THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY

REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL and ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE

Creeping Thing - Cyrus

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

Creeping Thing

(/r¥v, *she'rets*, any swarming creature; or cm¥r, *re'mes*, any low-gliding animal; ἑρπετόν) is used in Scripture to designate not only reptiles, properly so called, but also insects, aquatic creatures, and even the smaller mammalia. *SEE REPTILE*.

Creighton William, D.D.,

was born in New York, Feb. 22d, 1793. He was educated in Columbia College, graduating in the class of 1812, and received his doctor's degree in 1830. He was ordained deacon in 1815, and soon after was employed in Grace Church, N. Y., as an assistant to the Rev. Dr. Bowen. In 1816 he was called to the rectorship of St. Mark's Church, in the Bowery, of which he remained rector until 1836, when he became rector of Zion Church, Greenburgh, and resigned the same in 1845. In the year 1836 the Parish of Christ Church, Tarrytown, was organized, of which he was chosen rector, and remained so up to the time of his death, a period of twenty-nine years, without salary. In 1845 he was elected president of the Convention of the Diocese of New York, and was re-elected every succeeding year until the consecration of the Rev. Dr. Wainwright in 1852. At the first election of a provisional bishop of New York he was chosen to that high office, but, from various considerations, declined its acceptance. He was also chosen president of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies of the General Conventions of 1853, 1856, and 1859 respectively. He had previously served the Church in different stations of trust, as member of the Standing Committee, chairman of the Missionary Committee, etc. In 1849-50 the Church of St. Mary's, Beechwood, was founded by him and his son-in-law, the Rev. Edward N. Mead, D.D.; the principal part of the cost for the erection and ground being contributed by them, and divine service being maintained by them in it, as a free church, to the present time. Dr. Creighton died at Tarrytown, April 23d, 1865. — *Church Review*, July, 1865.

Crell (Crellius), Johannes

a Socinian divine, whose works form part of the Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum, was born in Franconia in 1590, and studied at Nuremberg and other German universities. Originally a Lutheran, he afterwards adopted the principles of Socinus, and went to Cracow, in Poland, in 1612, where

he became a preacher; he then was appointed professor of Greek, and afterwards rector of the university at that place. He died in 1633. His works are collected in *Opera omnia exeqetica, didactiea, et polenzica, magnam, partem hactenzus inedita* (Irenopoli. 1656, 4 vols. in 3); *Touching one God* (trans. Lond. 1665, 4to). — Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, 1:812.

Crell (or Krell), Nicholas

a distinguished German jurist, was born at Leipsic between the years 1550-53; graduated at Leipsic 1575, and was called to the court of the elector Augustus. Christian I, who succeeded his father in 1586, made him privy councillor and chancellor. Augustus had been zealous in opposing Crypto-Calvinism, but Christian I did not share his partiality for the *Formula Concordiae*, and Crell, by his order, superintended the preparation of a German Bible, with practical notes, for popular use. Christian dying before its completion (Sept. 25, 1591), the work was discontinued. The electress Sophia, who governed during the minority of her son Christian II, favored the extreme Lutheran party, and Crell waas thrown into prison. In Sept., 1597, he had a hearing in prison, and in 1599 he was condemned as unfaithful to the elector and to his trust. His appeal to the imperial court at Spires was rejected, and he vas executed Oct. 9, 1601, commending himself to God. See Niedner, *Ztsch. f. hist. Theol*. (1848, p. 315); Hutterus, *Concordia Concors*, c. 49; Arnold, *Kirchenu*. *Ketzerhistorie*, 2:16, 32; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 3, 183; and CRYPTO-CALVINISTIC CONTROVERSY.

Crell, Samuel

grandson of Johannes Crell, born in 1660. After being for some time a preacher at Konigswalde, he lived successively in Berlin, in the Netherlands, and in England, where he became acquainted with Sir Isaac Newton, Dr. Grabe, and other eminent men, by whom he was highly esteemed. He died at a very advanced age at Amsterdam in 1747. He wrote several historical treatises on the ante-Nicene fathers, and one on the Introduction to St. John’s Gospel. He was a disciple of Socinus, but it is said that towards the end of his life he received the orthodox view of the atonement. See Fock, *Socinianismus*, etc., p. 240; Nichols, *Calvinism and Arminianism*, 2:342.

Crescens

(Κρήσκης, for Latin *Crescens*, growing), an assistant of the apostle Paul (2 Timothy 4:10, where he is stated to have left Rome for Galatia), A.D. 64. He is generally supposed to have been one of the seventy disciples of Christ. It is alleged in the *Apostolical Constitutions* (7, 46), and by the fathers of the Church, that he preached the Gospel in Galatia, a fact probably deduced conjecturally from the only text (2 Timothy 4:10) in which his name occurs. There is a less ancient tradition (in Sophronius), according to which Crescens preached, went into Gaul (Galatia; see Theodoret on 2 Timothy 1, c.), and became the founder of the Church in Vienne; but it deserves no notice, having probably no other foundation than the resemblance of the names Galatia and Gallia. From the fact of his having a Latin name, many have inferred that he was a Christian of Rome. (See Bechler, *De Crescente*, Viteb. 1689.)

Crescens

a Cynic philosopher who acquired great influence over the mind of the emperor Aurelius. While the other schools of philosophers looked down with contempt on the Christians, the Cynics had been more favorably inclined towards them; but Justin Martyr having offended Crescens by some remarks he made against him in an apology addressed to the emperor, Crescens swore to be revenged, and, to accomplish his purpose, incited the emperor to persecute the Christians. Justin Martyr was one of the victims of this persecution. *SEE JUSTIN MARTYR*.

Crescent

the emblem of the Ottoman empire. *SEE CONSTANTINOPLE* (1, 1).

Crespin, Jean

a French Reformer, born at Arras, studied law at Lowen and Paris, but, being persecuted for his religious opinions, he fled to Geneva in 1548. Here he established a printing-office, was made a citizen in 1552, and died in 1572. The books issued from his press, which can be recognized by the sign of an anchor, are remarkable for beauty of typography and for correctness. Among his own writings are, *Histoire des martyrs persecutes et mis a imort pour la verite de l'evangile* (Genesis 1570, fol.; 1619); *L'etat de I'glise des tems des apdtres jusqu'en* 1560 (1564, and a transl.,

The Estate of the Church [Lond. 1602, 4to]); *Bibliotheca studii theologici ex patribus collecta* (158l, fol.).

Crete

Picture for Crete

(Κρήτη), one of the largest islands in the Mediterranean, now called *Candia*, and by the Turks Kirid. It is 160 miles long, but of very unequal width, varying from 35 to 6 miles. It is situated at the entrance of the Archipelago, having the coast of the Morea to the south-west, that of Asia Minor to the north-east, and that of Libya to the south. Great antiquity was affected by the inhabitants, and it has been supposed by some that the island was originally peopled from Egypt; but this is founded on the conclusion that Crete was the Caphtor of <050223>Deuteronomy 2:23, etc., and the country of the Philistines, which seems more than doubtful. *SEE CAPHTOR*. Surrounded on all sides by the sea, the Cretans were excellent sailors, and their vessels visited all the neighboring coasts. Though extremely bold and mountainous, this island has very fruitful valleys (Virgil, *AEn*. 3, 106), and was highly prosperous and full of people in very ancient times: this is indicated by its "hundred cities" alluded to in the, epithet ἑκατόμπολις, applied to it by Homer (*Il*. 2:649). It was remarkable for its patriotism, although it kept aloof from the intestine wars of Greece. One of its peaks was the famous Mt. Ida, and in one of its remarkable caverns was the renowned Labyrinth of antiquity. This island was also the scene of many of the fables of mythology, and was even reputed as the abode of "the father of gods and men." The chief glory of the island, however, lay in its having produced the legislator Minos, whose institutions had so important an influence in softening the manners of a barbarous age, not in Crete only, but also in Greece, where these institutions were imitated. The natives were celebrated as archers. Their character was not of the most favorable description (sec Polyb. 6:46, 3; 47, 5; Died. Sic. *Exc. Vat*. p. 131 Livy, 44:45; Ovid, *Ars Amat*. 1:297; Plutarch, *Philopoem*. 13); the Cretans, or Kretans, being, in fact one of the three K's against whose unfaithfulness the Greek proverb was intended as a caution — Kappadokia, Krete, and Kilikia. In short, the ancient notices of their character fully agree with the quotation which Paul produces from "one of their own poets" (προφήτης) in his Epistle to Titus (i. 12), who had been left in charge of the Christian church in the island: The Cretans are always liars (ἀεὶ ψεῦσται, eternal liars), evil beasts (κακὰ θηρία,

