the second century of the Christian sera, this *proselyte baptism* was an established rite among the Jews; and their writers, as well as many Christian theologians (e.g. Lightfoot, Wetstein, Wall, and others), claim for it a much greater antiquity. But this opinion is hardly tenable, for, as an act which strictly gives *validity* to the admission of a proselyte, and is no mere *accompaniment* to his admission, baptism certainly is not alluded to in the New Testament; while, as to the passages quoted in proof from the classical (profane) writers of that period, they are all open to the most fundamental objections. Nor is the utter silence of Josephus and Philo on the subject, notwithstanding their various opportunities of touching on it, a less weighty argument against this view. It is true that mention is made in the Talmud of that regulation as already existing in the first century A.D.; but such statements belong only to the traditions of the Gemara, and require careful investigation before they can serve as proper authority. This Jewish rite was probably originally only a purifying ceremony; and it was raised to the character of an initiating and indispensable rite, coordinate with that of sacrifice and circumcision, only *after* the destruction of the Temple, when sacrifices had ceased, and the circumcision of proselytes had, by reason of public edicts, become more and more impracticable. *SEE PROSELYTE*.

2. JOHN'S BAPTISM. — It was the principal object of John the Baptist to combat the prevailing opinion that the performance of external ceremonies was sufficient to secure participation in the kingdom of God and his promises; he required repentance, therefore, as a preparation for the approaching kingdom of the Messiah. That he may possibly have baptized *heathens* also seems to follow from his censuring the Pharisees for

confiding in their descent from Abraham, while they had no share in his spirit; yet it should not be overlooked that this remark was drawn from him by the course of the argument (<40308>Matthew 3:8, 9; <42307>Luke 3:7, 8). W We must, on the whole, assume that John considered the existing Judaism as a stepping-stone by which the Gentiles were to arrive at the kingdom of God in its Messianic form. The general point of view from which John contemplated the Messiah and his kingdom was that of the Old Testament, though closely bordering on Christianity. He regards, it is true, an alteration in the mind and spirit as an indispensable condition for partaking in the kingdom of the Messiah; still, he looked for its establishment by means of conflict and external force, with which the Messiah was to be endowed; and he expected in him a Judge and Avenger, who was to set up outward and visible distinctions. It is, therefore, by no means a matter of indifference whether baptism be administered in the name of that Christ who floated before the mind of John, or of the suffering and glorified One, such as the apostles knew him; and whether it was considered a preparation for a political, or a consecration into a spiritual theocracy. John was so far from this latter view, so far from contemplating a purely spiritual development of the kingdom of God, that he even began subsequently to entertain doubts concerning Christ (<40112>Matthew 11:2). John's baptism had not the character of an immediate, but merely of a preparatory consecration for the glorified theocracy (<43031>John 1:31). The apostles, therefore, found it necessary to rebaptize the disciples of John, who had still adhered to the notions of their master on that head (Acts 19). To this apostolic judgment Tertullian appeals, and in his opinion coincide the most eminent teachers of the ancient' church, both of the East and the West." — Jacobi, in *Kitto's Cyclop.* s.v. *SEE JOHN (THE BAPTIST)*.

The *Baptism of Jesus by John* (<40313>Matthew 3:13; <41009>Mark 1:9; <42321>Luke 3:21; comp. <43019>John 1:19), as the first act of Christ's public career, is one of the most important events recorded in the evangelical history. We might be apt to infer from Luke and Matthew that there had been an acquaintance between Christ and John prior to the baptism, and that hence John declines (<40314>Matthew 3:14) to baptize Jesus, arguing that he needed to be baptized by him. This, however, has been thought to be at variance with <43031>John 1:31, 33. Lucke (*Comment.* 1:416 sq., 3d edit.) takes the words "I knew him not" in their strict and exclusive sense. John, he says, could not have spoken in this manner if he had at all known Jesus; and had he known him, he could not, as a prophet, have failed to discover, even at an earlier

period, the but too evident "glory" of the Messiah. On the other hand, the narrative of the-first three Gospels presupposes John's personal acquaintance with him, since, although the herald of the Messiah, he could not otherwise have given that refusal (<4014>Matthew 3:14) to the Messiah alone; for his own language necessarily implies that Jesus was not a stranger to him. *SEE MESSIAH*.

With regard to the *object of Christ in undergoing baptism*, we find, in the first instance, that he ranked this action among those of his Messianic calling. This object is still more defined by John the Baptist (<4013>John 1:31), which passage Lucke interprets in the following words: "Only by entering into that community which was to be introductory to the Messianic, by attaching himself to the Baptist like any other man, was it possible for Christ to reveal himself to the Baptist, and through him to others." Christ himself never for a moment could doubt his own mission, or the right period when his character was to be made manifest by God; but John needed to receive that assurance, in order to be the herald of the Messiah who was actually come. For all others whom John baptized, either before or after Christ, this act was a mere preparatory consecration to the kingdom of the Messiah; while for Jesus it was a direct and immediate consecration, by means of which he manifested the commencement of his career as the founder of the new theocracy, which began at the very moment of his baptism, the initiatory character of which constituted its general principle and tendency. *SEE JESUS*.

Baptism of the Disciples of Christ. — Whether our Lord ever baptized has been doubted. (See Schenk, *De lotione a 'Christo administrata*, Marb. 1745.) The only passage which may distinctly bear on the question is <4001>John 4:1, 2, where it is said "that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples." We necessarily infer from it that, as soon as our Lord began his ministry, and gathered to him a company of disciples, he, like John the Baptist, admitted into that company by the administration of baptism. Normally, however, to say the least of it, the administration of baptism was by the hands of his disciples. Some suppose that the first-called disciples had all received baptism at the hands of John the Baptist, as must have pretty certainly been the case with Andrew (see <4015>John 1:35, 37, 40), and that they were not again baptized with water after they joined the company of Christ. Others believe that Christ himself baptized some few of his earlier disciples, who were afterward authorized to baptize the rest. But in any

case the words above cited seem to show that making disciples and baptizing them went together; and that baptism was, even during our Lord's earthly ministry, the formal, mode of accepting his service and becoming attached to his company.

After the resurrection, when the church was to be spread and the Gospel preached, our Lord's own commission conjoins the making of disciples with their baptism. The command, "Make disciples of all nations by baptizing them" (<4028>Matthew 28:19), is merely the extension of his own practice, "Jesus made disciples and baptized them" (<4001>John 4:1). The conduct of the apostles is the plainest comment on both; for so soon as ever men, convinced by their preaching, asked for guidance and direction, their first exhortation was to repentance and baptism, that thus the convert should be at once publicly received into the fold of Christ (see <4102>Acts 2:38; 8:12, 36; 9:18; 10:47; 16:15, 33, etc.). (See Zimmermann, *De Baptismi origine et usu,* Gott. 1816.) *SEE DISCIPLE*.

3. CHRISTIAN BAPTISM is a sacrament instituted by Christ himself. When he could no longer personally and immediately choose and receive members of his kingdom, when at the same time all had been accomplished which the founder thought necessary for its completion, he gave power to the spiritual community to receive, in his name, members by *baptism.* The authority and obligation of baptism as a universal ordinance of the Christian Church is derived from the commission of Christ, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in (to, εἰς) the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (<4028>Matthew 28:19). See II *below.*

1. *Design and Benefits of Baptism.* — As to the design and benefits of baptism there are various views held. The principal are the following:

> **1.** *That it is a direct instrument of grace;* the application of water to the person by a properly qualified functionary being regarded as the appointed vehicle by which God bestows regenerating grace upon men. This is the view of the Roman and Eastern churches, and of one (the "High-Church") party in the Protestant Episcopal and the Lutheran churches. Nearly the same view is held by the Disciples of Christ (Campbellites), who regard baptism as the remitting ordinance of the Gospel, or the appointed means through which the penitent sinner obtains the assurance of that remission of sins procured by the death of Christ. *SEE REGENERATION*.

2. *That it is neither an instrument nor a seal of grace, but simply a ceremony of initiation into church membership.* This is the Socinian view of the ordinance.

3. *That it is a token of regeneration,* to be received only by those who give evidence of being really regenerated. This is the view adopted by the Baptists.

4. *That it is a symbol of purification,* the use of which simply announces that the religion of Christ is a purifying religion, and intimates that the party receiving the rite assumes the profession, and is to be instructed in the principles of that religion. This opinion is extensively entertained among the Congregationalists of England.

5. *That it is the rite of initiation into the visible church, and that, though not an instrument, it is a seal of grace,* divine blessings being thereby confirmed and obsignated to the individual.

This is the doctrine of the Confessions of the majority of the Reformed churches. The Augsburg Confession states,

Art. 9: "Concerning baptism, our churches teach that it is a necessary ordinance; that it is a means of grace, and ought to be administered also to children, who are thereby dedicated to God, and received into his favor. They condemn the Anabaptists who reject the baptism of children, and who affirm that infants may be saved without baptism." The Westminster Confession,

Art. 28: "Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible church, but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life; which sacrament is, by Christ's own appointment, to be continued in his church until the end of the world. The outward element to be used in this sacrament is water, wherewith the party is to be baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, by a minister of the Gospel lawfully called thereunto. Dipping of the person into water is not necessary; but baptism is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person. Not only those that do actually profess faith in and obedience unto Christ, but also the infants of one or both believing parents,

are to be baptized. Although it be a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance, yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it, or that all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated. The efficacy of baptism is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered; yet, notwithstanding, by the right use of this ordinance the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God's own will, in his appointed time. The sacrament of baptism is but once to be administered to any person." In the 17th article of the Methodist Episcopal Church it is declared that "Baptism is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference whereby Christians are distinguished from others that are not baptized, but it is also a sign of regeneration, or the new birth. The baptism of young children is to be retained in the church." The same formula appears in the Articles of the Church of England and of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, with certain additions, as follows:

"**Art. 27.** Baptism is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but it is also a sign of regeneration, or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the church: the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed -and sealed: faith is confirmed, and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God. The baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the church as most agreeable with the institution of Christ." The following excellent summary of the benefits of baptism is given by Watson (*Institutes,* 2:646): "Baptism introduces the adult believer into the covenant of grace and the Church of Christ, and is the seal, the pledge to him on the part of God of the fulfillment of all its provisions in time and in eternity, while on his part he takes upon himself the obligations of steadfast faith and obedience. To the infant child it is a visible reception into the same covenant and church-a pledge of acceptance through Christ — the bestowment of a title to all the grace of the covenant as circumstances may require, and as the mind of the child may be capable, or made capable of receiving it, and as it may be sought in future life by prayer, when the period of reason and moral choice shall arrive. It conveys, also, the present 'blessing' of Christ, of which we are assured by his taking children in his arms and blessing them; which

blessing cannot be merely nominal, but must be substantial and efficacious. It secures, too, the gift of the Holy Ghost in those secret spiritual influences by which the actual regeneration of those children who die in infancy is effected, and which are a seed of life in those who are spared, to prepare them for instruction in the Word of God, as they are taught it by parental care, to incline their will and affections to good, and to begin and maintain in them the war against inward and outward evil, so that they may be divinely assisted, as reason strengthens, to make their calling and election sure. In a word, it is, both as to infants and to adults, the sign and pledge of that inward grace which, though modified in its operations by the difference of their circumstances, has respect to, and flows from, a covenant relation to each of the three persons in whose one name they are baptized-acceptance by the *Father*, union with *Christ* as the head of his mystical body, the church, and the communion of the *Holy Ghost.* To these advantages must be added the respect which God bears to the believing act of the parents, and to their solemn prayers on the occasion, in both which the child is interested, as well as in that solemn engagement of the parents which the rite necessarily implies to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

Exaggerated ideas of the necessity and efficacy of baptism developed themselves as early as the second and third centuries (see references in Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, § 72). It became the custom to defer baptism as long as possible (a practice recommended, e.g. by Tertullian, *De Bapt.* c. 18). Many would not be baptized until just before death; e.g. Constantine. They supposed that baptism removes all previous sins in a sort of magical way; but that sins after baptism are remitted with difficulty, or not at all. Hence the baptism of new converts was delayed, entirely contrary to the 'spirit and practice of the apostles, who baptized' converts immediately (Acts 2:41; 16:15). See Baumgarten, *De Procrastinatione Baptismi ap. Veteres*, Halle, 1747. After Augustine, through whom the doctrine of "no salvation out of the church" came to be received, it began to be held that infants dying without baptism were lost, and the baptism of very young infants became the common rule, while the baptism of adult converts was hastened (Knapp, *Theology*, § 141).

The Church of Rome continues to teach that original sin is *effaced* by the sacrament of baptism. The Anglican Church holds that "this infection of nature doth remain in them that are regenerated." The Russian Catechism declares that in holy baptism the believer "dies to the carnal life of sin, and

is born again of the Holy Ghost to a life spiritual and holy;" which is the doctrine of the Greek Church generally. *SEE GRACE*; *SEE REGENERATION*; *SEE SACRAMENTS*.

II. *Obligation and Perpetuity of Baptism.* — That baptism is obligatory is evident from the example of Christ, who by his disciples baptized many that, by his miracles and discourses, were brought to profess faith in him as the Messiah; from his command to his apostles after his resurrection (<40>Matthew 28:19); and from the practice of the apostles themselves (<44>Acts 2:38). But the Quakers assert that water baptism was never intended to continue in the Church of Christ any longer than while Jewish prejudices made such an external ceremony necessary. They argue from <49>Ephesians 4:5, in which *one* baptism is spoken of as necessary to Christians, that this must be a baptism of the Spirit. But, from comparing the texts that relate to this institution, it will plainly appear that water baptism was instituted by Christ in more general terms than will agree with this explication. That it was administered to all the Gentile converts, and not confined to the Jews, appears from <40>Matthew 28:19, 20, compared with <44>Acts 10:47; and that the baptism of the Spirit did not supersede water baptism appears to have been the judgment of Peter and of those that were with him; so that the one baptism spoken of seems to have been that of water, the communication of the Holy Spirit being only called baptism in a figurative sense. As for any objection which may be drawn from <46>1 Corinthians 1:17; it is sufficiently answered by the preceding verses, and all the numerous texts in which, in epistles written long after this, the apostle speaks of *all* Christians as baptized, and argues from the obligation of baptism in such a manner as we could never imagine he would have done if he had apprehended it to have been the will of God that it should be discontinued in the church (compare <45>Romans 6:3, etc.; <51>Colossians 2:12; <48>Galatians 3:27). Doddridge, *Lectures on Divinity*, Lect. 201. For a clear view of the obligation of baptism, see Hibbard on *Christian Baptism*, pt. 2, ch. 10. *SEE ANTI-BAPTISTS*; *SEE QUAKERS*.

III. *Mode of Baptism.* — The ceremonies used in baptism have varied in different ages and countries; a brief account of them is given below (VIII). Among Protestants baptism is performed with great simplicity; all that is deemed *essential* to the ordinance being the application of water by sprinkling, pouring, or immersion, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

1. The *Baptists* (q.v.) maintain, however, that immersion is the *only valid baptism,* in this point separating themselves from all the rest of Christendom. They rely for their justification chiefly upon the following arguments:

(1.) That the word βαπτίζω means, *literally*, to "immerse," and nothing else; while its *figurative* uses always include the idea of "burying" or "overwhelming;"

(2.) that the terms *washing, purifying, burying in baptism*, so often mentioned in the Scriptures, allude to this mode;

(3.) that the *places* selected for baptism in the New Test. imply immersion;

(4.) that immersion *only* was the practice of the apostles, the first Christians, and the church in general for many ages, and that it was only laid aside from the love of novelty and the coldness of climate. These positions, they think, are so clear from Scripture and the history of the church that they stand in need of but little argument for their support.

(5.) Farther, they also insist that all positive institutions depend entirely upon the will and declaration of the institutor; and that, therefore, reasoning by analogy from previously abrogated rites is to be rejected, and the express command of Christ respecting baptism ought to be our rule. *SEE IMMERSION*.

2. The *Christian Church* generally, on the other hand, denies that immersion is *essential* to the ordinance of baptism, and admits any of the three modes, sprinkling, pouring, or immersion. The *Greek* Church requires trine immersion in its rubrics, but in Russia baptism by sprinkling or affusion is regarded as equally valid. The *Roman* ritual favors affusion thrice repeated, but admits also of immersion. In the "Office for the Public Baptism of Infants" in the *Church of England* it is directed that the "priest shall dip the child in the water if the sponsors shall certify him that the child may well endure it;" but "if they certify that the child is weak, it shall suffice to pour water upon it." In the "Office for the Private Baptism of Infants" it is directed that the baptism shall be by affusion, the infant in such cases being always certified to be weak. In the "Office for the Baptism of Adults," it is left altogether to the discretion of the minister to

dip the person to be baptized in the water or to pour water upon him. The framers of the Office evidently, by the discretionary power left to the officiating minister, have decided that the mode in this respect is immaterial. The ritual of the *Methodist Episcopal Church,* in like manner, leaves the administrator free; and he is so, in fact, in most (but not all) Protestant Churches. The substantial question, therefore, between the Baptists and the Christian Church generally, is whether *immersion is essential to baptism* or not. The negative is maintained by the following arguments (besides others for which we have not space), viz.

(1.) As to the *meaning* of βαπτίζω, it is allowed, on all hands, that it is (at least sometimes) applied to acts involving the process of immersion both by profane and sacred writers (see above). But the best lexicographers agree that this is not its exclusive meaning, and none but a daring controversialist would assert that it is. The word βαπτίζω is derived from βαπτὸς, the verbal adjective *of* βάπτω, *to wet thoroughly,* and its etymological meaning is to *put into a drenched or imbued condition* (*Meth. Quar. Rev.* 1850, p. 406). In the New Testament it generally means to *purify* by the application of water. (See Beecher on *Baptism;* Murdock, in *Bib. Sac.* Oct. 1850, on the Syriac words for baptism.) "As the word βαπτίζω is used to express the various ablutions among the Jews, such as sprinkling, pouring, etc. (Hebrews 9:10), for the custom of washing before meals, and the washing of household furniture, pots, etc., it is evident from hence that it does not express the manner of doing a thing, whether by immersion or affusion, but only the thing done — that is, washing, or the application of water in some form or other. It nowhere signifies *to dip,* but in denoting a mode of, and in order to, washing or cleansing; and the mode or use is only the ceremonial part of a positive institute, just as in the Lord's Supper the time of day, the number and posture of the communicants, the quantity and quality of bread and wine, are circumstances not accounted essential by any part of Christians. If in baptism there be an expressive emblem of the descending influence of the Spirit, pouring must be the mode of administration, for that is the scriptural term most commonly and properly used for the communication of divine influences (Matthew 3:11; Mark 1:8, 10; Luke 3:16-22; John 1:33; Acts 1:5; 2:38, 39; 8:12, 17; 11:15, 16). The term *sprinkling,* also, is made use of in reference to the act of purification (Isaiah 52:15; Ezekiel 36:25; Hebrews 9:13, 14), and therefore cannot be inapplicable to baptismal purification" (Watson). So far, then, as the word

βαπτίζω is concerned, there is no foundation for the exclusive theory of the Baptists.

(2.) As for the fact that John baptized "*in* Jordan,' it is enough to reply that to infer always a plunging of the whole body in water from this particle would, in many instances, be false and absurd. Indeed, if immersion were intended, the preposition should be εἰς and not ἐν. The same preposition, ἐν, is used when it is said they should be "baptized with fire," but few will assert that they should be plunged into it. The apostle, speaking of Christ, says he came not, ἐν, "by water only," but, ἐν, — "by water and blood." There the same word, ἐν, is translated *by;* and with justice and propriety, for we know no good sense in which we could say he came in water. Jesus, it is said, came up *out of* the water, but this is no proof that he was immersed, as the Greek term ἀπό properly *signifies from;* for instance, "Who hath warned you to flee *from,"* not *out of,* the "wrath to come?" with many others that might be mentioned. Again, it is urged that Philip and the eunuch went down both into the water. To this it is answered that here also is no proof of immersion; for if the expression of their going down *into* the water necessarily includes dipping, then Philip was dipped as well as the eunuch. The preposition εἰς, translated *into,* often signifies no more than *to* or *unto,* see <40154>Matthew 15:24; <45610>Romans 10:10; <44814>Acts 28:14; <40311>Matthew 3:11; 17:27; so that from none of these circumstances can it be proved that there was one person of all the baptized who went into the water ankle deep. As to the apostle's expression, "buried with him in baptism," that has no force in the argument for immersion, since it does not allude to a custom of dipping, any more than our baptismal crucifixion and death has any such reference. It is not the sign, but the thing signified, that is here alluded to. As Christ was buried and rose again to a heavenly life, so we by baptism signify that we are separated from sin, that we may live a new life of faith and love. (See above.)

(3). It is urged further against immersion that it carries with it too much, of the appearance of a burdensome rite for the Gospel dispensation; that it is unfit publicly for so solemn an ordinance; that it has a tendency to agitate the spirits, often rendering the subject unfit for the exercise of proper thoughts and affections, and, indeed, utterly incapable of them; that in many cases the immersion of the body would, in all probability, be instant death; that in other situations it would be impracticable for want of water: hence it cannot be considered as necessary to the ordinance of baptism, and there is the strongest improbability that it was universally practiced in the

times of the New Testament, or in the earliest periods of the Christian Church; indeed, the allegation of the *exclusiveness* of this mode is far from being adequately supported by ancient testimony, while in many instances (e.g. that of the Philippine jailer, <44173>Acts 17:33) this theory involves the most unlikely suppositions. See above (I-V).

IV. *Subjects of Baptism.* — The Christian churches generally baptize infants as well as adult believers, and this is believed to have been the practice of the church from the apostolical age. The Roman and Lutheran: churches teach that baptism admits children into the church and makes them members of the body of Christ. The Reformed churches, generally, teach that the children of believers are included in the covenant, and are therefore entitled to baptism. The Methodist Church holds that all infants are redeemed by Christ, and are therefore entitled to baptism, wherever they can receive the instruction and care of a Christian church or family.

(I.) As to the *antiquity* of infant baptism, it is admitted by Baptist writers themselves that it was practiced in Tertullian's time (A.D. 200); but they insist that beyond that date there is no proof of any other baptism than that of adult believers. The principal passages cited in the controversy are from Origen, Tertullian, Irenaeus, and Justin Martyr.

1. *Origen* (A.D. 185-253) speaks in the most un- equivocal terms of the baptism of infants, as the general practice of the church in his time, and as having been received from the apostles. His testimony is as follows: "According to the usage of the church, baptism is given even to infants; when, if there were nothing in infants which needed forgiveness and mercy, the grace of baptism would seem to be superfluous" (*Homil. VIII in Levit.* ch. 12). Again: "Infants are baptized for the forgiveness of sins. Of what sins? Or, when have they sinned? Or, can there be any reason for the laver in their case, unless it be according to the sense which we have mentioned above, viz. that no one is free from pollution, though he has lived but one day upon earth? And because by baptism native pollution is taken away, therefore infants are baptized" (*Homil. in Luc.* 14). Again: "For this cause it was that the church received a tradition from *the apostles* (παράδοσις ἀποστολική) to give baptism even to infants" (*Comm. on Rom.* lib. v, cap. 9). Neander (*Ch. Hist.* 1:514) depreciates this testimony, but without any real ground. On any ordinary subject it would be taken as decisive, at least as to the prevalence of infant baptism in Origen's time, and *long before.*

2. *Tertullian* (A.D. 160-240), in his treatise *De Baptismo* (c. 18), opposes infant baptism on the ground (1) "that it is too important; not even earthly goods are intrusted to infants;" (2) that "sponsors are imperilled by the responsibility they incur." Tertullian adopted the superstitious idea that baptism was accompanied with the remission of all past sins, and that sins committed after baptism were peculiarly dangerous. He therefore advised that not merely infants, but young men and young women, and even young widows and widowers, should postpone their baptism until the period of their youthful appetite and passion should have passed. In short, he advised that, in all cases in which death was not likely to intervene, baptism be postponed until the subjects of it should have arrived at a period of life when they would be no longer in danger of being led astray by youthful lusts. And thus, for more than a century after the age of Tertullian, we find some of the most conspicuous converts to the Christian faith postponing baptism till the close of life. Further, if he *could* have said that infant baptism was "an innovation," he would; no argument was surer or weightier in that age; and he constantly appeals to it on other subjects. All attempts to invalidate this testimony have failed. If any fact in history is certain, it is that infant baptism was practiced in Tertullian's time, and long before. For the Baptist view, however, on this point, see an able article in the *Christian Review,* 16:510. See also *Bibliotheca Sacra,* 3, 680; v. 307.

3. *Irenaeus* (circ. A.D. 125-190) has the following passage (lib. 2, cap. 39): "Omnes venit per semetipsum salvare; omnes, inquam, qui per eum *renascuntur* in Deum, *infantes* et parvulos et pueros," etc.; i.e. ' He came to save all by himself; all, I say, who, by him, *are born again* unto God, *infants,* and little children, and youth," etc. All turns here on the meaning attached by Irenaeus to the word *renasci;* and this is clear from a passage (lib. 3, c. 19) in which he speaks of the Gospel commission. "When," says he, "[Christ] gave this commission of *regenerating to God* [renasci], he said, 'Go, teach all nations, *baptizing* them, etc.'" Neander (whose loose admissions as to the entire question are eagerly made use of by Baptists) remarks of this passage that "it is difficult to conceive how the term regeneration can be employed in reference to this age (i.e. infancy), to denote any thing else than baptism" (*Ch. Hist.* 1:314).

4. *Justin Martyr,* who wrote his "Apology" about A.D. 138, declares that there were among Christians, in his time, "many persons of both sexes, some sixty and some seventy years old, who had been made disciples to Christ from their infancy" (ο ἐκ παίδων ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ,

Apol. 2), and who must therefore have been baptized during the lifetime of some of the apostles. In his *Trypho* he says, "We are circumcised by baptism, with Christ's circumcision." If ἐκ παίδων *means from infancy,* which is probable, but not absolutely certain, this passage is conclusive.

These citations seem clearly to carry back the practice of infant baptism to a date very near the apostles' time. If it were then "an innovation," we should have had *some* indication of so great a change; but there is none. Up to the rise of the Anabaptists in the 16th century, the practice of infant baptism existed in the church without opposition, or with only here and there an occasional word of question.

(II.) At the present day the Greek Church, the Roman Church, and all Protestant churches (except the Baptists) hold to infant baptism. The usage rests on the following grounds (among others), viz.

1. If the practice of infant baptism prevailed at the early period above mentioned, and all history is silent as to the time of its introduction, and gives no intimation of any excitement, controversy, or opposition to an innovation so remarkable as this must have been had it been obtruded on the churches without apostolical authority, we may fairly conclude, even were Scripture silent on the subject, that infant baptism has invariably prevailed in the church as a new Testament institution.

2. From the very nature of the case, the first subjects of the baptism of Christ and his apostles were adults converted from Judaism or heathenism. But although there are no express examples in the New Testament of Christ and his apostles baptizing infants, there is no proof that they were excluded. Jesus Christ actually blessed little children; and it is difficult to believe that such received his blessing, and yet were not to be members of the Gospel church. If Christ received them, and would have us "receive" them, how can we keep them out of the visible church? Besides, if children were not to be baptized, it is reasonable to expect that they would have been expressly forbidden. As whole households were baptized, it is also probable there were children among them.

3. Infants are included in Christ's act of redemption, and are entitled thereby to the benefits and blessings of his church. Moreover, they are specifically embraced in the Gospel covenant. The covenant with Abraham, of which circumcision was made the sign and seal, is not to be regarded

wholly nor even chiefly, as a political and national covenant. The engagement was,

(1.) That God would bless Abraham. This included justification, and the imputation of his faith for righteousness, with all spiritual blessings.

(2.) That he should be the father of many nations. This refers quite as much to his *spiritual* seed as to his *natural* descendants.

(3.) The promise of Canaan; and this included the higher promise of the eternal inheritance (Hebrews 11:9, 10).

(4.) God would be "a God to Abraham and to his seed after him," a promise connected with the highest spiritual blessing, and which included the justification of all believers in all nations. See Galatians 3:8, 9.

Now of this spiritual covenant, circumcision was the *sign* and the *seal,* and, being enjoined on all Abraham's posterity, was a constant *publication* of God's covenant grace among the descendants of Abraham, and its repetition a continual *confirmation* of that covenant. Baptism is, in like manner, the initiatory sign and seal of the same covenant, in its new and perfect form in Christ Jesus; otherwise the new covenant has no initiatory rite or sacrament. The argument that baptism has precisely the same federal and initiatory character as circumcision, and that it was instituted for the same ends, and in its place, is clearly established in several important passages of the New Testament. To these we can only refer (Colossians 2:10-12; Galatians 3:27, 29; 1 Peter 3:21).