Angl. ‘brutes’), slow bellies” (γαστέρες ἀργαί, gorbellies, bellies which take long to fill). The quotation is usually supposed to have been from Callimachus’s *Hymn on Jove*, 8; but Callimachus was not a Cretan, and he has only the first words of the verse, which Jerome says he borrowed from Epimenides (q.v.), who was of Crete, and from whose work (Περί χρησιμῶν, see Clemens *Alex. Strom*. 1:129) the citation appears to have been made (see Gottschalk, *De Epimenidepropheta*, Altdorp, 1714; Hoffmann, *De Paulo scripturas profan. ter allegante, Tub*. 1770, p. 17; Heinrich, *Epimenides a. Kreta*, Lpz. 1801). Ample corroboration of the description which it gives of the ancient inhabitants may be seen in the commentators (see Wolfii *Cur*. 4:554 sq.). *SEE CRETIAN*. Mr. Hartley, in his *Researches in Greece*, says, “The Cretans of the present day are precisely what they were in the days of the apostle Paul; they are notoriously, whether Turks or Greeks, the worst characters in the Levant.” (See the *Penny Cyclopoedia*, s.v. Candia.) years 1866 and 1867 the whole force of the Ottoman empire, and thereby enlisted the sympathy of all the Christian powers of Europe, most of which urged the Turkish government to consent to the annexation of the island to Greece. (In November, 1867, the fate of, Crete was not yet decided.) (See Paulin, *Description phyique de l’le de Crete*, Paris, 1859.)

It seems likely that a very early acquaintance took place between the Cretans and the Jews. The story in Tacitus (*Hist.* v. 2) that the Jews were themselves of Cretan origin, may be accounted for by supposing a confusion between the Philistines and the Jews, and by identifying the Cherethites of 1 Samuel 30:14; 2 Samuel 8:18; Ezekiel 25:16; Zephaniah 2:5, with Cretan emigrants. In the last two of these passages they are expressly called Κρῆτες by the Sept., and in Zephaniah 2:6, we have the word Κρήτη. Whatever conclusion we may arrive at on this point, there is no doubt that Jews were settled in the island in considerable numbers during the period between the death of Alexander the Great and the final destruction of Jerusalem. Gortyna (q.v.) seems to have been their chief residence, for it is specially mentioned (1 Maccabees 15:23) in the letters written by the Romans on behalf of the Jews, when Simon Maccabseus renewed the treaty which his brother Judas had made with Rome (see 1 Maccabees 10:67). At a later period Josephus says (*Ant.* 17:12, 1; *War*, 2:7, 1) that the pseudo-Alexander, Herod’s supposed son, imposed upon the Jews of Crete Crete was an independent state, with some variations of government, until it was conquered by the Romans,

B.C. 67, under Metellus, hence called Cretius, and united in one province with Cyrenaica, which was at no great distance (Strab. 10:475) on the opposite coast of Africa. *SEE CYRENE*. It is possible that in Titus 3:1, there may be an implied reference to a turbulent condition of the Cretan part of the province, especially as regarded the Jewish residents. It formed part of the Eastern empire until taken by the Saracens in 823, and was recovered from them by the emperor Nicephorus Phocas in 981. On the establishment of the Latin empire of Constantinople in 1204, it came by purchase into the hands of the Venetians, and was retained by them until the year 1669, when, after a twenty-four years' siege of the capital, the conquest of the whole island was effected by the Turks, to whose dominions it still nominally belongs. In August, 1866, the Christians of Crete rose in insurrection against the Turkish rule, and demanded annexation to the kingdom of Greece. They resisted throughout the when on his way to Italy. And later still, Philo (*Leg. ad Cai*. § 36) makes the Jewish envoys say to Caligula that all the more noted islands of the Mediterranean, including Crete, were full of Jews. Thus the special mention of Cretans (Acts 2:11) among those who were in Jerusalem at the great Pentecost is just what we should expect. No notice is given in the Acts of any more direct evangelization of Crete, and no absolute proof can be adduced that Paul was ever there before his voyage from Caesarea to Puteoli, though it is barely possible that he may have visited the island in the course of his residences at Corinth and Ephesus. *SEE TITUS*. The circumstances of Paul's recorded visit were briefly as follows. The vessel in which he sailed to Italy, being forced out of her course by contrary winds, was driven round the island, instead of keeping the direct course to the north of it. In doing this, the ship first made the promontory of Salmone, on the eastern side of the island, which they passed with difficulty, and took shelter at a place called Fair-Havens, near to which was the city Lasea. But after spending some time at this place, and not finding it, as they supposed, sufficiently secure to winter in, they resolved, contrary to the advice of Paul (the season being far advanced), to make for Phoenice, a more commodious harbor on the western part of the island; in attempting which they were driven far out of their course by a furious east wind called Euroclydon, and wrecked on the island of Melita (Acts 27). *SEE SHIPWRECK (OF PAUL)*. It is evident from Titus 1:5, that the apostle himself was here at no long interval of time before he wrote the letter. We believe this to have been between the first and second imprisonments. *SEE TITUS, EPISTLE TO*. Titus was much honored here during the Middle

Ages. The cathedral of Megalo-Castron was dedicated to him; and his name was the watchword of the Cretans when they fought against the Venetians, who themselves seem to have placed him above St. Mark in Candia, when they became masters of the island (Pashley’s *Travels in Crete*, 1:6, 175, Lond. 1837). See Hock’s *Kreta* (Gott. 1829), and some papers from the Italian in the Museum of Class. Antiq. (vol. 2, Lond. 1856). Also Meursius, *De Rhodo, Creta*, etc. (*Anatol*. 1675); Neumann, *Rer. Creticar. spec*. (Gott. 1820); Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geogr*. s.v. Creta; Spratt’s *Researches in Crete* (London, 1865, 2 vols. 8vo). *SEE GREECE*.

Crete

(<440211>Acts 2:11) or Cre’tian (<560112>Titus 1:12 and subscr.), a Cretan (Κρής), or inhabitant of the island of CRETE *SEE CRETE* (q.v.). Treatises on the notoriously bad character of this people (referred to in the latter passage) have been written in Latin by Hollebeck (Lugd. B. 1798), Peffinger (*Argent*. 1701), Schmidt (Lips. 1673), and Steger (Lips. 1684).

Crib

(sWbae, *ebus’*), a stall or barn where fodder is stored (<201404>Proverbs 14:4) and where cattle are fed (<183909>Job 39:9; <230103>Isaiah 1:3); perhaps simply a manger for them to eat out of, as the Sept. and Vulg. render in the last-cited passage. *SEE MANGER*.

Crime

(fP;v]mi, judgment, <260723>Ezekiel 7:23; hMæzæ, *zimmah’*, mischief, “heinous crime,” <183111>Job 31:11; αἰτία, <442527>Acts 25:27; ἔγκλημα, <442516>Acts 25:16). *SEE LAW*; *SEE JUDGE*; *SEE PUNISHMENT*.

Crimson

ynæv; *shani’* (<240430>Jeremiah 4:30; elsewhere “scarlet;” fully ynæv; t[il'/T, crimson-worm, <022504>Exodus 25:4, or t[il'/t ynæv] worm crimson, <031404>Leviticus 14:4, or simply [l'/T, the worm itself, <230115>Isaiah 1:15, all rendered, except in this last passage, likewise:’ scarlet”), later lymir]Ki, *kar’il’* (invariably “crimson,” <140207>2 Chronicles 2:7, 14; 3:14; on this Hebrews term, see Lorsbach, *Archiv fur morgenlind*. Literatur, 2:305; Gesenius, *Thesaur*. p. 714), a well-known red color (Pliny, 21:22), of a

deep hue bordering on purple (q.v.), and in this respect differing from the brighter scarlet (q.v.), yet of a brilliant color (<2Ki18>Isaiah 1:18; comp. Pliny, 33:40; hence χρῶμα ὀξύ; so in <4027>Matthew 27:28, χλάμυς κοκκίνη = ἐσθὴς λαμπρά in <4231>Luke 23:11). highly prized among the ancients for garments and tapestry (Horace, Sat. 2:6, 102), as articles of luxury with the nobility (<2460>Jeremiah 4:30; <1024>2 Samuel 1:24; <2102>Proverbs 31:21; <2505>Lamentations 4:5; comp. Martial, 3, 2, 11; 2:39, 1; 43, 8; Patron. Sat. 32), and with the Romans for the robes of generals and princes (Pliny, 22:3; comp. <4027>Matthew 27:28, where κοκκίνῃ πυρπύρα in <4157>Mark 15:17, 20, and <3904>John 19:4), especially the emperors (Sueton. *Domit*. 4). Many of the fabrics of the tabernacle and sacerdotal paraphernalia were also woven (Exodus 38; <0408>Numbers 4:8) of threads of this dye (<0138>Genesis 38:28; <0602>Joshua 2:18), which was likewise employed for the curtain of Solomon's Temple (<1403>2 Chronicles 3:14; comp. Sueton. *Nero*, 30). The color again occurs in the Mosaic ritual (<0306>Leviticus 14:6; <0419>Numbers 19:6). As to its symbolical significance, Philo (*Opp.* 1:536; comp. 2:148) and Josephus (*Ant.* 3, 7, 7) think that it, like the two sacred colors (scarlet and purple), reps resents the element of fire; according to Bahr (*Sync. bol*. 1:333 sq.), it denotes life (i.e. fire and blood, which are both red); while others find in it other typical allusions. *SEE DYE*.

Crimson is obtained from the pulverized cochineal berries, i.e. the dead bodies and larve-nests (see Brandt and Ratzeburg's *Medicin. Zoologie*, Berl. 1831 sq., 2, pl. 26, fig. 15) of a small parasitic insect, the female cochineal-worm (תּוֹלַע, *tola'*) or *kermes* (the Coccus ilicis of Linn., cl. 4, Tetragynia), which towards the end of April fastens itself, like little raisins, in the form of round reddish or violet-brown berries upon the twigs, less frequently on the leaves, of the palmoak (πρῖνος or ἡ κόκκος, *Ilex aquifolia or coccifera; comp. Theophrastus, Plaut*. 3, 16; Pliny, 16:12; Pausanias, 10:36, 1; see Kirby, *Entomol*. 1:351; Cuvier, *Anim. King*. 3, 604, 608). This shrubby tree, some two or three feet high, grows abundantly in Asia Minor and Hither Asia (certainly also in Palestine; see Belon, *Observ*. 2:88), as well as in Southern Europe, has oval, pointed, evergreen, thorny leaves, a grayish smooth bark, and bears round scarlet berries in clustered tufts (*Dioscor*. 4:48). Among the ancients, the Phoenicians generally supplied the rest of the world with crimson materials, and best under-stood the art of dyeing this color (<1407>2 Chronicles 2:7; comp. Pliny, 9:65). (See Beckmann, *Beitr*. III, 1:1 sq.; Bochart, *Hieroz*. 3,

524 sq.; Braun, *De vestitu sacerd*. 1. i, c. 15, p. 215 sq.; Hartmann, *Hebr.* 1:388 sq.; 3, 135 sq.; *Penny Cyclopaedia*, s.v. Cochineal.) *SEE COLOR*.

Cripple

(χωλός, lame, as elsewhere usually rendered, or "halt"), a person deprived of the use of the lower limbs (Acts 14:8).

Crisp Tobias, D.D.,

a divine of the 17th century born 1600, died rector of Brinkworth 1642. His life was distinguished by charity, piety, humility, and purity, but he was nevertheless charged with simony in obtaining the living of Newington Butts in 1627. He followed the Puritan side in the ecclesiastical troubles, and was an extreme Calvinist, running into Antinomianism The Westminster Assembly proposed to have his sermons burnt. The last edition of them, edited by Gill, appeared in London 1791 (2 vols. 8vo), to which the life of Crisp is prefixed. Dr. Crisp acknowledges that, "in respect of the rules of righteousness, or the matter of obedience, we are under the law still, or else," as he adds, "we are lawless, to live every man as seems good in his own eyes, which no true Christian dares so much as think of." The following sentiments, however, among others, are taught in his sermons: "The law is cruel and tyrannical, requiring what is naturally impossible." "The sins of the elect were so imputed to Christ as that, though he did not commit them, yet they became actually his transgressions, and ceased to be theirs." "The feelings of conscience, which tell them that sin is theirs, arise from a want of knowing the truth." "It is but the voice of a lying spirit in the hearts, of believers that saith they have yet sin wasting their consciences, and lying as a burden too heavy for them to bear." "Christ's righteousness is so imputed to the elect that they, ceasing to be sinners, are as righteous as he was, and all that he was." "An elect person is not in a condemned state while an unbeliever; and should he happen to die before God call him to believe, he would not be lost." "Repentance and confession of sin are not necessary to forgiveness. A believer may certainly conclude before confession, yea, as soon as he hath committed sin, the interest he hath in Christ, and the love of Christ embracing him." These dangerous sentiments, and others of a similar bearing, have been fully answered by many writers, but by none more ably than by the Rev. John Fletcher, in his *Checks to Antinomianism*." — Buck,

Theol. Dict. s.v.; Orme, *Life of Baxter*, 2:232; Bogue and Bennett, *Hist. of Dissenters*, 1:400. *SEE ANTINOMIANISM*.

Crispin and Crispinian

two brothers who, during the reign of Diocletian, went as missionaries from Rome to Gaul, and settled at Soissons. In order to support themselves and to have access to the people, they became shoemakers. Thus they worked for some time for the propagation of Christianity, until 287, when, by order of the emperor Maximinianus, they were beheaded. They are commemorated in the Church of Rome on Oct. 25, and are commonly venerated as the special patrons of the shoemakers. There is a legend (for which, however, there seems to be no foundation) about these saints to the ‘effect that they stole from rich persons the leather to make gratuitously shoes for the poor. — Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex*. 2:918.

Crisping-pin

(fyrjæ; *charit’*, something chiselled; the Sept. translates undistinguishably, Isaiah 3:22). This word properly signifies a casket or pouch, and is elsewhere rendered a “bag” for money (2 Kings 5:23, where the Arabic gives a leather money-bag); but in the passage in Isaiah it is to be understood as some kind of female ornament; probably, like our modern reticule, it was a richly ornamented purse or small bag, which the women wore attached to their girdles. They are usually described as made of silk, and wrought with gold and silver; but Jahn thinks that this purse was made of solid metal, sometimes of pure gold, and fashioned like a cone, with a border of rich cloth at the top. *SEE ORNAMENT*.