"The ultimate authority for infant baptism in the bosom of a regular Christian community and under a sufficient guarantee of pious education- for only on these terms do we advocate it — lies in the universal import of Christ's person and work, which extends as far as humanity itself. Christ is not only able, but willing to save mankind of all classes, in all circumstances, of both sexes, and at all stages of life, and consequently to provide for all these the necessary means of grace (comp. Galatians 3:28). A Christ able and willing to save none but adults would be no such Christ as the Gospel presents. In the significant parallel, Romans 5:12 sq., the apostle earnestly presses the point that the reign of righteousness and life is, in its divine intent and intrinsic efficacy, fully as comprehensive as the reign of sin and doubt, to which children among the rest are subject — nay, far more comprehensive and availing; and that the blessing and gain

by the second Adam far outweigh the curse and the loss by the first. When the Lord, after solemnly declaring that all power is given to him in heaven and earth, commands his apostles to make all nations disciples (μαθητεύειν) by baptism and instruction, there is not the least reason for limiting this to those of maturer age. Or do nations consist only of men, and not of youth also, and children? According to <19701>Psalm 117:1, 'all nations,' and according to <19906>Psalm 150:6, 'every thing that hath breath,' should praise the Lord; and that these include babes and sucklings is explicitly told us in <19802>Psalm 8:2, and <42116>Matthew 21:16. With this is closely connected the beautiful idea, already clearly brought out by Irenaeus, the disciple of Polycarp, and the faithful medium of the apostolical tradition descending from John's field of labor-the idea that Jesus Christ became for children a child, for youth a youth, for men a man; and by thus entering into the various conditions and stages of our earthly existence, sanctified every period of life, infancy as well as manhood. The Baptist view robs the Savior's infancy of its profound and cheering significance." — Schaff, *Apost. Ch.*, § 143.

(III.) The BAPTISTS reject infant baptism, and maintain that the ordinance is only to be administered to persons making a profession of faith in Christ. The arguments by which they seek to maintain this view are substantially as follows, viz.

1. The commission of Christ to the disciples (<41615>Mark 16:15, 16) fixes instruction in the truths of the Gospel and belief in them as prerequisites to baptism.

2. The instances of baptism given in the N.T. are adduced as confirming this view. "Those baptized by John *confessed their sins* (<40306>Matthew 3:6). The Lord Jesus Christ gave the command to *teach* and baptize (<402819>Matthew 28:19; <41615>Mark 16:15, 16. At the day of Pentecost, they who *gladly received the word* were baptized, and they afterward continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship (<44241>Acts 2:41, 42, 47). At Samaria, those who *believed* were baptized, both men and women (<44812>Acts 8:12). The eunuch openly avowed his faith (in reply to Philip's statement, If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest), and went down into the water and was baptized (<44835>Acts 8:35, 39). Saul of Tarsus, after his sight was restored, and he had received the Holy Ghost, arose and was baptized (<44917>Acts 9:17, 18). Cornelius and his friends heard Peter, received the Holy Ghost, and were baptized (<441044>Acts 10:44-48). Lydia

heard Paul and Silas; the Lord opened her heart, and she was baptized, and her household."

3. The Baptists farther assert that the N.T. affords no single example of infant baptism. They explain the baptisms of "households" by the assumption that none of their members were infants.

4. They argue that if infant baptism be a Christian ordinance, it must be expressly enjoined in Scripture, which is not the case.

5. They argue, finally, that as "Christian faith is a *personal* matter, its profession ought to be a matter of free conviction and choice, which cannot be the case with infants." *SEE PAEDOBAPTISM*.

V. *The Minister of Baptism.* — The administration by baptism is a function of the ministerial office (Matthew 28:16-20). But it is the *general* opinion, both of the Roman and Protestant churches, that the presence of an ordained minister is not absolutely *essential* to the ordinance, and that, in extreme cases, it is lawful for lay persons to baptize. At the present day, not only lay baptism, but baptism administered by heretics, schismatics, and even *women*, is held to be valid by the Greek and Roman churches. The Lutherans also hold the same view. Baptism by midwives was admitted by the Church of England in extreme cases down to the Great Rebellion. Not that it was believed that laymen have the *right* to baptize, but that, the baptism having been once performed, it is valid to such an extent that rebaptism is improper. *SEE BAPTISM* (LAY).

VI. *Repetition of Baptism.* — In the third century the question arose whether the baptism of heretics was to be accounted valid, or whether a heretic who returned to the Catholic Church was to be rebaptized. In opposition to the usage of the Eastern and African churches, which was defended by Cyprian, the principle was established in the Roman Church under Stephen, that the right of baptism, if duly performed, was always valid, and its repetition contrary to the tradition of the church. In the next age Basil and Gregory of Nazianzen followed Cyprian's view, but by the influence of Augustine the Roman view became the prevalent one; but the Donatists maintained that heretics must be rebaptized. *SEE DONATISTS* (Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doct.* § 72 and 137, and references there). After the Reformation, the Roman Church, compelled by its old usage and principle, continued to acknowledge the validity of Protestant baptisms, while Protestants, in turn, admit the validity of Roman Catholic baptism.

VII. *Sponsors or Godfathers.* — Sponsors (called also godfathers and godmothers) are persons who, at the baptism of infants, answer for their future conduct, and solemnly promise that they will renounce the devil and all his works, and follow a life of purity and virtue; and by these means lay themselves under an indispensable obligation to instruct them and watch over their conduct. In the Roman Church the number of godfathers and godmothers is reduced to two; in the Church of England, to three; formerly the number was not limited. It is prohibited, in the Roman Church, to sponsors to marry their godchildren, or each other, or either parent of their godchild; nor may the baptizer marry the child baptized or its parent. The custom of having sponsors is not in use among the dissenting denominations in England, nor among the evangelical churches in America. The parents are held to be the proper persons to present their children for baptism, and to train them up afterward; indeed, while they live, no other persons can possibly take this duty from them. In the early church the parents were commonly the sponsors of infants. The duty of those who undertook the office of sponsor for *adult* persons was not to answer in their names, but to admonish and instruct them, both before and after baptism. In many churches this office was chiefly imposed upon the deacons and deaconesses. The only persons excluded from this office by the ancient Church were catechumens, energumens, heretics, and penitents; also persons not *confirmed* are excluded by some canons. Anciently one sponsor only was required for each person to be baptized, who was to be of the same sex as the latter in the case of adult persons; in the case of infants the sex was indifferent. The origin of the prohibition of sponsors marrying within the forbidden degrees of spiritual relationship appears to have been a law of Justinian, still extant in the Codex (lib. v, tit. 4, *De Nuptiis, Leg.* 26), which forbade a godfather to marry the woman for whom he had stood sponsor at baptism. The council *in Trullo* extended this prohibition to the marrying the *mother* of the baptized infant (can. 53); and it was subsequently carried to such an extent that the council of Trent (Sess. 24, *De Reform. Matrimon.* cap. 2) was compelled to relax it in some degree. — Bingham, 11, 8. *SEE SPONSORS*.

VIII. *Ceremonies, Places, and Times of Baptism.* —

1. In the earlier ages of the Church there were several peculiarities in the mode of baptism which have now fallen into disuse, except, perhaps, in the Roman Catholic and Greek churches. Among there usages were *trine*

immersion (i.e. dipping three times, once at the naming of each person in the Trinity, Tertull. *Cont. Prax.* 26), anointing with oil, giving milk and honey to the baptized person, etc. After the council of Nice, Christians added to baptism the ceremonies of exorcism and adjuration, to make evil spirits depart from the persons to be baptized. They made several signings with the cross, they used lighted candles, they gave salt to the baptized person to taste, and the priest touched his mouth and ears with spittle, and also blew and spat upon his face. At that time also baptized persons wore white garments till the Sunday following.

Three things were required of the catechumens immediately before their baptism:

(1.) A solemn renunciation of the devil;

(2.) A profession of faith in the words of some received creed; and

(3.) An engagement to live a Christian life. The form of renunciation is given in the *Const. Apost.* lib. 7, cap. 41.

The time of administering the rite was subject to various changes; at first it was without limitation. Soon Easter and Whitsuntide were considered the most appropriate seasons, and Easter-eve deemed the most sacred; afterward, Epiphany and the festivals of the apostles and martyrs were selected in addition. From the tenth century the observance of the stated seasons fell into disuse, and children were required to be baptized within a month of their birth (Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. 11, ch. 6; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity,* ch. 19). *SEE IMPOSITION OF HANDS*.

Until the time of Justin Martyr there appears to have been no fixed place for baptism, which was administered wherever it best suited; but in after times baptisteries were built near the churches, in which alone baptism might be administered. Baptism was not permitted to be conferred in private houses without the bishop's express license, and persons so baptized could never be received into priest's orders (*Council of Neocaesarea,* can. 2). Such private baptisms were called παραβαπτίσματα. Afterward the font appears to have been set up in the church porch, and thence was removed into the church itself. *SEE BAPTISTERY*.

2. The following are the baptismal ceremonies of the Church of Rome, though not all of universal obligation:

(1.) The child is held without the Church, to signify an actual exclusion from heaven, which is symbolized by the Church.

(2.) The priest blows three times in the face of the child, signifying thereby that the devil can be displaced only by the Spirit of God.

(3.) The sign of the cross is made on the forehead and bosom of the child.

(4.) The priest, having exorcised the salt (to show that the devil, until God prevents, avails himself of every creature in order to injure mankind), puts it into the mouth of the infant, signifying by it that wisdom which shall preserve him from corruption.

(5.) The child is exorcised.

(6.) The priest touches his mouth and ears with saliva, pronouncing the word *Ephphatha*.

(7.) The child is unclothed, signifying the laying aside the old man.

(8.) He is presented by the sponsors, who represent the Church.

(9.) The renunciation of the devil and his works is made.

(10.) He is anointed with oil.

(11.) The profession of faith is made.

(12.) He is questioned whether he will be baptized.

(13.) The name of some saint is given to him, who shall be his example and protector.

(14.) He is dipped thrice, or water is poured thrice on his head.

(15.) He receives the kiss of peace.

(16.) He is anointed on the head, to show that by baptism he becomes a king and a priest.

(17.) He receives the lighted taper, to mark that he has become a child of light.

(18.) He is folded in the alb, to show his baptismal purity (Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*, 1:241).

The practice of *exorcising water* for baptism is kept up in the Roman Church to this day. It exhibits a thoroughly pagan spirit. The following formula, taken from the *Rituale Romananum,* is used at the ceremony of exercising the water: "I exorcise thee, creature of water, by God + the living, by God + the true, by God + the holy; by God who, in the beginning, separated thee by a word from the dry land, whose Spirit over thee was borne, who from Paradise commanded thee to flow." Then follows the rubric: "*Let him with his hand divide the water, and then pour some of it over the edge of the font toward the four quarters of the globe, and then proceed thus:* I exorcise thee also by Jesus Christ his only Son, our Lord, who, in Cana of Galilee, changed thee by his wonderful power into wine; who walked upon thee on foot, and who was baptized in thee by John in Judaea, etc.; . . . that thou mayest be made water holy, water blessed, water which washes away our filth, and cleanses our guilty stain. Thee therefore I command — every foul spirit — every phantasm — every lie — be thou eradicated, and put to flight from the creature of water; that, to those who are to be baptized in it, it may become a fountain of water springing up into life eternal, regenerating them to God the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, in the name of the same our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall come again to judge the living and the dead, and the whole world by fire, Amen." Then follows a prayer, in which the priest supplicates the Almighty to send down the "ANGEL OF SANCTITY" over the waters thus prepared for the purpose of purification. Afterward the rubric directs that "*he shall* BLOW THREE TIMES *upon the water, in three different directions, according to a prescribed figure* Ψ. *In the next place, he is to deposit the incense upon the censer, and to incense the font. Afterward, pouring of the Oil of the Catechumens into the water after the form of a* CROSS, *he says, with a laud voice,* Let this font be sanctified, and made fruitful-by the Oil of salvation for those who are born again thereby unto life eternal in the name of the Father +, and of the Son +, and of the Holy Ghost +, Amen." Then follows another rubric: "*Next, he pours in of the* CHRISM *after the manner above mentioned, saying,* Let this infusion of the Chrism of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost the Comforter, be made in the name of the sacred Trinity, Amen." Again: "*Afterward he takes the two vessels of the before-mentioned holy Oil and Chrism, and in pouring from each in the form of a Cross, he says,* Let this mixture of the Chrism of Sanctification, of the Oil of Unction, and of the Water of Baptism, be made together in the name of the Father +, and of the Son +, and of the Holy Ghost +, Amen." Finally, the rubric again directs as

follows: "*Then the vessel being put aside, he mingles with his right hand the holy Oil and the infused Chrism with the water, and sprinkles it all over the font. Then he swipes his hand upon* (*what is termed*) *medulla panis; and if any one is to be baptized, he baptizes him as above. But if there is no one to be baptized, he is forthwith to wash his hands, and the water of ablution must be poured out into the sacrarium* (see *Rit. Romans* p. 58. — Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*,, bk. 2, ch. 2).

3. The ceremonies of baptism in the Protestant churches are: generally very simple, consisting, as has been said, in the application of water, by sprinkling, pouring, or immersion, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Ritual services are fixed in the Church of England, and the same (or nearly the same) are used in the Protestant Episcopal Church in America (see Prayer-book, *Ministration of Baptism*). The same forms, omitting the sign of the cross, and those parts which imply baptismal regeneration (*ex opere*) and the use of sponsors, is used in the Methodist Episcopal Church (*Discipline*, pt. 4, ch. 1). The Presbyterian Church prescribes no complete ritual, but gives certain rules in the *Directory for Worship*, ch. 7. The Reformed Dutch Church prescribes a simple and scriptural form (*Constitution* of R. D. Church, ed. Mentz, p. 93). The German Reformed Church admits sponsors, but they must be "in full communion with some Christian church (*Constitution*, pt. iv); and a form approaching to that of the Methodist Episcopal Church is given in the *Provisional Liturgy* of 1858, p. 204. The Lutheran Church prescribes forms of baptism (*Liturgy*, § 4), and admits sponsors, who may be the parents of the child.