Crispus

(Κρίσπος, for Lat. *Crispus*, curled; found also in the Talmudists under the forms apsyRq and ypsyrq), chief of the Jewish synagogue at Corinth (Acts 18:8), converted and baptized by the apostle Paul (1 Corinthians 1:14) A.D. 50. According to tradition (*Constitut. Apost.* 7:46) he was afterwards bishop of *A*Egina. The Greek Church observe his festival on the 4th of October.

a very useful work in Biblical literature, undertaken and published by Cornelius Bee, bookseller (London, 1660, 9 vols. fol.), as an appendage to Walton's *Polyglot*, under the direction of bishop Pearson, John Pearson, Anthony Scattergood, and Francis Gouldman. It was reprinted at Frankfort, under the care of Gurtler, in 1695, in 7 vols. In 1698 it reappeared at Amsterdam in 9 vols.; and a supplement of 2 vols. more was published in 1700 and 1701; and a second supplement appeared in 2 vols. fol., Amst. 1732. This collection contains all, or most of the books of the O.T., the entire annotations of Münster, Vatablus, Castalio, Clarius, Drusius, and Grotius; brief annotations of Fagius on the Chaldaic paraphrase of the Pentateuch, and his larger exposition of the first four chapters of Genesis; the commentaries of Masius on Joshua; the annotations of Codurcus on Job; of Pricaeus on the Psalms, and of Bayne on the Proverbs; the commentary of Forerius on Isaiah, that of Lively on Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, and Jonah; of Badwell on the Apocrypha, and Hoeschel on Ecclesiastes, etc. On the N.T. it contains the collations of Valla, with the animadversions of Revins; the annotations of Erasmus, Vatablus, Castalio, Clarius, Zegerus, and Grotius; on particular places and subjects of the N.T., Münster, Drusius, Scaliger, Casaubon, Cameron, Lud. Capellus, Gualtperius, Schultetus, and Pricemus. There are also a number of philological tracts and dissertations, such as John Gregory's *Notes and Observations*; Fagius's *Comparison of the principal Translations of the O.T.*; Cartwright's *Mellificium Ebraicum*; Drusius on the *Mandrakes*; Jos. Scaliger and Amama on *Tythes*; Lud. Capellus on the *Vow of Jephtha and Corban*; *Pithaeus De Latinis Bibliorum Interpretationibus*; Urstius *De fabrica Arcae Noe*; Rittershusius *De Jure Asylorum*; Allatius *De Engastrymutho*; Montanus on *Jewish Antiquities*; Bertram and Cunaeus on the Hebrew Republic; Waser on the *Ancient Coins and Measures of the Hebrews, Chaldaeans, and Syrians*; and many others of a similar description (Orme, *Biblioth. Bibl*. p. 128). The Amsterdam edition (1698-1732,13 vols. fol.) is the best, being well printed, with additions, and including four volumes of Thesaurus not contained in the original edition. Poole's Synopsis forms an excellent abridgment of this great work. *SEE COMMENTARY*.

Criticism, Biblical

This phrase is employee in two senses. Some take it to signify not only the restoration of the text of Scripture to its original state, but the principles of interpretation. This is an extensive and improper application. The science is strictly occupied with the text of the Bible. It is limited to those principles and operations which enable the reader to detect and remove corruptions, to decide upon the genuineness of disputed readings, and to obtain as nearly as possible the original words of inspiration.

I. There are only three or four sources of material for the work of Biblical criticism, both in detecting the changes made upon the original text, and in restoring genuine readings:

1. MSS. or written copies of the Bible.
2. Ancient translations into various languages.
3. The writings and remains of those early ecclesiastical writers who have quoted the Scriptures.
4. Critical conjecture; but this must be used with extreme caution.

SEE OLD TEST.; *SEE NEW TEST.*

Criticism employs the ample materials furnished by these sources. To attain its end, it must work upon them with skill and discrimination. They afford wide scope for acuteness, sobriety, and learning; and long experience is necessary in order that they may be used with efficiency and success. (See *Jour. Sac. Lit.*, Jan. 1864; Heinfetter, *The True Text of the* [Heb.] *Scriptures*, 2d ed. Lond. 1861.) *SEE MANUSCRIPTS*; *SEE VERSIONS*.

CANONS OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

(1.) EXTERNAL OR OBJECTIVE.

1. *Readings found in the most ancient and more carsefulty written MSS. should be preferred*. Hence “uncial” copies are in general more weighty than “ursive.” Yet great unanimity in the latter may overbalance fluctuation in the former.

2. *Independent witnesses must chiefly be regarded*. Hence the necessity of classifying authorities, and of reckoning all that can be traced to a common origin or edition as but one, since no copy can rise higher in value than its source, and each transcription is an additional opportunity for error. On

this account the critical materials of the O.T. are meager, as all existing Hebrews MSS. are of the Masoretic recension; and but for the evidence (both historical and internal) of great competency, care, and scrupulousness on the part of these editors, their work would be of much less utility than it now is. In the N. T, too, this rule greatly reduces the testimony of the earliest extant MSS., inasmuch as they all seem to belong to the Alexandrian type, and for this reason their provincialisms in orthography ought especially to be rejected.

3. *Readings found in the original text are not to be lightly set aside through deference to versions or citations*. This not only follows as a corollary from the preceding rule, but its importance is enhanced by the ignorance, prejudices, special objects, and laxity of translators and writers quoting (sometimes from memory). In doubtful cases only (either from conflict, failure, or improbability in the original readings), therefore, can these be safely resorted to. Hence is evident equally the absurdity of exalting the Septuagint as a whole above the Hebrew, and the Vulgate above the Greek Testament. When not liable to suspicion from the above causes, however, and where sufficiently exact to be verbally appreciable, translations and quotations, like direct and explicit historical statements as to particular readings, are entitled to consideration in proportion to their antiquity and excellence of opportunity.

(II.) INTERNAL OR SUBJECTIVE.

N. B. — This whole kind of evidence is only to be used, and that but sparingly, when the foregoing rules fall short, or are opposed by some palpable inconsistency in point of exegesis or philology in the text.

1. *Purely conjectural emendation may sometimes be cautiously employed in such cases*, because it is possible that some clerical errors may have existed in the original autographs themselves, and others probably crept in at the earliest date in copying; these would therefore be liable to corrupt all later testimony. On the other hand, arbitrary corrections must never be made except where they are absolutely demanded, and where they can also be shown to have been naturally displaced by the errata; nor yet unless they are such as would be likely to have eluded the diligence of earlier collators.

2. *Among several various readings, which are otherwise nearly equally supported, that one is to be selected from which the others can most readily be derived*. On this principle is based the famous law of critics in

general, that "the most difficult reading is to be preferred," which is but partially true, however, since the harshest readings may have been the result of inadvertence in copying, and on this principle they could never be eliminated; whereas the design of criticism is the common-sense one of lessening rather than increasing the incongruities of the text. It is only meant that we should choose that reading, rather than another, which, if originally in the text, would be most obnoxious to copyists; yet the rule must not be so construed as to come into collision with the foregoing canon.

3. *When the evidences in favor of the omission or insertion of a passage, clause, or highly significant word are nearly equally divided, it is safer to reject it* (if it be not already contained in the received text), or (if it be retained for the sake of convenience) to mark it as probably spurious; for the disposition of the Church, from quite an early to a comparatively recent period, has leaned towards the admission of more and more matter (whether marginal glosses or apocryphal additions) into the sacred canon, and copyists as well as editors have felt the influence of that reverent familiarity which renders it ever increasingly difficult to expunge any thing once included in Scripture. But in judging of the genuineness in such instances, little stress can be laid upon considerations drawn from doctrinal propriety or concinnity with the context, because these are greatly affected by the individual sentiments and conventional opinions of each critic.

II. The remainder of this article (which relates to the so-called "lower criticism") will contain a brief historical sketch of Biblical criticism, or a history of the texts of the Old and New Testaments; the condition in which they have been at different periods; the evidences on which our knowledge of their purity or corruption rests, and the chief attempts that have been made to rectify or amend them. A *history* of criticism must describe the various stages and forms through which the texts have passed. It will be convenient to reserve an enumeration of the causes which gave rise to various readings for a future article, *SEE VARIOUS READINGS*, and in this place to detail the phases which the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Old and New Testaments have presented both in their unprinted and printed state, in connection with the labors of scholars upon them.

A. THE OLD TESTAMENT. — There are four marked periods in the history of the Hebrew text.

1. *That Period in the History of the Unprinted Text which preceded the closing of the Canon.* — Of this we know nothing except what is contained in Scripture itself. The Jews bestowed much care on their sacred books. They were accustomed to hold them in great veneration even in the darkest times of national apostasy from Jehovah. How often the separate books were transcribed, or with what degree of correctness, it is impossible to tell. Many German critics suppose that the Hebrew text met with very unfavorable treatment; that it was early subjected to the carelessness of transcribers and officious critics. Differences, however, between parallel sections show rather the genuineness and integrity of the books in which they occur. Had such paragraphs exactly harmonized, we might have suspected design or collusion; but their variations discover the artlessness of the writers. We disagree with Eichhorn, Bauer, Gesenius, De Wette, and others, who have given lists of parallel passages in some books in order to show that the text was early exposed to extensive alterations.

The most important particular in this part of the history is the Samaritan recension of the Pentateuch. *SEE PENTATEUCH*. This edition (if so it may be called) of the Pentateuch is indeed uncritical in its character. While we freely acquit the Jews of tampering with the text of the Mosaic books, the Samaritans cannot be so readily exonerated from the imputation. Additions, alterations, and transpositions are quite apparent in their copy of the Pentateuch. A close alliance between the text which lies at the basis of the Septuagint version and that of the Samaritan Pentateuch has been always noticed. Hence some think that they flowed from a common recension. One thing is certain, that the Seventy agree with the Samaritan in about 2000 places in opposition to the Jewish text. In other books, too, of the Old Testament, besides the five books of Moses, the Seventy follow a recension of the text considerably different from the Jewish. Thus in Jeremiah and Daniel we find a different arrangement of sections, as well as a diversity in single passages. The books of Job and Proverbs present a similar disarrangement and alteration, which must be put down to the account of the Alexandrian Jews and, Greek translators. Far different was the conduct of the Palestinian Jews in the treatment of the sacred books. They were very scrupulous in guarding the text from innovation, although it is impossible that they could have preserved it from all corruption. But whatever errors or mistakes had crept into different copies were rendered apparent at the time when the canon was formed. We believe with Havernick (*Einleitung in das Alte Testament,* p. 49) that “Ezra, in unison

with other distinguished men of his time, completed the collection of the sacred writings.” He revised the various books, corrected inaccuracies that had crept into them, and rendered the Old-Testament text perfectly free from error. Thus a correct and genuine copy was furnished under the sanction of Heaven. Ezra, Nehemiah, and those with whom he was associated, were infallibly guided in the work of completing the canon. *SEE CANON*.

2. *From the Establishment of the Canon to the Completion of the Talmud*, i.e. the commencement of the sixth century after Christ. — The Targumists Onkelos and Jonathan closely agree with the Masoretic text. The Greek translations of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, belonging to the second century, deviate from the form of the text afterwards called the Masoretic much less than the Seventy. The Hebrew column of Origen’s *Hexapla* presents a text allied to the Masoretic recension. Jerome’s Latin version, made in the fourth century, is conformed to the same Hebrew original. In the two Gemaras, viz. the Jerusalem and the Babylonian, belonging to the fourth and sixth centuries respectively, we discern many traces of critical skill applied to the preservation of a pure text. Different readings in MSS. are mentioned, precepts are given respecting Biblical calligraphy, and true readings are restored. By far the most important fact which they present is the adducement of classes of critical corrections made at an earlier period, and which Morinus (Exercitationes Biblioce, p. 408) justly calls the fragments or vestiges of recensions. These are —

(1) µyrpæ/s rWF[æ, *Retrenchment of scribes*.

(2) µyrpæ/s ˆWQTæ, *Correction of scribes*.

(3) *Extraordinary punctuation*.

(4) bytæK]alow]yræq], “*Keri ve-lo kethib*,” read but not written.

(5) yræq]alow]bytæK], “*Kethib ve-lo keri*,” written but not read.

(6) The Talmud also mentions different readings which the Masoretes call bytæK]W yræq], “*Keri u-kethib*,” read and written. *SEE KERI* and *SEE KETHIB*.

The writings of Jerome afford evidence that, in the fourth century, the Hebrew text was without the vowel-points, or even the diacritical signs.

3. From the sixth Century, in which the Talmud was completed, to the Invention of Printing. — The learned Jews, especially those at Tiberias, where there was a famous school till the eleventh century, continued to occupy themselves with the Hebrew language and the criticism of the Old Testament. The observations of preceding Rabbis were enlarged, new remarks were made, and the vowel-system was invented, the 'origin' of which can hardly be placed earlier than the sixth century. The name Masora has usually been applied to that grammatico-historical tradition which, having been handed down orally for some centuries, became afterwards so extensive as to demand its committal to writing. Much of what is contained in the Masora exists also in the Talmud. Part of it, however, is older than the Talmud, though not reduced to its present form till a much later period. The various observations comprised in the Masora were at first written in separate books, of which there are MSS. extant. Afterwards they were put into the margin of the Bible MSS.

When we speak of the Masoretic recension of the text, it is not meant that the Masoretes gave a certain form to the text itself, or that they undertook and executed a new revision. They made the textus receptus of that day the basis of their remarks, and gave their sentiments concerning it. Had the text been altered in every case where they recommend; had it been made conformable to their ideas of what it should be, it would have been appropriate to have called it the Masoretic recension. The designation, however, though not applicable in strictness, is customary.

The most important part of the Masora (q.v.) consists of the marginal readings or Keris, which the Masoretes always preferred to the textual, and which the later Jews have adopted. The Keris are critical, grammatical, orthographical, explanatory, and euphemistic. It has been a subject of dispute among scholars from what source the Masoretes derived the Keris. It is highly probable that they were generally taken from MSS. and tradition, though they may have been in part the offspring of conjecture. It is but reasonable to suppose that these scholars sometimes gave the result of their own judgment. In addition to the Keris the Masora contains an enlargement of critical remarks found in the Talmud. Besides, the verses, words, and consonants of the different books of the Bible are counted, a task unparalleled in point of minute labor, though comparatively unprofitable.

The application of the Masora in the criticism of the Old Testament is difficult, because its text has fallen into great disorder. It was printed for the first time in the first Rabbinical Bible of Bomberg, superintended by Felix Pratensis. In the second Rabbinical Bible of Bomberg, R. Jacob ben-Chayim bestowed considerable care upon the printing of the Masora. At the end of this second Rabbinical Bible there is a collection of *Oriental* and *Western* readings, or, in other words, *Babylonian* and *Palestinian*, communicated by the editor, and the result of an ancient revision of the text. The number is about 216. Of the sources from which the collection was drawn we are entirely ignorant. Judging by the contents, it must be older than many observations made by the Masoretes. It should probably be referred to a period anterior to the introduction of the vowel system, as it contains no allusion to the vowels. It is certainly of considerable value, and proves that the Oriental no less than the Western Jews had always attended to the state of the sacred text. In addition to this list, we meet with another in the *Rabbinical Bibles* of Bomberg and Buxtorf, and in the sixth volume of the *London Polyglot*, belonging to the eleventh century. It owes its origin to the labors of Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali, the respective presidents of academies in Palestine and Babylon. These readings, with a single exception, refer to the vowels and accents. The vowel system had therefore been completed when this collection was made.