The *sign of the cross* is used in baptism in the Greek and Roman churches, and in the Church of England; it is optional in the Protestant Episcopal Church. *SEE CROSS IN BAPTISM*.

IX. *Works on Baptism.* — The literature of the subject is very ample. Besides the works cited in the course of this article, and the writers on systematic theology, see Baxter, *Plain Proof of Infants' Church Membership* (1656); Wall, *History of Infant Baptism, with Gale's Reflections and Wall's Defence*, edited by Cotton (Oxford, 1836 and 1844, 4 vols. 8vo); Matthies, *Baptismatis Expositio Bibl. — Hist. — Dogmatica* (Berlin, 1831, 8vo); Lange, *Die Kisnerstaufe* (Jena, 1834, 8vo); Walch, *Historia Paedobaptismi* (Jenae, 1739); Williams, *Antipaedobaptism examined* (1789, 2 vols. 12mo); *Facts and Evidences*

on Baptism, by the editor of Calmet's Dictionary (London, 1815, 2 vols. 8vo; condensed into one vol., entitled *Apostolic Baptism,* N. Y. 1850, 12mo); Towgood, *Dissertations on Christian Baptism* (Lond. 1815, 12mo); Ewing, *Essay on Baptism* (Glasgow, 1823); Bradbury, *Duty and Doctrine of Baptism* (Lond. 1749, 8vo); Woods, *Lectures on Infant Baptism* (Andover, 1829, 12mo); *Slicer, On Baptism* (N.Y. 1841, 12mo); Wardlaw, *Dissertation on Infant Baptism* (Lond. 12mo); Neander, *History of Doctrines,* 1:229 sq.; Beecher, *Baptism, its Import and Modes* (N. Y. 1849, 12mo); Coleridge, *Works* (N. Y. ed., v. 187); Hibbard, *Christiano Baptism, its Subjects, Mode, and Obligation* (N. Y. 1845, 12mo); Hofling, *Sacrament der Taufe* (Erlang. 1846, 2 vols.); Rosser, *Baptism, its Nature, Obligation,* etc. (Richmond, 1853, 12mo); Gibson, *The Fathers on Nature and Effects of Baptism* (Lond. 1854); Cunningham, *Reformers and Theology of Reformation,* Essay v; Summers, *On Baptism* (Richmond, 1853, 12mo); Hall, *Law of Baptism* (N. Y. 1846, 12mo); *Studien u. Kritiken,* 1861, p. 219; Litton, On *the Church,* 243 sq. One of the best *tracts* on infant baptism is Dr. Miller's, No. VIII of the Tracts of the Presbyterian Board. On early history, doctrines, and usages, Coleman, *Ancient Christianity,* ch. 19; Schaff, *Apostolical Church,* § 142; Palmer, *Origines Liturgicae,* 2:166 sq.; Procter *On Common Prayer,'* 361 sq.; Mosheim, *Commentaries;* Dorner, *Doctrine of the Person of Christ,* 1:168 sq.

On the *Baptist* side: Gale, *Reply to Wall* (bound in Cotton's edition of Wall); Booth, *Apology fu the Baptists* (*Works,* vol. 51); Booth, *Paedobaptism Examined* (Lond. 1829, 3 vols. 8vo); Gill, *Divine Right of Infant Baptism* and other Essays (in "Collection of Sermons and Tracts," Lond. 1773, 2 vols. 4to); Hinton, *History of Baptism* (Philippians 1849, 12mo); Robinson, *History of Baptism* (Lond. 1790, and later editions, 4to); Carson, *Baptism in its Mode and Objects* (Lond. 1844, 8vo; Phila. 5th ed. 1857, 8vo); Noel, *Essay on Christian Baptism* (N. Y. 1850, 12mo); Orchard, *Concise History of Foreign Baptists,* etc. (Lond. 1838); Curtis, *Progress of Baptist Principles* (Boston, 1856); Pengilly, *Scripture Guide to Baptism* (Phila. 1849, 12mo); J. T. Smitti, *Arguments for Infant Baptism examined* (Phila. 1850, 12mo); Haynes, *The Baptist Denomination* (N. Y. 1856, 12mo); Jewett *On Baptism* (Bapt. Pub. Soc.); Conant, *Meaning and Use of Baptizein* (N. Y. 1860, 4to). On sacramental grace and regeneration by baptism, *SEE GRACE*; *SEE SACRAMENTS*; *SEE REGENERATION (BAPTISMAL.)*.

baptism administered by *unordained* persons. In ordinary practice, the Christian Church has always held that baptism should be performed by ordained ministers (see above, *Ministers of Baptism*). Nevertheless, in case of necessity, baptism may be performed by any Christian, and is valid if performed according to Christ's order in (40)Matthew 28:19. It would be clearly wrong to assert that lay baptism is, under all circumstances, as regular as that by a minister; but it is also very difficult to decide that lay baptism is invalid where the services of a minister cannot be procured. The principle upon which this view of the case rests has been thus fairly stated by Hooker (*Eccl. Polity,* bk. v, 62:19): "The grace of baptism cometh by donation from God alone. That God hath committed the ministry of baptism unto special amen, it is for order's sake in his church, and not to the end that their authority might give being, or add force to the sacrament itself. That infants have right to the sacrament of baptism we all acknowledge. Charge them we cannot as guileful and wrongful possessors of that whereunto they have right, by the manifest will of the donor, and are not parties unto any defect or disorder in the manner of receiving the same. And, if any such disorder be, we have sufficiently before declared that, 'delictum cum capite semper ambulat,' men's own faults are their own harms." From this reasoning (which appears to be just), the inference is, that in the case of lay baptism, infants are not deprived of whatever benefits and privileges belong to that sacrament, the administrator, in any instance, being alone responsible for the urgency of the circumstances under which he performs the rite. By the rubrics of the second and of the fifth of Edward VI it was ordered thus: "The pastors and curates shall often admonish the people, that without great cause and necessity they baptize not children at home in their houses; and when great need shall compel them so to do, that then they minister it in this fashion: First, let them that be present call upon God for his grace, and say the Lord's Prayer, if the time will suffer; and then one of them shall name the child and dip him in the water, or pour water upon him, saying these words: I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." But in the revision of the Prayer-book after the Hampton Court Conference (1604), the rubrics were altered so as to exclude entirely this authority for lay baptism. Still, such baptism is not decided to be invalid. The Romanists admit its validity. See Procter *On Common Prayer,* p. 378, 382; Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. 16, ch. 1, § 4. On the practice of the Church of England

with regard to lay baptism, see Bingham, *Scholastical History of Lay Baptism* (1712, 2 vols.), ch. 3, § 5, extracted in Henry, *Compendium of Christian Antiquities, Appendix.* See also Waterland, *Letters on Lay Baptism* (*Works,* vol. 10); Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines,* § 137; Summers On *Baptism,* ch. 4. The Presbyterian Directory for Worship declares that "baptism is not to be unnecessarily delayed; nor to be administered, in any case, by any private person, but by a minister of Christ, called to be the steward of the mysteries of God" (ch. 7, § 1). The Reformed Confessions, so far as they speak on this point, generally oppose lay baptism: see *Conf. Helvet.* 2:20; *Conf. Scotica,* 22. Comp. also Calvin, *Institutes,* bk. 4, ch. 15, § 20.

Baptism For The Dead

(ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, <4659>1 Corinthians 15:29). This difficult passage has given rise to multitudinous expositions. Among them are the following (see also *Am. Presb. Rev.* Jan. 1863):

1. The Corinthians (according to Suicer), and after them the Marcionites and other heretics, practiced a sort of *vicarious* baptism in the case of those who had died unbaptized; that is, they caused a relation or friend of the dead person to be baptized in his stead, in the belief that such baptism would operate to obtain the remission of the sins of the deceased in the other world (Chrysostom, *Hom.* 40 *in* 1 *Cor.,* and Tertullian *contra Marcion,* lib. 5, cap. 10). The apostle then drew an argument from the heretical practice to prove their belief in the resurrection.

2. Chrysostom, however, declares that Paul refers to the declaration made by each catechumen at his baptism, of his belief in the resurrection of the dead, meaning to say this: "If there is, in fact, no resurrection of the dead, why, then, art thou baptized for the dead, i.e. the body?" An improvement, perhaps, upon this interpretation would be to consider the ancient martyrs to be referred to, *over* whose remains the churches were often built (probably, however, not as yet), in which such vows were taken.

3. Among the best interpretations is that of Spanheim (see Wolf, *Cur. Sin V. T.* in loc.), which considers "the dead" to be martyrs and other believers, who, by firmness and cheerful hope of resurrection, have given in death a worthy example, *by which* others were also animated to receive baptism. Still, this meaning would be almost too briefly and enigmatically expressed, when no particular reason for it is known, while also the allusion to the

exemplary death of many Christians could chiefly apply to the martyrs alone, of whom there were as yet none at Corinth. This interpretation, however, may perhaps also be improved if *Christ* be considered as prominently referred to among these deceased, by *virtue of* whose resurrection all his followers expect to be likewise raised.

4. Olshausen's interpretation is of a rather doubtful character. The meaning of the passage he takes to be, that "all who are converted to the church are baptized *for the good* of the dead, as it requires a certain number (Romans 11:12-25), a 'fullness' of believers, before the resurrection can take place. Every one, therefore, who is baptized is for the good of believers collectively, and of those who have already died in the Lord." Olshausen is himself aware that the apostle could not have expected that such a difficult and remote idea, which he himself calls "a mystery," would be understood by his readers without a further explanation and development of his doctrine. He therefore proposes an explanation, in which it is argued that the miseries and hardships Christians have to struggle against in this life can only be compensated by resurrection. Death causes, as it were, vacancies in the full ranks of the believers, which are again filled up by other individuals. "What would it profit those who are baptized *in the place* of the dead (to fill up their place in the community) if there be no resurrection?"

5. None of these explanations, however, well suits the signification of ὑπέρ, "for," i.e. *in behalf of, on account of,* and is, at the same time, consistent in other respects. Dr. Tregelles (*Printed Text of the Gr. Test.* p. 216) has proposed a slight emendation of the text' that appears to obviate the difficulty almost entirely. It consists simply in the following punctuation:" Else what shall they do which are baptized? [It is] for the dead, if the dead rise not at all," i.e. we are baptized merely in the name of (for the sake of, out of regard to) dead persons, namely, Christ and the prophets who testified of him. This interpretation renders No. 3 above more easy of adoption.

Treatises entitled *De baptismo* ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν have been written by Schmidt (Argent. 1656), Calon (Viteb. 1684), Deutsch (Regiom. 1698), Grade (Gryph. 1690), Hasaeus (Brem. 1725), Muller (Rost. 1665), Olearius (Lips. 1704), Reichmann (Viteb. 1652), Schenck (Franeq. 1667), Zeutschner (Fcft. a. V. 1706), Facius, (Colossians 1792), Neumann (Jen.

1740), Nobling (Sus. 1784), Richter (Zwic. 1803), Heumann (Isen. 1710, Jen. 1740), Streccius (Jen. 1736).

Baptism Of The Dead,

a superstitious custom which anciently prevailed among the people in Africa of baptizing the dead. The third council of Carthage (canon 6) speaks of it as a matter of which ignorant Christians were fond, and forbids "to believe that the dead can be baptized." Gregory Nazianzen also observes that the same superstitious opinion prevailed among some who delayed to be baptized. It is also mentioned by Philastrius (*De Haeres.* cap. 2) as the general error of the Montanists or Cataphrygians, that they baptized men after death. The practice seems to be founded on a vain opinion that when men had neglected to receive baptism during their life, some compensation might be made for this default by receiving it after death. See Burton, *Bampton Lectures*, art. 78; Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. 11, ch. 4, § 3.

Baptism Of Fire.

The words of John the Baptist (4011Matthew 3:11), "He that cometh after me shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire," have given occasion to various interpretations. Some of the fathers (e.g. John Damascenus) hold it to mean the everlasting fire of hell. Others of the fathers (as Chrysostom, *Hom.* 11 *in Matt.*) declare that *by fire*, in this passage the Baptist means the Holy Spirit, who, as fire, should destroy the pollutions of sin in the regeneration conferred by holy baptism. Others again, as Hilary and Ambrose, as well as Origen, believe it to mean a purifying fire through which the faithful shall pass before entering Paradise, thus giving rise to the Romish doctrine of purgatory. Others think that it means the fire of tribulations and sorrows; others, the abundance of graces; others, the fire of penitence and self-mortification, etc. (Suicer, *Thesaurus*, p. 629). Some old heretics, as the Seleucians and Hermians, understood the passage literally, and maintained that material fire. was necessary in the administration of baptism; but we are not told either how, or to what part of the body they applied it, or whether they obliged the baptized to pass through or over the flames. Valentinus rebaptized those who had received baptism out of his sect, and drew them through the fire; and Heraclion, who is cited by Clemens Alexandrinus, says that some applied a red-hot iron to the ears of the baptized, as if to impress on them some mark.

The simplest and most natural view is that the passage is not to be interpreted of any separate form of baptism from that "with the Holy Ghost;" but the expression "with fire" is epexegetical, or explanatory of the words "with the Holy Ghost." Such a mode of expression, in which the connecting particle *and* only introduces an amplification of the former idea, is very common in the Scriptures. The sense will therefore be, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, through the outward symbol of fire," viz. the "cloven tongues like as of fire" (<40203>Acts 2:3). *SEE PENTECOST*; *SEE HOLY GHOST*. It must be admitted, however, against this view, that "fire" elsewhere is the symbol of vengeance or destruction, and that in all the parallel passages it has this import (see Kuinol in loc.). It would therefore be more appropriate to understand the fiery baptism to be the temporal and eternal punishments to which the Jews were exposed, in contrast with the spiritual baptism offered as the other alternative (comp. the context in Matthew and Luke;' also the parallel passages, in Acts). *SEE FIRE*.

Baptismal Formula

(<402819>Matthew 28:19). *SEE BAPTISM*; *SEE TRINITY*; *SEE SACRAMENT*.

Baptismal Regeneration

SEE BAPTISM; *SEE REGENERATION*.

Baptist John The.

SEE JOHN THE BAPTIST.

Baptist Denomination

SEE BAPTISTS.