Here the history of the unprinted text may be said to close. The old unvowelled copies perished. New ones furnished with points and accents came into use. But, although the ancient copies are now irrecoverably lost, there is no reason for supposing that their preservation to the present time would have had any essential influence in altering the form of the text. The text appears to have been established and settled when the punctuation system was completed. The labors of the Masoretic doctors have been of substantial benefit in maintaining its integrity.

4. *From the Invention of Printing to the present Time*. — There are three early editions from which all others have been taken.

1. That published at Soncino (A.D. 1488), which was the first entire copy of the Hebrew Scriptures ever printed. The text is furnished with the points and accents, but, we are ignorant of the MSS. employed by the editor.

2. The second great edition was that in the Complutensian Polyglot (1514 -17) taken from seven MSS.

3. The third was the second Rabbinical Bible of Bomberg, superintended by R. Jacob ben-Chayim (Venice, 1525, 6 vols. fol.). The text is formed chiefly after the Masora, but Spanish MSS. were used. Almost all modern printed copies have been taken from it. The Antwerp Polyglot has a text compounded of those in the second and third recensions just mentioned.

Among the editions furnished with a critical apparatus, that of Buxtorf, published at Basle 1619, occupies a high place. It contains the commentaries of the Jewish Rabbis Jarchi, Aben-ezra, Kimchi, Levi ben-Gerson, and Saadias Haggaon. The appendix is occupied with the Jerusalem Targum, the great Masora corrected and amended, with the various readings of Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali.

The other principal editions with various readings are those of Seb. Münster, Jablonski, Van der Hooght, J. H. Michaelis, C. F. Houbigant, and Benjamin Kennicott.

(1.) Münster's edition appeared at Basle in 1536, 2 vols. 4to. The text is supposed to be founded upon that of Brescia, 1494, 4to, which resolves itself into the Soncino edition of 1488.

(2.) Jablonski's edition was published at Berlin in 1699, 8vo, and again at the same place in 1712, 12mo. It is founded upon the best preceding editions, but chiefly the second edition of Leusden (1667). The editor also collated various MSS. The text is remarkably accurate.

(3.) Van der Hooght's edition appeared at Amsterdam 1705. The text is taken from Athias's (1661 and 1667). The Masoretic readings are given in the margin; and at the end are collected the various readings of the editions of Bomberg, Plantin, Athias, and others.

(4.) The edition published by J. H. Michaelis in 1720 is accompanied with the readings of twenty-four editions which the editor examined, besides those of five MSS. in the library at Erfurdt. There is a want of accuracy in his collations.

(5.) In 1753, C. F. Houbigant published a new edition in folio. The text is that of Van der Hooght, without the points. In the margin of the Pentateuch the Samaritan readings are added. For it he collated, but hastily, twelve MSS. He has justly been blamed for his rash indulgence in conjectural emendation.

(6.) Dr. Kennicott's edition, which is the most important hitherto published, appeared at Oxford, in folio — the first volume in 1776, the second in 1780. The number of MSS. collated by himself and his associates, the chief of whom was Professor Bruns of Helmstadt, amounted to 694. In addition to his collation of MSS. and printed editions, he followed the example of various editors of the Greek Testament in having recourse to Rabbinical writings, especially the Talmud. The immense mass of various readings here collected is unimportant. It serves, however, to show that, under the influence of the Masora, the Hebrew text has attained a considerable degree of uniformity in all existing MSS.

(7.) In 1784-88, John Bernard de Rossi published at Parma, in 4 vols. 4to, an important supplement to Kennicott's collection. These various readings were taken from 88 MSS. used by Kennicott and collated anew by De Rossi, from 479 in his own possession and 110 in other hands, from many editions and Samaritan MSS., and also from ancient versions.

(8.) In 1793, Doderlein and Meisner published at Leipzig an edition intended in some measure to supply the want of the extensive collations of Kennicott and De Rossi. It contains the most important readings. The edition of Jahn, published at Vienna in 1806, is very valuable and convenient.

(9.) The most accurate editions of the Masoretic text are those of Van der Hooght, as lately edited by Hahn and by Theile, at Leipzig, and stereotyped. The text of Van der Hooght may now be reckoned as the textus receptus. (For full lists of the printed editions of the Hebrew Bible, the reader is referred to Le Long's *Bibliotheca*, edited by Masch, and to Rosenmüller 's *Handbuchfur die Literatur der biblischen Kritik und Exegese*, 1:189-277. See also Darling's *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica* , vol. on the "Holy Scriptures," col. 45 sq.)

Notwithstanding all these editions, something is still wanted. In the best of them there are passages requiring emendation. It is curious to observe how contradictions are allowed to remain on the face of the Old-Testament history. It may be that the Masora has produced so great a uniformity that extant MSS. do not sanction any departure from the present text, but, where passages are manifestly corrupt, it is proper that they should be rectified. The criticism of the Hebrew Bible is still behind that of the Greek Testament. The latter was earlier begun, and has been more vigorously prosecuted. We remain nearly in the same state with regard to the Old-

Testament text as that in which Kennicott and De Rossi left us, and it is time that some advance should be made in this department. The only important recent work in this direction is Dr. S. Davidson's *Revision of the Hebrews Text of the O.T.* (London, 1855, 8vo). *SEE SCRIPTURES, HOLY*.

B. We shall now give a brief history of THE NEW TESTAMENT text in its *unprinted* and *printed* form. The criticism of the New Testament is rich in materials, especially in ancient MSS. But, although the history of New-Testament criticism records the industrious collection of a large amount of materials, it is not equally abundant in *well-accredited facts*, such as might be of essential benefit in enabling us to judge of the changes made in the text. History is silent respecting the period when the two parts of the New Testament, viz., the εὐαγγέλιον and ἀπόστολος, or, in other words, the four Gospels, and the Pauline and remaining epistles, were.put together, so as to form one whole. About the beginning of the third century, it is certain that all the books of the New Testament which we now possess were acknowledged to be divine and regarded as canonical. *SEE CANON*.

1. In the middle of the same century Hesychius and Lucian undertook to amend the MSS. of the New Testament. Of their critical labors Jerome seems not to have entertained a high opinion. The MSS. they revised did not meet with general approval, and pope Gelasius issued a decree against them. It is highly probable that they were not the authors of recensions which were widely circulated or generally adopted. Origen did not revise the text of the New Testament.

At a comparatively recent period certain internal marks were observed to belong to documents containing the same text. A similarity in characteristic readings was noticed. Bengel appears to have been the first to whom the idea suggested itself of dividing the materials according to the peculiarities which he faintly perceived. It was afterwards taken up by Semler, and highly elaborated by Griesbach. Later editors and critics have endeavored to improve upon Griesbach's system. The different forms of text observed by Semler and Griesbach they called recensions, although the appellation of *family* is more appropriate. The subject of recensions, though frequently discussed, is not settled. In the history of the *unprinted* text it is the chief topic which comes before the inquirer. Reserving it for future notice, *SEE RECENSIONS*, We pass to the history of the printed text, and the efforts made to emend it.

2. The *whole* of the New Testament was first printed

(1.) in the Complutensian Polyglot, 1514, fol. (vol. v), though not published till 1517. The first published was

(2.) that of Erasmus, at Basle, in 1516, 2 vols. in 1, fol. Both were issued independently of one another, and constitute the basis of the *received text*. Yet the best materials were not employed in preparing them, and on both the Vulgate was allowed to exert an undue influence. Even critical conjecture was resorted to by Erasmus. No less than five impressions were published by Erasmus, into the *third* of which <GIH>1 John 5:7, was first put. In the last two he made great use of the Complutensian Polyglot.

(3.) The third place among the early editors of the Greek Testament has been assigned to Robert Stephens, whose first edition was printed at Paris (1546, 12mo), chiefly taken from the Complutensian, and generally styled the *Mirifica* edition, from the commencement of the preface. His second edition was published in 1549; the third in 1550, in folio. In this last he followed the fifth of Erasmus, with which he compared fifteen MSS., and the Complutensian Polyglot. In 1551 appeared another edition, accompanied by the Vulgate and the translation of Erasmus. It is remarkable for being the first into which the division of verses was introduced.

(4.) The next person that contributed to the criticism of the Greek Testament was Theodore Beza. The text of his first edition (1565, folio) was the same as that of the third of Stephens, altered in about fifty places, accompanied with the Vulgate, a Latin version of his own, and exegetical remarks. In his second edition (1582) he had the benefit of the Syriac version and two ancient codices. A third impression appeared in 1589, and a fourth in 1598. The *Elzevir* editions exhibit partly the text of the third of Stephens, and partly that of Beza. The first appeared at Leyden in 1624. The second edition of 1633 proclaims its text to be the *textus receptus*, which it afterwards became. Subsequently three other editions issued from the same press. The editor does not appear to have consulted any Greek MSS. All his readings are either in Beza or Stephens. The Elzevir editions are all in 12mo.

(5.) Brian Walton, the learned editor of the London Polyglot, gave a more copious collection of various readings in the sixth volume of that work than had before appeared, which was further enlarged by Dr. Fell, in his

edition, published at Oxford in 1675, and reprinted by Gregory in 1703, folio. *SEE POLYGLOTS*.

(6.) Dr. John Mill, encouraged and supported by Fell, gave to the world a new edition in 1707, folio. The text is that of Stephens's third edition. In it the editor exhibited, from Gregory's MSS., a much greater number of readings than is to be found in any former edition. He revised and increased the extracts formerly made from ancient versions. Nor did he neglect quotations from the fathers. It is said that the work contains thirty thousand various readings. This important edition, so far superior to every preceding one, cost the laborious editor the toilsome study of thirty years, and excited the prejudices of many who were unable to appreciate its excellence. It constituted a new era in the criticism of the New Testament. Ludolph Kuster reprinted Mill's Greek Testament at Amsterdam in 1710, enriching it with the readings of twelve additional MSS. The first attempt to emend the *textus receptus* was made by John Albert Bengel, abbot of Alpirspach. His edition appeared at Tubingen (quarto, 1734), to which was prefixed his "Introductio in crisin Novi Testamenti." Subjoined is an *apparatus criticus*, containing his collection of various reading, chiefly taken from Mill, but with important additions.

(7.) Dr. John James Wetstein contributed, in no small degree, to the advancement of sacred criticism, by his large edition of the Greek Testament, published at Amsterdam in 1751-2, 2 vols. folio. In 1730 he had published prolegomena. It was his desire to give a new and corrected text, but he was compelled by circumstances to exhibit the textus receptus. Yet he noted, partly in the text itself, partly in the inner margin, such readings as he preferred. His collection of various readings, with their respective authorities, far exceeds all former works of the same kind in copiousness and value. He collated anew many important MSS. that had been superficially examined, gave extracts from many for the first time, and made use of the Harclean (improperly called the Philoxenian) version, hitherto uncollated. For convenience he marked the *uncial* MSS. with the letters of the alphabet, and the *cursive* with numerical letters. His exegetical notes are chiefly extracts from Greek, Latin, and Jewish writers. The edition of the Greek Testament under consideration is indispensable to every critic, and will always be reckoned a marvellous monument of indomitable energy and unwearied diligence. The *Prolegomena* contain a treasure of sacred learning that will always be prized by the scholar. They were republished, with valuable notes, by Semler (1774, 8vo).

(8.) The scholar who is pre-eminently distinguished in the history of New-Testament criticism is Dr. John James Griesbach. He enriched the materials collected by Wetstein with new and important additions, by collating MSS., versions, and early ecclesiastical writers, particularly Origen, with great labor. The idea of *recensions*, recommended by Bengel and Semler, he adopted; and carried out with much acuteness and sagacity. His first edition appeared at Halle (2 vols. 8vo, 1774-5). The first three gospels were synoptically arranged, but in 1777 he published them in their natural order. The text is founded on a comparison of the copious materials which he possessed. Nothing was adopted from conjecture, and nothing received which had not the sanction of codices as well as versions. A select number of readings is placed beneath the text. In his *Symboloe Criticae* he gave an account of his critical labors, and of the collations of new authorities he had made. Such was the commencement of Griesbach's literary labors.

(9.) Between the years 1782-88, C. F. Matthaei published a new edition of the Greek Testament at Riga, in 12 vols. 8vo. His text was founded on a collation of more than 100 Moscow MSS., which he first examined. It is accompanied with the Vulgate, *scholia*, and *excursus*. He avowed himself an enemy to the idea of *recensions*, despised the ancient MSS. (especially cod. Bezae) and the quotations of the fathers, while he unduly exalted his Moscow MSS. His chief merit lies in the careful collation he made of a number of MSS. hitterto unknown.

(10.) Before the completion of Matthaei's edition appeared that of Alter (Vindob. 1786-7, 2 vols. 8vo). The text is that of the Vienna MS., with which he collated 22 others in the Imperial library. To these he added readings from the Coptic, Slavonian, and Latin versions.

(11.) In 1788, Professor Birch, of Copenhagen, enlarged the province of sacred criticism by his splendid edition of the four Gospels in folio and quarto. The text is a reprint of Stephens's third, but the materials appended to it are highly valuable. They consist of extracts taken by himself and Moldenhauer, in their travels, from many MSS. not examined by Wetstein, and of Alter's selections from the Jerusalem-Syriac version discovered in the Vatican. Birch was the first who carefully collated the *Codex Vaticanus*. The publication of the second volume was prevented by a fire that destroyed many of the materials. In 1798 he published his various readings on the remainder of the New Testament, except the Apocalypse. In 1800 he published those relating to this book also.

(12.) In 1796 appeared the first volume of a new and greatly-improved edition of Griesbach's New Testament. For it he made extracts from the Armenian, Slavonic, Latin, Sahidic, Coptic, and other versions, besides incorporating into his collection the results of the labors of Matthaei, Alter, and Birch. The second volume appeared in 1806, both published at Halle, in 8vo. At the end of the second volume is a dissertation on 1 John 5:7. The work was reprinted at Leipzig, 1803-7, in four splendid 4to vols.; also at London in 1809, and again in 1818, 2 vols. 8vo. The prolegomena are exceedingly valuable. This edition cannot be too highly rated. It is indispensable to every critic and intelligent theologian.

(13.) In 1827, many new materials having been procured since the date of Griesbach's last edition, it was thought necessary to publish a third. It appeared accordingly, under the superintendence of Dr. Schulz, at Berlin, in 8vo. The first volume contains the prolegomena and the Gospels. It exhibits various readings from about 20 new sources, many corrections of Griesbach's references and citations, besides considerable improvements in other respects. The second volume has not been published.

The editions of Knapp, Schott, Tittmann, Vater, Nabe, and Göschen are chiefly founded upon that of Griesbach. Of these the most esteemed is that of Knapp, which has passed through five editions, and is characterized by sound judgment, especially in the punctuation and accents.