Baptistery

a place or room set apart for performing baptism. We have no account in the New Testament of any such separated places. John and the disciples of our Lord Jesus Christ baptized in the Jordan. But baptism could be administered in other places (see <440836>Acts 8:36, 37; 16:13-16). There was a public baptism of three thousand converts on the day of Pentecost (<440241>Acts 2:41), but no account is given of the place. Examples also occur in the Acts of the Apostles of baptism in private houses. Passages in the writings of Justin Martyr, Clement, and Tertullian show that, during their time,

there were no baptisteries. In later times the baptistery was one of the *exedrae,* or buildings distinct from the church itself, and consisted of the porch, where the person about to be baptized made the confession of faith, and an inner room, where the ceremony was performed. Thus it remained till the sixth century, when the baptistery was taken into the church porch, and afterward into the church itself. The ancient baptisteries were sometimes called φωτιστήρια (*illuminatoria*), either because baptism was sometimes called φωτισμός, *illumination,* or because they were places of illumination or instruction, preceding baptism, where the catechumens were taught the first principles of the Christian faith. We occasionally meet with the word κολυμβήθρα or *piscina* (the font). The octagonal or circular form was adopted, surmounted with a dome, and the baptistery was situated at the entrance to the principal or western gate. These edifices are of considerable antiquity, since one was prepared for the ceremonial of the baptism of Clovis. It is not possible to decide at what period they began to be multiplied, and at length united to, or changed into parish churches; yet it appears that the alteration took place when stated seasons of baptism ceased, and the right of administration was ceded to all presbyters and deacons. The word *baptistery* is now applied also to the baptismal font. — Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. 8, ch. 7, § 1-4.

Baptists

a name given to those Christian denominations which reject the validity of infant baptism, and hold that the ordinance of baptism can be administered only to those who have made a personal profession of faith in Christ. The Baptist churches also, in general, maintain that the entire immersion of the body is the only scriptural mode of baptism; yet the Mennonites, who are generally regarded as Baptists, use sprinkling. The name *Baptist,* as assumed by the Baptist denominations, of course implies that they *alone* maintain the Christian doctrine and practice of baptism; and in this sense their right to this *distinctive* name is denied by all other Christian denominations, as well as the similar claims of the Unitarians and (Roman) Catholics to their respective names. But, as established by usage, without having regard to its original signification, it is now generally adopted. The name *Anabaptist* is rejected by the Baptists as a term of reproach, because they protest against being identified with the Anabaptists of Munster, and as also incorrect, because most of their members receive the rite for the first time on their admission to a Baptist church.

I. *History.*

1. *Before the sixteenth Century.* — All Baptists, of course, claim that the apostolic church was essentially Baptist, and that infant baptism is an innovation. But Baptist writers differ concerning the time of the introduction of infant baptism, and also as to the question whether it is possible to trace an *uninterrupted succession* of Baptist churches from the apostles' time down to the present. Some Baptist writers have attempted to trace this succession, as Orchard (*History of Foreign Baptists,* Lond. 1838), who gives, as the summing up of his researches, that "all Christian communities during the first three centuries were of the Baptist. denomination in constitution and practice. In the middle of the third century the Novatian Baptists established separate and independent societies, which continued until the end of the sixth age, when these communities were succeeded by the Paterines, which continued until the Reformation (1517). The Oriental Baptist churches, with their successors, the Paulicians, continued in their purity until the tenth century, when they visited France, resuscitating and extending the Christian profession in Languedoc, where they flourished till the crusading army scattered, or drowned in blood, one million of unoffending professors. The Baptists in Piedmont and Germany are exhibited as existing under different names down to the Reformation. These churches, with their genuine successors, the Mennonites of Holland, are connectedly and chronologically detailed to the present period."

This view is, however, far from being shared by all Baptists. The leading Baptist Quarterly of America, *The Christian Review* (Jan. 1855, p. 23), remarks as follows: "We know of no assumption more arrogant, and more destitute of proper historic support, than that which claims to be able to trace the distinct and unbroken existence of a church substantially Baptist from the time of the apostles down to our own." Thus also Cutting (*Historic Vindications,* Boston, 1859, p. 14) remarks on such attempts: "I have little confidence in the results of any attempt of that kind which have met my notice, and I attach little value to inquiries pursued for the predetermined purpose of such a demonstration."

The non-Baptist historians of the Christian Church almost unanimously assert that infant baptism was practiced from the beginning of Christianity, *SEE BAPTISM*, and generally maintain that no organized body holding Baptist principles can be found before the rise of the Anabaptists (q.v.),

about 1520. *SEE PAULICIANS*: *SEE LOLLARDS*; *SEE WALDENSES*. Soon after the Anabaptists, Menno (q.v.) renounced the doctrines of the Roman church, and organized (after 1536) a Baptist denomination, which spread widely, especially in Germany and Holland, and still exists. *SEE MENNONITES*.

2. *Great Britain*. — Whether and to what extent Baptist principles were held in Great Britain before the sixteenth century is still a matter of historic controversy. In 1535 Henry VIII ordered sixteen Dutchmen to be put to death for being Anabaptists, and in 1539, 30 persons were exiled because they rejected infant baptism. The general pardon of 1550 excepted the Baptists. Elizabeth commanded all Anabaptists to depart out of the' kingdom within 21 days. King James refused all concessions to Baptists, as well as to Nonconformists in general. At the beginning of the seventeenth century, Mr. Smyth (1610), a leading minister among the Baptists, published a work against persecution, but it called forth a new proclamation against the Baptists and their books, and in 1611, another Baptist, Mr. Wightman, was burned. Cromwell protected the Baptists, but they were again persecuted under Charles II and James II. The Toleration Act of William III, 1689, recognised them as the third dissenting denomination. The first Baptist churches were Arminian; a Calvinistic Baptist church was established about 1633. In 1640 there were 7 Baptist congregations in London, and about 40 more in the country. Those who held Arminian views received the name *General*, those who held Calvinistic views, the name *Particular* Baptists. Many General Baptists adopted Arianism and Socinianism; and in 1770, the orthodox portion seceded, and formed what is known as the *"New Connection of General Baptists."* In 1792 William Carey prevailed on the Nottingham Association to found the *Baptist Missionary Society*, an event of the utmost importance in the history of the Christian church in general, for from it dates the awakening of a new zeal in the European and American churches for the conversion of the pagan world. In 1842 the Baptist Missionary Society reported at its "Jubilee" that it had translated the Scriptures, wholly or in part, into forty-four languages or dialects of India, and printed, of the Scriptures alone, in foreign languages nearly half a million.

Among the earliest writers of the Baptist denomination in England were Edward Barker, Samuel Richardson, Christopher Blackwood, Hansard Knollys, Francis Cornwell, and in the latter half of the seventeenth century, Jeremiah Ives, John Tombes, John Norcott, Henry D'Anvers, Benjamin

and Elias Keach, Edward Hutchinson, Thomas Grantham, Nehemiah Cox, D.D., Thomas de Launne, and Dr. Russell Collins. But by far the most celebrated of all Baptist writers is John Bunyan. John Milton also is claimed by the Baptists, though not as a member of their denomination, at least as a professor of their distinctive principles; for they say he "composed his two most elaborate, painstaking volumes to prove from the Scriptures the divine origin and authority of the distinguishing principles of Baptists." Among the Baptist writers in the early part of the eighteenth century were Samuel Ewen, John Brine, Benjamin Beddoma, the three Stennetts (Joseph Stennett, Joseph Stennett, jun., D.D., Samuel Stennett, D.D.), John Evans, LL.D., J. H. Evans, Dr. Gale, the famous Dr. Gill, Joseph Burroughs, William Zoat, Caleb Evans, D.D., Abraham Booth, and Joseph Jenkins. Toward the close of the last and the beginning of the present century, the Baptist denomination had a large number of writers, among whom were William Jones, Thomas Llewellyn, William Richards, Robert Hall, John Foster, Andrew Fuller, Christopher Anderson, and Joseph Ivimey. The Rev. F. A. Cox (a Baptist writer) states (*Encyc. Metrop.*), however, that, "till of late years, Baptist literature must be regarded as, on the whole, somewhat inferior." Cox enumerates among the great men of the English Baptists, "Gale and Carson for Greek scholarship; Gill for Hebrew knowledge and rabbinical lore; Carey for Oriental research; Fuller for theological wisdom and controversial acuteness; Hughes for the union of elegant taste and public zeal in the formation of the Bible and Tract Societies; Foster for the reach and profundity of his mind; and Hall as the most chaste and beautiful of writers, and, perhaps, the greatest of English preachers." More recently, the Rev. C. H. Spurgeon acquired the reputation of being one of the most popular preachers of the nineteenth century. Sir Morton Peto has become a prominent member of the House of Commons. See Crowell, *Literature of American Baptists in Missionary Jubilee* (p. 400, 405).

3. *United States.* — The Baptist churches in the United States owe their origin to Roger Williams (q.v.), who, before his immersion, was an Episcopalian minister. He was persecuted for opposing the authority of the state in ecclesiastical affairs and for principles which "tended to Anabaptism." In 1639 he was immersed by Ezekiel Holliman, and in turn immersed Holliman and ten others, who with him organized a Baptist Church at Providence, Rhode Island. A few years before (1635), though unknown to Williams, a Baptist preacher of England, Hansard Knollys, had

settled in New Hampshire and taken charge of a church in Dover; but he resigned in 1639 and returned to England. Williams obtained in 1644 a charter for the colony which he and his associates had founded in Rhode Island, with full and entire freedom of conscience. Rhode Island thus became the first Christian state which ever granted full religious liberty. In the other British colonies the persecution against the Baptists continued a long time. Massachusetts issued laws against them in 1644, imprisoned several Baptists in 1651, and banished others in 1669. In 1680 the doors of a Baptist meeting-house were nailed up. In New York laws: were issued against Ithem in 1662, in Virginia in 1664. With the beginning of the eighteenth century the persecution greatly abated. They were released from tithes in 1727 in Massachusetts, in 1729 in New Hampshire and Connecticut, but not before 1785 in Virginia. The spread of their principles was greatly hindered by these persecutions, especially in the South, where in 1776 they counted about 100 societies. After the Revolution they spread with extraordinary rapidity, especially in the South and Southwest, and were inferior in this respect only to the Methodists. In 1817 a triennial general convention was organized, which, however, has since been discontinued. In 1845 the discussion of the slavery question caused alienation between the, Northern and Southern Baptists. The destruction of slavery, in consequence of the failure of the Great Rebellion and the adoption of the constitutional amendment in 1865, led to efforts to reunite the societies of the Northern and the Southern States. The Northern associations generally expressed a desire to co-operate again with their Southern brethren in the fellowship of Christian labor, but they demanded from the Southern associations a profession of loyalty to the United States government, and they themselves deemed it necessary to repeat the testimony which, during the war, they had, at each annual meeting, borne against slavery. The Southern associations that met during the year 1865 were unanimous in favor of continuing their former separate societies, and against fraternization with the Northern societies. They censured the American Baptist Home Missionary Society for proposing, without consultation or co-operation with the churches, associations, conventions, or organized boards of the Southern States, to appoint ministers and missionaries to preach and raise churches within the bounds of the Southern associations. Some of the Southern associations, like that of Virginia, consequently advised the churches “to decline any co-operation or fellowship with any of the missionaries, ministers, or agents of the American Baptist Home Mission Society.” A number of negro Baptist

churches in the Southern States separated from the Southern associations, and either connected themselves with those of the North, or organized, with the co-operation of the Northern missionaries, independent associations. Divisions among the American Baptists commenced early to take place; *SEE SIX-PRINCIPLE BAPTISTS*; *SEE SEVENTH-DAY BAPTISTS*; *SEE SEVENTH-DAY GERMAN BAPTISTS*; *SEE OLD-SCHOOL BAPTISTS*; *SEE FREE-WILL BAPTISTS*; *SEE DISCIPLES*; *SEE CHURCH OF GOD*. Some divisions have become extinct, as the *Roqerenes*, organized in 1680 in Connecticut, and called after Jonathan Rogers. They observed the seventh day instead of Sunday, and believed in spiritual marriages. The *Free* or *Open Communion Baptists*, who were organized about 1810, united in 1841 with the Free-will Baptists.

The Baptist literature of the United States begins in the seventeenth century with the pleas of Roger Williams and his companion, John Clarke, for religious liberty. Contributions to the denominational literature were also made by the Wightmans, of Connecticut (Valentine, Timothy, and John Gano), the two Abel Morgans, John Callender, and Benjamin Griffith. The first Baptist book on Systematic Theology was published in 1700 by the Rev. John Watts. About the middle of the eighteenth century the Rev. Isaac Backus commenced his literary career. He was followed by the Rev. Dr. Stillman, Rev. Morgan Edwards, Samuel Shepard, Rev. William Rogers, Rev. Richard Furman, and the eccentric John Leland. Fruitful authors at the beginning of the present century were Thomas Baldwin, D.D., Rev. Henry Holcombe, James Manning, D.D., Rev. Dr. Stanford, Rev. Dr. Mercer, Rev. A. Broaddus, Rev. Jonathan Maxey, D.D., and Rev. William Staughton, D.D. The literature of the last fifty years is very numerous. We give below (from Crowell, Literature of the American Baptists during the last fifty years, in *Missionary Jubilee*, N. Y. 1865, p. 405-465) a list of the most important denominational works of Baptist authors, and of the most important contributions of Baptist authors to religious and general literature.

A. *Denominational Literature.*—

a. *Didactic.*— Jesse Mercer, of Georgia (on Ordination; Church Authority; Lord's Supper); Andrew Broaddus, Va. (Church Discipline); W. Crowell, Ill. (Church Members' Manual); Warham Walker, N. Y. (Church Discipline); E. Savage (Church Discipline); J. L. Reynolds (Church Order); Th. F. Curtis (Progress of Baptist Principles; Communion); Fr. Wayland

(Principles and Practices of Baptist Churches); D. C. Haynes (The Baptist Denomination); E. T. Hiscox (Church Directory); W. Jewell, S. W. Lynd, Mill, R. Fuller, T. L. Davidson, N. M. Crawford, E. Turney, W. C. Duncan, M. G. Clarke (Baptism); A. N. Arnold (Communion); J. I. Dagg (Church Order).

b. *Historical.* — Benedict (Hist. of Baptists, the standard American work); Duncan (Early Baptists); W. Gammell (American Baptist Missions); W. Hague (Baptist Church transplanted from the Old to the New World); J. Newton Brown (Hist. of Bapt. Publication Society; Baptist Martyrs; Simon Menno); F. Dennison (Baptists and their Principles); S. S. Cutting (Provinces and Uses of Baptist History).

c. *Polemic* (against other denominations). — S. Wilcox, D. Hascall, Th. Baldwin, G. Foote, J. T. Hinton, W. Hague, J. Richards, J. J. Woolsey, C. H. Hosken, R. B. C. Howell, E. Turney, G.W. Anderson, J. T. Smith, T. G. Jones, S. Henderson, A. C. Dayton (the latter two specially against Methodism). *d. Apologetic* (in defense of Baptist principles). — Among those who wrote in defense of the Baptists respecting the Lord's Supper were T. Baldwin, J. Mercer, D. Sharp, Spencer C. Cone, A. Broaddus, D. Merrill, G. F. Davis, H. J. Ripley, Barnas Sears, J. B. Taylor, T. F. Curtis, J. Knapp, A. N. Arnold, W. Crowell, H. Harvey, John L. Waller, A. Hovey, C. H. Pendleton, M. V. Kitz Miller, Willard Judd, James Pyper, J. M. C. Breaher, M. G. Clarke, J. Wheaton Smith. Among the writers defending the denominational view of Baptism are D. Merrill, H. Holcomb, Irah Chase, H. . Ripley, Adoniram Judson; W. Judd, A. Bronson, J. T. Smith, W. Hague, T. G. Jones, Richard Fuller, J. Bates, J. Dowling. *e. Hymn-books.* — The principal writers of lyric poetry are S. F. Smith, S. Dyer, S. D. Phelps, S. P. Hill, H. S. Washburn, James D. Knowlee, J. R. Scott, Miss M. A. Collier, Mill, L. H. Hill, J. N. Brown, R. Turnbull.

B. *Contributions of Baptist Authors to Religious Literature. — a. Didactic.* — Broaddus (Hist. of the Bible); W. Collier (Gospel Treasury); H. Holcombe (Primitive Theology); J. Newton Brown (Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge; Obligations of the Sabbath); Howard Malcom (Bible Dictionary; Extent of Atonement); Francis Wayland (The Ministry; Human Responsibility); W. R. Williams (The Lord's Prayer; Religious Progress); H. C. Fish (History of Pulpit Eloquence). *b. Critical and Exegetical.* — Irah Chase (Constitutions and Canons of the Apostles; Daniel); H. J. Ripley (Four Gospels; Acts; Romans); H. B. Hackett (Chaldee and Hebrew

Grammars; Acts; Philemon); A. C. Kendrick (Olshausen's Commentary); Th. C. Conant (Gesenius's Hebrew Grammar; Job; the word); Mrs. H. C. Conant (Neander's Commentaries); R. E. Pattison (Ephesians); J. T. Hinton (Daniel); A. Hovey (Miracles of Christ); E. Hutchinson (Syriac Grammar); A. Sherwood (Notes on New Testament). *c. Polemical.* — Against Universalism, by E. Andrews, J. Tripp, J. Russell, W. C. Rider, R. R. Coon; against Roman Catholicism, by J. Dowling and R. Fuller. *d. Historical.* — Benedict (Hist. of all Religions); J. C. Choules (Hist. of Missions); Mrs. H. C. Conant (Popular Hist. of the Bible).

4. *Continent of Europe*. — After the extirpation of the Anabaptists, the Baptist principles were represented on the European continent almost exclusively by the Mennonites (q.v.). In 1834 a Baptist society was organized in Hamburg by Oncken, a native German, who was immersed in the Elbe in 1833 by Dr. Sears, since which time the Baptists have spread rapidly in Northern Europe. In several states, as Sweden and Mecklenburg, they met with cruel persecution, but in Hamburg they were recognised by the state in 1859. Besides the independent churches organized by them, Baptist doctrine, or at least the rejection of paedobaptism, has found some adherents in several other churches, e.g. some pastors in the *Free Evangelical churches of France,* in the *Reformed State Church of France,* and in the *Free Apostolic Church,* founded in 1856 in Norway. Among the missions established by the Baptists in Asia, Africa, and Australasia, those in India, especially those among: the Karens in Burmah (q.v.), have been the most successful. The Karen mission not only counts numerous congregations, but is already the nucleus of a Christian nation.

II. *Doctrines and Government.* — The Baptists have no standard Confession of Faith. As their churches are independent, each adopts its own articles of religion. In England, as has been stated above, the "Old Connection" are chiefly Socinians; the "New Connection," evangelical Arminians; 'the "Particular Baptists," Calvinists of various shades. In the United States, the regular Baptists are for the most part Calvinists, perhaps of a stricter order than their British brethren. The Baptists generally form "Associations," which, however, exercise no jurisdiction over the churches. They recognize no higher church officers than pastors and deacons. Elders are sometimes. ordained as evangelists and missionaries. Between clergy and laity they recognize no other distinction but that of office.

Though Regular Baptists accept of no authority other than the Bible for their faith and practice, yet nearly all of the societies have a confession of faith, in pamphlet form for distribution among its members. The following form, generally known as the "New Hampshire Confession of Faith," is perhaps in more general use among the societies in the North and East, while the "Philadelphia Confession of Faith" is that generally adopted in the South. We give both:

Confession of Faith of Regular Baptists (*Northern*).

1. *The Scripture*. — We believe that the Holy Bible was written by men divinely inspired, and is a perfect treasure of heavenly instruction; that it has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth, without any mixture of error, for its matter; that it reveals the principles by which God will judge us; and therefore is, and shall remain to the end of the world, the true center of Christian union, and the supreme standard by which all human conduct, creeds, and opinions should be tried.

2. *The True God.* — We believe the Scriptures teach that there is one, and only one living and true God, an infinite, intelligent Spirit, whose name is JEHOVAH, the Maker and Supreme Ruler of heaven and earth; inexpressibly glorious in holiness, and worthy of all possible honor, confidence, and love; that in the unity of the Godhead there are three persons, the Father, the Son,and the Holy Ghost, equal in every divine perfection, and executing distinct but harmonious offices in the great work of redemption.

3. *The Fall of Man.* — We believe the Scriptures teach that man was created in holiness, under the law of his Maker; but by voluntary transgression fell from that holy and happy state; in consequence of which all mankind are now sinners, not by constraint, but choice; being by nature utterly void of that holiness required by the law of God, positively inclined to evil, and therefore under just condemnation to eternal ruin, without defense or excuse.

4. *The Way of Salvation.* — We believe the Scriptures teach that the salvation of sinners is wholly of grace, through the mediatorial offices of the Son of God, who, by the appointment of the Father, freely took upon him our nature, yet without sin; honored the divine law by his personal obedience, and by his death made a full atonement for our sins; that, having risen from the dead, he is now enthroned in heaven; and uniting in his wonderful person the tenderest sympathies with divine perfections, he is

every way qualified to be a suitable, a compassionate, and an all-sufficient Savior.

5. *Justification.* — We believe the Scriptures teach that the great Gospel blessing which Christ secures to such as believe in him is justification; that justification includes the pardon of sin and the promise of eternal life on principles of righteousness; that it is bestowed, not in consideration of any works of righteousness which we have done, but solely through faith in the Redeemer's blood, by virtue of which faith his prefect righteousness is freely imputed to us of God; that it brings us into a state of most blessed peace and favor with God, and secures every other blessing needful for time and eternity.

6. *Salvation.* — We believe the Scriptures teach that the blessings of salvation are made free to all by the Gospel; that it is the immediate duty of all to accept them by a cordial, penitent, and obedient faith; and that nothing prevents the salvation of the greatest sinner on earth but his own determined depravity and voluntary rejection of the Gospel, which rejection involves him in an aggravated condemnation.

7. *Regeneration.* — We believe the Scriptures teach that in order to be saved sinners must be regenerated, or born again; that regeneration consists in giving a holy disposition to the mind; that it is effected in a manner above our comprehension by the power of the Holy Spirit, in connection with divine truth, so as to secure our voluntary obedience to the Gospel; and that its proper evidence appears in the holy fruits of repentance, and faith, and newness of life.

8. *Repentance and Faith.* — We believe the Scriptures teach that repentance and faith are sacred duties, and also inseparable graces, wrought in our souls by the regenerating Spirit of God, whereby, being deeply convinced of our guilt, danger, and helplessness, and of the way of salvation by Christ, we turn to God with unfeigned contrition, confession, and supplication for mercy; at the same time heartily receiving the Lord Jesus Christ as our prophet, priest, and king, and relying on him alone as the only and all-sufficient Savior.

9. *God's Purpose of Grace.* — We believe the Scriptures teach that election is the eternal purpose of God, according to which he graciously regenerates, sanctifies, and saves sinners; that, being perfectly consistent with the free agency of man, it comprehends all the means in connection

with the end; that; is a most glorious display of God's sovereign goodness, being infinitely free, wise, holy, and unchangeable; that it utterly excludes boasting, and promotes humility, love, prayer, praise, trust in God, and active imitation of his free mercy, that it encourages the use of means in the highest degree; that it may be ascertained by its effects in all who truly believe the Gospel; that it is the foundation of Christian assurance; and that to ascertain it with regard to ourselves demands and deserves the utmost diligence.

10. *Sanctification.* — We believe the Scriptures teach that sanctification is the process by which, according to the will of God, we are made partakers of his holiness; that it is a progressive work; that it is begun in regeneration; and that it is carried on in the hearts of believers by the presence and power of the Holy Spirit, the Sealer and Comforter, in the continual use of the appointed means-especially the word of God, self-examination, self-denial, watchfulness, and prayer.

11. *Perseverance of Saints.* — We believe the Scriptures teach that such only are real believers as endure unto the end; that their persevering attachment to Christ is the grand mark which distinguishes them from superficial professors; that a special Providence watches over their welfare; and they are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation.

12. *The Law and Gospel.* — We believe the Scriptures teach that the law of God is the eternal and unchangeable rule of his moral government; that it is holy, just, and good; and that the inability which the Scriptures ascribe to fallen man to fulfill its precepts arises entirely from their love of sin; to deliver them from which, and to restore them through a Mediator to unfeigned obedience to the holy law, is one great end of the Gospel, and of the means of grace connected with the establishment of the visible church.

13. *A Gospel Church.* — We believe the Scriptures teach that a visible church of Christ is a congregation of baptized believers, associated by covenant in the faith and fellowship of the Gospel; observing the ordinances of Christ; governed by his laws; and exercising the gifts, rights, and privileges invested in them by His word; that its only scriptural officers are bishops, or pastors, and deacons, whose qualifications, claims, and duties are defined in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus.

14. *Baptism and the Lord's Supper.* — We believe the Scriptures teach that Christian baptism is the immersion in water of a believer, into the name

of the Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost; to show forth in a solemn and beautiful emblem our faith in the crucified, buried, and risen Savior, with its effect in our death to sin and resurrection to a new life; that it is prerequisite to the privileges of a church relation, and to the Lord's Supper, in which the members of the church, by the sacred use of bread and wine, are to commemorate together the dying love of Christ, preceded always by solemn self-examination.

15. *The Christian Sabbath.* — We believe the Scriptures teach that the first day of the week is the Lord's day, or Christian Sabbath; and it is to be kept sacred to religious purposes by abstaining from all secular labor and sinful recreation, by the devout observance of all the means of grace, both private and public, and by preparation for that rest which remaineth for the people of God.

16. *Civil Government.* — We believe the Scriptures teach that civil government is of divine appointment, for the interest and good order of human society; and that magistrates are to be prayed for, conscientiously honored and obeyed, except only ill things opposed to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the only Lord of the conscience, and the Prince of the kings of the earth.

17. *Righteous and Wicked.* — We believe the Scriptures teach that there is a radical and essential difference between the righteous and the wicked; that such only as through faith are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and sanctified by the spirit of our God, are truly righteous in his esteem; while all such as continue in impenitence and unbelief are, in his sight, wicked and under the curse; and this distinction holds among men both in and after death.

18. *The World to Come.* — We believe the Scriptures teach that the end of the world is approaching; that at the last day Christ will descend from heaven, and raise the dead from the grave for final retribution; that a solemn separation will then take place; that the wicked will be adjudged to endless punishment, and the righteous to endless joy; and that this judgment will fix forever the final state of men in heaven or hell, on principles of righteousness.

19. *Covenant.* — Having been, as we trust, brought by divine grace to embrace the Lord Jesus Christ, and to give ourselves wholly to him, we do now solemnly and joyfully covenant with each other TO WALK TOGETHER

IN HIM, WITH BROTHERLY LOVE, to his glory as our common Lord. We do therefore, in his strength, engage —

That we will exercise a Christian care and watchfulness over each other, and faithfully warn, exhort, and admonish each other as occasion may require:

That we will not forsake the assembling of ourselves together, but will uphold the public worship of God and the ordinances of his house That we will not omit closet and family religion at home, nor neglect the great duty of religiously training our children and those under our care for the service of Christ and the enjoyment of heaven:

That, as we are the light of the world and salt of the earth, we will seek divine aid to enable us to deny ungodliness, and even worldly lust, and to walk circumspectly in the world, that we may win the souls of men:

That we will cheerfully contribute of our property, according as God has prospered us, for the maintenance of a faithful and evangelical ministry among us, for the support of the poor, and to spread the Gospel over the earth:

That we will in all conditions, even till death, strive to live to the glory of him who hath called us out of darkness into his marvellous light.

"And may the God of peace, who brought again from the dead our lord Jesus, that great shepherd of the sheep. through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make us perfect in every good work, to do his will, working in us that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory forever and ever. AMEN."

Confession of Faith of Baptist Churches (*Southern*).

1. *Holy Scripture.* — The holy Scripture is the only sufficient, certain, and infallible rule of all saving knowledge, faith, and obedience; the supreme judge by which all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits, are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest.

2. *God the Trinity.* — The Lord our God is but one only living and true God, infinite in being and perfection. In this divine and infinite being there are three subsistencies, the Father, the Word (or Son), and Holy Spirit, of one substance, power, and eternity.

3. *God's Decree.* — Those of mankind that are predestinated to life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath chose in Christ unto everlasting glory, out of his mere free grace and love, without any other thing in the creature as a condition or cause moving him thereunto. As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so he hath, by the eternal and most free purpose of his will, foreordained all the means thereunto; wherefore they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called unto faith by Christ, by his Spirit working in due season, are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by his power through faith unto salvation.

4. *The Fall of Man and* Sin. — Although God created man upright and perfect, and gave to him a righteous law, yet he did not long abide in this honor, but did wilfully transgress the command given unto him in eating the forbidden fruit; which God was pleased, according to his wise and holy *counsel*, to permit, having purposed to order it to his own glory. Our first parents, by this *sin*, fell from their original righteousness and communion with God, whereby death came upon all; all becoming dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body. They being the root, corrupted nature was conveyed to all their posterity, descending from them by ordinary generation, being now conceived in *sin*, and by nature children of wrath.

5. *God's Covenant.* — Man having brought himself under the curse of the law by his fall, it pleased the Lord to reveal the *Covenant of Grace*, wherein he freely offereth unto sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ, requiring of them faith in him that they might be saved; and promising to give unto all those that are ordained unto eternal life his Holy Spirit, to make them *willing* and able to believe.

6. *Christ the Mediator.* — The Son of God, the second person in the Holy Trinity, being very and eternal God, the brightness of the Father's glory, of one substance, and equal with *him*, who made the world, who upholdeth and governeth all things he hath made, did, when the fullness of time was come, take upon him man's nature, with all the essential properties and common infirmities thereof, yet without sin — so that two whole, perfect, and distinct natures were inseparably joined together in one person, which person is very God and very man, yet one Christ, the only Mediator between God and man.

7. *Redemption.* — The Lord Jesus. by his perfect obedience and sacrifice of himself, which he, through the eternal Spirit, once offered up unto God, hath fully satisfied the justice of God, procured reconciliation, and purchased an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven for all those whom the Father hath given unto him.

To all those for whom Christ hath obtained eternal redemption he doth certainly and effectually apply and communicate the same; making intercession for them; uniting them to himself by his Spirit; revealing unto them, in and by the word, the mystery of salvation; persuading them to believe and obey; governing their hearts by his word and Spirit, and overcoming all their enemies by his almighty power and wisdom, in such manner and ways as are most consonant to his wonderful and unsearchable dispensation, and all of free and absolute grace, without any condition foreseen in them to procure it.

8. *The Will*. — Man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so as a natural man, being altogether averse from that good, and dead in sin, is not able by his own strength to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereunto.

When God converts a sinner, and translates him into a *state* of grace, he freeth him from his natural bondage under sin, and by his grace alone enables him freely to will and to do that which is spiritually good.

9. *Effectual Calling.* — Those whom God hath predestinated unto life he is pleased, in his appointed and accepted time, effectually to call by his word and Spirit out of that state of sin and death in which they are by nature, to grace of salvation by Jesus Christ.

10. *Justification.* — Those whom God effectually calleth he also freely justifieth, accounting and accepting their persons as righteous; not for anything wrought in them or done by them, but for Christ’s sake alone.

11. *Adoption.* — All those that are justified, God vouchsafed, in and for the Fake of his only Son, Jesus Christ, to make partakers of the grace of adoption, by which they are taken into the number, and enjoy the liberties and privilege of children of God.

12. *Sanctification.* — They who are united to Christ, effectually called and regenerated, having a new heart and a new spirit created in them, through the virtue of Christ’s death and resurrection, are also further sanctified,

really and personally, through the same virtue, by his word and Spirit dwelling in them.

13. *Saving Faith.* — The grace of faith, whereby the elect are enabled to believe to the saving of their souls, is the work of the Spirit of Christ in their hearts, and is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the word.

14. *Repentance.* — Saving repentance is an evangelical grace, whereby a person, being by the Holy Spirit made sensible of the manifold evils of his sin, doth, by faith in Christ, humble himself for it, with godly sorrow, detestation of it, and self-abhorrency.

15. *Good Works.* — Good works, done in obedience to God's commandments, are the fruits and evidences of a true and lively faith.

16. *Perseverance.* — Those whom God hath accepted in the Beloved, effectually called and sanctified by his Spirit, shall certainly persevere therein to the end, and be eternally saved.

17. *Moral Law.* — The moral law doth forever bind all, as well justified persons as others, to the obedience thereof, and that not only in regard to the matter contained in it, but also in respect of the authority of God the Creator who gave it; neither doth Christ in the Gospel any way dissolve, but much strengthen this obligation.

18. *The Sabbath.* — God, by his word, in a positive, moral, and perpetual commandment, binding all men, in all ages, hath particularly appointed one day in seven for a Sabbath to be kept holy unto him, which, from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, was the last day of the week; and from the resurrection of Christ was changed into the first day of the week, which he called the Lord's day.

19. *The Church.* — The Lord Jesus Christ is the head of the church, in whom, by the appointment of the Father, all power for the calling, institution, order, or government of the church is invested in a supreme and sovereign manner. In the execution of this power, the Lord Jesus calleth out of the world unto himself, through the ministry of his word, by his Spirit, those that are given unto him by his Father, that they may walk before him in all the ways of obedience, which he prescribeth to them in his word.

20. *Church Officers.* — A particular church gathered, and completely organized according to the mind of Christ, consists of officers and members; and the officers appointed by Christ to be chosen and set apart by the church are bishops, or elders, and deacons.

21. *Ministers, their Duty and Support.* — The work of pastors being constantly to attend the service of Christ, in his churches, in the ministry of the word, and prayer, with watching for their souls, as they that must give an account to him, it is incumbent on the churches to whom they minister not only to give them all due respect, but to communicate to them of all their good things, according to their ability.

22. *Baptism.* — Baptism is an ordinance of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ to be unto the party baptized a sign of his fellowship with him in his death and resurrection; of his being ingrafted into him; of remission of sins; and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to live and walk in newness of life. Those who do actually profess repentance toward God, and obedience to our Lord Jesus Christ, are the only proper subjects of this ordinance. The outward element to be used in this ordinance is water, wherein the party is to be immersed, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

23. *Lord's Supper.* — The supper of the Lord Jesus was instituted by him, the same night wherein he was betrayed, to be observed in his churches unto the end of the word, for the perpetual remembrance and showing forth the sacrifice of himself in his death.

24. *The Resurrection.* — The bodies of men after death return to dust, but their souls, which neither die nor sleep, having an immortal subsistence, immediately return to God who gave them; the souls of the righteous, being then made perfect in holiness, are received into paradise, where they are with Christ, and behold the face of God, in light and glory, waiting for the full redemption of their bodies; and the souls of the wicked are cast into hell, where they remain in torment and utter darkness, reserved to the judgment of the great day.

25. *The Judgment.* — God hath appointed a day wherein he will judge the world in righteousness, by Jesus Christ, to whom all power and judgment is given of the Father, then shall the righteous go into everlasting life, and receive the fullness of joy and glory, with everlasting reward, in the presence of the Lord: but the wicked who know not God, and obey not the

Gospel of Jesus Christ, shall be cast into eternal torments, and punished with everlasting destruction, from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.

The American Baptists differ also from the British in a more general adoption of "close communion." *SEE COMMUNION*.

III. *Statistics:*

1. *United States.* — According to the *American Baptist Year-book* for 1890, there were, in 1889, 1294 associations, 33,588 churches, 21,175 ordained ministers, and 3,070,047 members. The number of Baptist theological institutions was, in 1889, 7; universities and colleges, 31; seminaries for female education exclusively, 32; seminaries and academies, male and co-educating, 46; institutions for the colored race and Indians, 17. The Baptists, in 1889, published 54 weekly papers, 2 bi-weeklies, 33 monthlies, 4 semi-monthlies, 1 bi-monthly, 9 quarterlies, and 1 yearly publication. Six periodicals are published in foreign languages.

The general benevolent associations are

(1.) the American Baptist Missionary Union, organized in 1814. The receipts in 1889 were $415,144. There are under the charge of the Board 62 stations, 1179 out-stations, in the work among the heathen. In all the mission-fields there are 279 missionaries employed, 173 of whom are female helpers. There are 2076 preachers, 1316 churches, 134,413 members. 10,308 were baptized in 1888. Its fields of labor, in addition to general Bible work, are Burmah, Assam, Telugu, China, Japan, Africa, and Europe (France, Germany, Denmark, Sweden).

(2.) American Baptist Publication Society, organized in 1824; office located at 1420 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, with branch houses in various cities of the United States. In 1889 its receipts amounted to $626,360 24. Ninety-eight new publications were issued during the year. 661,582,811 pages 16mo were printed; total number of pages issued since the society's organization is 7,840,079,755 pages 16mo. The *Reaper* has a circulation of 2,835,000 copies; *Sunlight*, 2,117,000 copies.

128 persons are employed by the society as its agents in the states and foreign countries.

(3.) American Baptist Home Missionary Society, organized in 1832. Total receipts in 1889, $375,254 93. Missionaries and agents employed during the year, 790; churches and out-stations supplied, 1795. It maintains not only missions in various states of the Union, but also aids in the erection of churches and in educational work.

(4.) American and Foreign Bible Society. *SEE BIBLE SOCIETIES*.

(5.) Southern Baptist Convention, organized in 1845. Its Foreign Mission Board is located at Richmond, Va., and reported in 1889, receipts, $149,584 64; expenditures, $102,119 77; Its Home Mission Board is located at Atlanta, Ga. Receipts, $159,985; expenditures, $159,156 05. There have been under commission during the year 328 missionaries: among foreign populations, 12; in Cuba, 20, among the colored people, 41; among the native population, 255.

(6.) American Baptist Historical Society, organized in 1853, has a library of 7468 volumes and 2806 pamphlets.

(7.) Women's Baptist Foreign Missionary Society, organized in 1871; located in Boston. Receipts in 1889, $76,193 88. It is auxiliary to the Missionary Union, and operates chiefly by establishing schools, medical work, and Bible women.

(8.) Women's Baptist Foreign Missionary Society of the West, organized in 1871; located in Chicago. Receipts, $30,793 12, in 1889. It employed 30 workers in the foreign field during the year.

(9.) Women's Baptist Home Mission Society, organized in 1877; located in Chicago. Receipts in 1889, $39,774 71. 71 missionaries were employed during the year.

(10.) Women's American Baptist Home Mission Society, organized in 1877. Receipts in 1880, $28,935 72.

(11.) Baptist Ministers' Aid Society, organized in 1885, in Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan, maintains a home at Fenton, Mich., having 11 inmates.

(12.) American Baptist Education Society, organized in 1888. Receipts during 1889, $2596; expenditures, $3342.

2. *Great Britain.* — According to the English *Baptist Hand-book* for 1890, there were in Great Britain and Ireland 46 associations of General and Particular Baptists. 2786 churches, 3781 chapels, 299,126 members, 448,796 pupils of Sunday-schools. In 1889 a scheme was proposed for the amalgamation of the General Baptists and Particular Baptists, and carried into effect, the names General and Particular being dropped, and the word Baptist used only. In Scotland there were, in 1889, 103 Baptist churches, 94 ministers, and 11,773 members. In Ireland, 20 churches, 14 ministers, and 1602 members. The Particular Baptists have 9 colleges: Bristol (founded in 1770); Rawdon, Leeds (1804); Regent's Park, London (1810); Pontypool (1807); Haverford West (1841); Pastor's, London. (1856); Manchester (1866); North Wales. Llangollen (1862); Scotland, Glasgow (1869). The first five had together, in 1890, 111 pupils. The General Baptists have a college at Nottingham (since 1798), with 9 students.

The religious and benevolent societies are many: the *Baptist Hand-book* for 1890 names 26. The *Baptist Missionary Society* had in 1889 an income of £80,818, and has missions in India, Ceylon, China, Japan Palestine, Africa, the West Indies, and France. The General Baptists have a mission in India. The *Baptist Union* strives to be a bond of union for the independent churches to obtain statistical information on Baptist churches and institutions throughout the world, and to prepare an annual report on the state of the denomination.

According to the *Baptist Hand-book,* the periodicals of the English Baptists are 5 yearly, 15 monthly, 1 bimonthly, and 3 weeklies.

3. *In other Countries.* — The British Possessions in America had, in 1889, 23 associations, 756 churches, 475 pastors, 74,781 members, 9 periodicals, and 5 educational institutions. Germany had, in 1889, 104 churches and 19,743 members; Switzerland, 4 churches and 507 members; Denmark, 21 churches and 2572 members, Sweden, 497 churches and 32,305 members; France, 13 pastors and 1123 members; Italy, 53 churches and 910 members; Austria-Hungary, 6 churches and 1472 members; Romania and Bulgaria, 3 churches and 231 members; Russia, 44 churches and 11,293 members; Holland, 19 churches and 1218 members. In Asia the American Baptist Missionary Union (in India, Burmah, and Ceylon) reported, in 1889, 63,233 members; those of the English Baptist Missionary Society (India, Ceylon, China, Japan), 6761 members; those of the General Baptist Missionary Society of England (India), 1401 members; the Baptist

Missionary Society of England (North China), 1178 members, Canadian Baptist Missions (India), 1852 members; American Southern Baptists in China, 727 members. In Africa the English Baptist Missionary Society had, in 1889, 1098 members; the American Baptist Missionary Union in Congo, 246 members; the Southern Baptists in Liberia, 149 members. There are 200 Baptists in St. Helena, and 186 churches and 15,196 members in Australasia. See Benedict, *History of the Baptists;* Cox, *The Baptists* (in the *Enc. Metr.*); *Missionary Jubilee* (N. Y. 1865); Smith, *Tables of Church History;* Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, s.v. Schem, *Ecclesiastical Year-book;* Cutting, *Historical Vindications.* For a fuller account of works on the history of American Baptists, compare above, Baptist Literature.

Baptists, Free-Communion,

a denomination of Baptists which arose in the eighteenth century in Rhode Island and Connecticut, and owed its origin to the preaching of Whitfield. Many of those who were converted through his instrumentality formed a separate organization, and took the name “Separates.” Gradually they became Baptists, without, however, practicing close communion. In 1785 they formed an association called the “Groton Union Conference.” In 1820 they had 25 churches, some of which soon united with the Free-will Baptists. A General Conference was organized in 1835, *but* in 1841 the whole body united with the Free-will Baptists. See Belcher, *Religious Denominations;* Cox, *The Baptists* (in the *Encyclopaedia Metropolitana*).

Baptists, Free-Will,

a section of Baptists which commenced in North America June 30,1780. The first church was organized at New Durham, N. H., by Benjamin Randall, who in his twenty-second year was a convert of George Whitfield. In 1784 the first quarterly meeting was organized; in 1792, the first yearly meeting, consisting of delegates of the quarterly meetings. The most successful minister of this denomination was John Colby, who entered the ministry in 1809, and died in 1817. In 1827 a general conference was formed, which was at first annual, then biennial, and is now triennial, and is composed of delegates appointed by the yearly meetings. In 1841, nearly the whole body of another Baptist denomination, the Free Communion Baptists, united with them, while, on the other hand, they withdrew, a few years ago, connection from 4000 members in North Carolina on account of their being slaveholders. On the same principle, they refused to receive into

the connection some 12,000 from Kentucky and vicinity, who sent deputies to the general conference for that purpose. They are Arminians, and agree in doctrine almost wholly with the New Connection of General Baptists in England, except that they are open communionists, while the English New Connection generally hold to strict communion. At the fifth general conference, held at Wilton, Me., in October, 1831, the subject of "Washing the Saints' Feet," which had produced no small excitement among this denomination, was discussed, and it was agreed that the churches of the denomination should be at full liberty to retain the ordinance or not. It is now not generally practiced, though not entirely in desuetude. The ecclesiastical bodies among Free-will Baptists are, the church, the quarterly meeting conference, the annual meeting, and the general conference. The officers in the church are two — elders and deacons. Each church elects its own pastor, and exercises discipline over its own members; but, as a church, it is accountable to the yearly meeting. Also ministers are accountable to the quarterly meetings to which they belong, and not to the churches over which they are pastors. A council from the quarterly meeting organizes churches and ordains ministers. The quarterly meetings consist of ministers and such brethren as the churches may select. The general conference meets every three years, and consists of delegates chosen from the annual conferences.

Confession of Faith.

1. *The Scriptures.* — The Holy Scriptures, embracing the Old and New Testaments, were given by inspiration of God, and constitute the Christian's perfect rule of faith and practice.

2. *God.* — There is only one true and living God, who is a spirit, self-existent, eternal, immutable, omnipresent, omniscient, omnipotent, independent, good, wise, just, and merciful; the creator, preserver, and governor of the universe; the redeemer, savior, sanctifier, and judge of men; and the only proper object of divine worship. He exists in three persons, offices, distinctions, and relations — Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, which mode of existence is above the understanding of finite men.

3. *Christ* — The Son of God possesses all divine perfections, which is proven from his titles: true God, great God, mighty God, God over all, etc.; his attributes: eternal, unchangeable, omniscient, etc., and from his works. He is the only incarnation of the Divine Being.

4. *The Holy Spirit.* — He has the attributes of God ascribed to him in the Scriptures; is the sanctifier of the souls of men, and is the third person in the Godhead.

5. *Creation.* — God created the world and all it contains for his own glory, and the enjoyment of his creatures; and the angels, to glorify and obey him.

6. *Man's Primitive State, and his Full.* — Our first parents were created in the image of God, holy, and upright, and free; but, by yielding to temptation, fell from that state, find all their posterity with them, they then being in Adam's loins; and the whole human family became exposed to temporal and eternal death.

7. *The Atonement.* — As sin cannot be pardoned without a sacrifice, and the blood of beasts could never actually wash away sin, Christ gave himself a sacrifice for the sins of the world, and thus made salvation possible for all men. Through the redemption of Christ man is placed on a second state of trial; this second state so far differing from the first, that now men are naturally inclined to transgress the commands of God, and will not regain the image of God in holiness but through the atonement by the operation of the Holy Spirit. All who die short of the age of accountability are rendered sure of eternal life. Through the provisions of the atonement all are abilitated to repent of their sins and yield to God; the Gospel call is to all, the Spirit enlightens all, and men are agents capable of choosing or refusing.

8. *Regeneration* is an instantaneous renovation of the soul by the Spirit of God, whereby the penitent sinner, believing in and giving up all for Christ, receives new life, and becomes a child of God. This change is preceded by true conviction, repentance of and penitent sorrow for sin; it is called in Scripture being born again, born of the Spirit, passing from death unto life. The soul is then *justified* with God.

9. *Sanctification* is a setting apart the soul and body for holy service, an entire consecration of all our ransomed powers to God; believers are to strive for this with all diligence.

10. *Perseverance.* — As the regenerate are placed in a state of trial during life, their future obedience and final salvation are neither determined nor certain; it is, however, their duty and privilege to be steadfast in the truth, to grow in grace, persevere in holiness, and make their election sure.

11. Immediately after *death* men enter into a state of happiness or misery, according to their character. At some future period, known only to God, there will be a *resurrection* both of the righteous and the wicked, when there will be a general *judgment*, when all will be judged according to the deeds done in the body; the righteous be admitted into eternal happiness, and the wicked assigned to eternal misery.

12. *The Church.* — A Christian church is an assembly of persons who believe in Christ, and worship the true God agreeably to his word. In a more general sense, it signifies the whole body of real Christians throughout the world. The church being the body of Christ, none but the regenerate, who obey the Gospel, are its real members. Believers are received into a particular church on their giving evidence of faith, covenanting to walk according to the Christian rule, and being baptized.

13. *Baptism.* — Baptism is an immersion of the candidate in water, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; the only proper candidate being one who gives evidence of a change of heart.

14. *Communion.* — Communion is a solemn partaking of bread and wine, in commemoration of the death and sufferings of Christ. — *American Christian Record.*

The denomination has a printing establishment at Dover, N. H.; two colleges — Bates, at Lewiston, Me., with 48 students, and Hillsdale, Mich., with 600 students; two theological institutions — one at New Hampton, N. H., with 16 students, the other at Hillsdale, Mich., with 21 students (1867). In 1888 the following statistics were reported: Yearly meetings, 31; quarterly meetings, 147; ordained preachers, 1686, besides many licensed preachers; churches, 1942; total membership, 114,774. The Foreign Missionary Society has a mission at Orissa, India; they have also a Home Miss. Society and an Education Society. In New Brunswick and Nova Scotia they have several thousand members, and a journal, the *Religious Intelligencer*, published at St. John's, N. B. See Stewart, *History of Free-will Baptists*, Dover, 1862, vol. 1, from 1780 to 1830; (Winebrenner) *History of Denominations in the United States;* Belcher, *Religious Denominations;* Cox, *The Baptists* (in the *Encyclopaedia Metropolitana*); Schem, *Ecclesiastical Year-book; Free-will Baptist Register.*

Baptists, German,

a denomination of American Baptists who are commonly called Dunkers, while they call themselves Brethren. They originated at Schwarzenau, in Germany, in 1708, but were driven by persecution to America between 1719 and 1729. They purposely neglect any record of their proceedings, and are opposed to statistics, which they believe to savor of pride. They originally settled in Pennsylvania, but are now most numerous in Ohio. In 1790, a party of Universalists, led by one John Ham, separated from the Dunkers, since which time there has been no connection between them. The seceders are to be found in Kentucky, Illinois, Missouri, and Iowa. The whole denomination has been believed to hold Universalist views, but they have always protested against the charge. With the Mennonites, they appeal to the Confessions of Faith published in Holland two centuries ago. They practice trine immersion, with laying on of hands while the person is in the water. They lay their candidate forward in the water instead of backward, as the regular Baptists do. Their officers are bishops (or ministers), elders, teachers, and deacons (or visiting brethren). They also have deaconesses — aged women, who are allowed to exercise their gifts statedly. Bishops are chosen from the teachers, after they have been fully tried and found faithful It is their duty to travel from one congregation to another, to preach, to officiate at marriages and funerals, to set in order whatever may be wanting, to be present at love-feasts and communions, when a bishop is to be ordained, when teachers or deacons are chosen or elected, and when any officer is to be excommunicated. An elder is the first or eldest chosen teacher in a congregation where there is no bishop. It is his duty to appoint meetings, to assist in excommunication, to exhort and preach, to baptize, to travel occasionally, and, where no bishop is present, to perform all the duties of the latter. Teachers are chosen by vote. It is their duty to exhort and preach at any of their stated meetings, and, when so requested by a bishop or elder, to perform the ceremonies of matrimony and of baptism. It is the duty of deacons to keep a constant oversight of poor widows and their children, and give them such aid from time to time as may: be necessary; to visit all the families in the congregation at least once a year, and exhort, comfort, and edify them, as well as to reconcile all offenses and misunderstandings that. may occur from time to time; and, when necessary, to read the Scriptures, pray, and exhort at the regular meetings. An annual meeting is held about Whitsuntide, and attended by bishops and teachers, as well as by such other members as may be

delegated by the congregations. A committee of five of the oldest bishops hears those cases which may be referred to them by the teachers and representatives from the congregations. Their decisions are published in English and German. In plainness of speech and dress they resemble the Society of Friends. They will not go to law, nor engage in war, and seldom take interest for the money which they lend to their poorer brethren. The *Baptist Yearbook* for 1890 estimates the number of their preachers at 1490, of congregations at 4390, of members at 204,517. The census of 1850 gave them only 52 church edifices. which indicates that a large number of their congregations worship in school-houses. See Belcher, *Religious Denominations. SEE TUNKERS.*(DUNKERS ? — ed.)

Baptists, Old-School.

A name assumed by those Baptists who, in the second half of the past century, opposed the formation of missionary societies, Sunday-schools, and similar institutions, which they considered as floodgates for letting in all those contrivances in religion which make the salvation of men appear to depend on human effort. They are frequently, also, called Anti-mission or Anti-effort Baptists. They have neither colleges nor theological institutions, and are almost entirely confined to the Western and South-western States. Their number is at present on the decrease. In 1844 they counted 61,000 members; in 1854, 66,500; in 1859, 58,000. In 1889 they had 155 associations, 1800 churches, 900 ordained ministers, and 45,000 members. See Belcher, *Religious Denominations;* Cox, *The Baptists; American Baptist Yearbook* for 1890.

Baptists, Seventh-Day,

a denomination of Baptists who keep the seventh day of the week instead of the first as the Sabbath. In England they assumed, soon after the Reformation, the name of Sabbatarians; but in 1818 this term was rejected by the general conference in America, and the term Seventh-day Baptists adopted. They believe that the first day was not generally used in the Christian Church as Sabbath before the reign of Constantine. Traces of seventh-day keepers are found in the times of Gregory I, Gregory VII, and in the twelfth century in Lombardy. In Germany they appeared late in the fifteenth, and in England in the sixteenth century. In 1595, a work advancing their views was published in England by one Nicholas Bound, D.D., and several of their members suffered imprisonment. They assumed a

denominational organization in 1650, and counted at the end of the seventeenth century eleven churches, of which now only three remain. In America the first Seventh-day Baptists were connected with First-day Baptist churches. A separate organization was commenced in 1671. Yearly meetings commenced at the beginning of the eighteenth century, and a general conference was organized at the beginning of the nineteenth century, which held its meetings at first annually, later (since 1846) triennially. In 1845 they divided themselves into five associations (Eastern, Western, Central, Virginia, and Ohio). They have repeatedly taken action against slavery, and in favor of temperance and other reforms. A foreign missionary society was established in 1842, and supports missionaries in China and Palestine. Besides, they have a Tract and Publishing Society. The latter issues a weekly, a monthly, and a quarterly periodical. Their literary institutions are De Ruyter Institute and Alfred University, both in the State of New York, besides several smaller academies. The *Baptist Year-book* for 1890 gives the following statistics: 110 churches, 113 ministers, and about 9000 members. See Belcher, *Religious Denominations.*

Baptists, Seventh-Day (German),

a denomination of Baptists which arose by secession from the German Baptists (q.v.) or Dunkers. In 1725 Conrad Beissel published a tract against the celebration of the first day, and, when this created some disturbance in the society at Mill Creek, of which he was a member, he retired to a cell on the banks of the Cocalico, and lived there for some time unknown to the people he had left. When discovered, some other members of the society at Mill Creek settled around him, and in 1728 introduced the seventh day into public worship. In 1732 the solitary life was changed into a conventual one, and a monastical society was established in May, 1733. The establishment received the name Ephrata. The habit of Capuchins was adopted by both the brethren and the sisters, and monastic names given to all who entered the cloister. No monastic vows, however, were taken, neither had they any written covenant. The property which belonged to the society was common stock, yet none were obliged to give up any of their possessions. Celibacy they recommend as a virtue, but do not require it. Governor Penn, who visited them frequently, offered to them five thousand acres of land, but they refused it. At an early period they established a literary institution, a Sabbath-school, and a printing-office, and greatly cultivated music. Branches of the society of Ephrata were established in

1756 in York county, and in 1763 in Bedford county. Their principal settlement at present is at Snowhill, near the Antietam Creek, in Franklin county, Pa. Dr. Baird says, “They are not believed to exceed a few hundreds in numbers, and their ministers may be as many as ten or twelve.” See Belcher, *Religious Denominations;* (Winebrenner) *Hist. of Denom. in the U.S.*

Baptists, Six-Principle.

The six principles which distinguish this section of Baptists from all others are those mentioned in the Epistle to the Hebrews 6:1, 2, viz.

1. Repentance from dead works;
2. Faith toward God;
3. The doctrine of baptisms;
4. The laying on of hands;
5. The resurrection of the dead;
6. Eternal judgment.

They distinguish four baptisms:

1. John’s “baptizing with the baptism of repentance;”

2. The baptism of the Holy Ghost and with fire on the day of Pentecost;

3. The baptism of Christ’s sufferings. But after the resurrection of Christ there is only one kind of baptism to remain, viz.,

4. The baptism of the believers in Christ in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

Their rite of “laying on of hands” corresponds with Episcopal confirmation, and is the chief point in their system on which they insist. They refuse communion as well as church-fellowship with churches who do not practice it. The Six-Principle Baptists are Arminians, holding to a general atonement. Their ministry generally has not been liberally educated nor adequately supported. They are almost confined to Rhode Island, out of which they have only a few congregations in Massachusetts, New York, and Pennsylvania. They originated as a separate organization in 1639, and at no period of their history counted more than 39 churches. In 1852 they formed two yearly conferences, the one of Rhode Island and Massachusetts, the other of New York and Pennsylvania. The *Baptist Year-book* for 1890 gives the following statistics: 16-churches, 16 ordained

ministers, 1450 members. See (Winebrenner) *History of Denominations in the U. S.* Belcher, *Religious Denominations;* Smith, *Tables of Church History*.