(14.) In 1830 appeared the first volume of a large critical edition, superintended by Dr. J. Martin Augustus Scholz, professor at Bonn, containing the Gospels. The second volume, in 1836, completed the work. Both are in quarto. The editor spent twelve years of incessant labor in collecting materials for the work, and traveled into many countries for the purpose of collating MSS. The prolegomena prefixed to the first volume occupy 172 pages, and contain ample information respecting all the codices, versions, fathers, acts of councils, etc., etc., which are used as authorities, together with a history of the text, and an exposition of his classification system. In the inner margin are given the general readings characteristic of the three great families. The total number of MSS. which he has added to those previously collated is 606. Little reliance, however, can be placed on the accuracy of the extracts which he has given for the first time. His researches have tended to raise the textus receptus higher than Griesbach placed it. In consequence of his preferring the Constantinopolitan family, his text comes nearer the Elzevir edition anthan

that of Griesbach. The merits of this laborious editor are considerable. He has greatly enlarged our critical apparatus. Yet in acuteness, sagacity, and scholarship he is far inferior to Griesbach. His collations appear to have been superficial. They are not to be depended on. Hence the text can not command the confidence of Protestant critics. We can not believe, with the editor, that the Byzantine family is equal in value or authority to the Alexandrine, which is confessedly more ancient, nor can we put his junior codices on a level with the very valuable documents of the Oriental recension. His text is, *on the whole*, inferior to that of Griesbach. In a few important passages only it is superior.

(15.) The edition of Lachmann, though small in compass, deserves to be especially mentioned. It was published at Berlin in 1831, 12mo. The editor says that he has nowhere followed his own judgment, but *the usage of the Oriental churches*. The text of Laohmann has been well received in Germany, and much importance has been attached to it. From the authority it has obtained, it would appear that the Constantinopolitan text of Scholz is not very favorably regarded.

De Wette, in his *Introduction to the Bible*, shows a leaning towards the views of Lachmann. Rinck coincides, on the whole, with the same. The last-named scholar has enlarged the critical apparatus of the New Testament by collating and describing several MSS. (*Lucubratio Critica in Acta Apost. epp. Cath. et Paulin.*, etc., etc., Basel, 1830, 8vo). There is also a large edition by Lachmann *(Novum Testamentum, Graece et Latine. Carolus Lachsinnnus recensuit. Phillppus Butt. mannus Ph. F. Graecce Lectionis auctoritates opposuit.* Tomus prior, Berolini. 1842, 8vo; tomus alter, ib. 1850).

The editions by this critic are by far the most important that have appeared since the days of Griesbach, and must produce results highly favorable to the advancement of New Testament criticism. The principles on which Lachmann proceeds were expounded in the *Theolog. Studien. und Kritiken* for 1830, p. 817-845, and again in 1835, p. 570 sq. The path which he first pursued in his smaller edition was indicated by Bentley, who purposed to publish the Greek Testament on similar principles. In order to discover his Oriental text (a text which is substantially the same as the Alexandrian), Lachmann makes use of the following authorities: 1. A, B, C, D, as also P, Q, T, Z, in the Gospels, and in the Pauline epistles, H in addition. 2. *Latin interpretations*, viz. in the Gospels the Vercellian, Veronian, Colbertine,

Cambridge; in the Acts the Cambridge and Laudian; in the Pauline epistles the Clermont, St. Germains, Boernerian; in the Apocalypse the Primasian. In addition to these, the Vulgate, as edited by Jerome, is everywhere employed. Of the fathers, he consults Irenneus, Ori en, Cyprian, Hilary, and Lucifer. The immense mass of later MSS. and fathers is entirely overlooked as useless. The authorities for the Greek readings are given below the text; and, when it is considered how few materials are employed, it will readily be supposed that the various readings noted are not numerous. They are however, most valuable and important. In addition to the Greek text and critical apparatus, the Hieronymian Vulgate is given, in the same form, as nearly as possible, in which it proceeded from Jerome, with important readings extracted from the Fuldensian Codex, from the same corrected by Victor, bishop of Capua, and from the Laurentian Codex. The great aim of the editor has been to exhibit a text in which the most ancient authorities are entirely agreed. Wherever this cannot be done with certainty, his critical apparatus shows the degree of probability attached to the text as given by him. To the volume is prefixed a preface of 55 pages (a few of them from Buttmann), in which the learned editor expounds his mode of procedure, and the authorities consulted. Respecting the opponents of his system, he does not speak in the most courteous or becoming language, nor is his Latinity the purest. Yet the preface is instructive withal, and *must be studied* by him who uses Lachmann's text. Were we disposed to follow the text of any one editor absolutely, we should follow Lachmann's. But it may be doubted whether he has not confined himself to a range of authorities too circumscribed. By keeping within the fourth century he has occasionally been compelled to rest upon one or two testimonies. We should therefore like to see more authorities consulted. We are persuaded, however, that this author has entered upon a right path of investigation, which will lead to results both permanently useful and unusually successful. The correctness of these principles, in the main, has been vindicated by the fact that later eminent critics have pursued essentially the same path.

(16.) Since the appearance of Lachmann's first edition, another has been published in Germany by Dr. Tischendorf (Leipzig, 1841, 8vo), which requires notice. It exhibits a corrected text, taken from the most ancient and best MSS., with the principal various readings, together with the readings of the Elzevir, Knapp, Scholz, and Lachmann editions. Great pains have manifestly been bestowed on the text and the critical apparatus subjoined to it. The prolegomena, consisting of 85 pages, are exceedingly

valuable. They treat of recensions, with an especial reference to Scholz's system; enumerate the readings peculiar to the third edition of Stephens and that of Mill, to the editions of Matthaei and Griesbach; and specify the critical materials employed in the elaboration of a pure text. A careful perusal of the editor's able preface, and a collation of his text and critical apparatus beneath it, have convinced us of the great candor, minute diligence, extreme accuracy, and admirable skill by which this edition of the Greek Testament is characterized.

In 1859, Tischendorf published the seventh edition of his Greek Testament (Lpz. 8vo), greatly enlarged and improved, from the materials which he had brought to light in the interim. A notable addition to the latter is the famous Sinaitic MS. (q.v.) discovered by him, and lately published, the results of the examination of which, together with those of the Codex Vaticanus recently given by cardinal Mai to the public, are embraced, with other fresh materials, in Tischendorf's eighth edition now in course of publication (Lpz. 1864, sq. 8vo).

(17.) A new and critical edition of the Greek Testament, accompanied by the old Latin version, has been begun by Dr. Tregelles, and issued in *fasciculi*, of which the Gospels have appeared (London, 4to). The editor aims at great accuracy in his authorities. His text, however, shows defective judgment, and relies too exclusively on a few ancient MSS. It will be a valuable contribution, however, to sacred criticism.

(18.) Alford's *Greek Testament* (London, 1853-61, 5 vols. 8vo) contains a revised text and a copious critical apparatus, mostly compiled, however, from Tischendorf, and marked by too great a leaning to subjective or internal evidence.

(19.) Mr. Scrivener's critical labors on the Greek Testament deserve mention in this connection for their accurate research. An account of them may be found in his *Introduction* (Cambr. 1861, 8vo).

III. The operations of sacred criticism have established the genuineness of the Old and New-Testament texts in every matter of importance. All the doctrines and duties remain unaffected by its investigations. It has proved that there is no material corruption in the inspired records. It has shown that during the lapse of many centuries the Holy Scriptures have been preserved in a surprising degree of purity. The text is substantially in the same condition as that in which it was found seventeen hundred years ago.

Let the plain reader take comfort to himself when he reflects that the received text which he is accustomed to read is *substantially* the same as that which men of the greatest learning and the most unwearied diligence have elicited from an immense heap of documents.

For a copious account of the various editions of the Greek Testament the reader is referred to Le Long's *Bibliotheca*, edited by Masch; or to Rosenmüller's *Handbuch ftr die Literatur der biblischen Kritik und Exegese*, 1, p. 278-422; or to Tregelles's *Account of the printed Text of the Gr. New Test*. (Lond. 1854). A pretty full list may be found in Dalling's *Cyclopoedia Bibliog.* col. 51 sq. See also an article on the "*Manuscripts and Editions of the New Testament*," by Moses Stuart, in Robinson's *Bibliotheca Sacra*, No. 2, May, 1843; Davidson's *Lectures on Biblical Criticism* (2 vols. 8vo, Edinb. and Bost. 1852). *SEE BIBLE*.

Croatia and Slavonia

a united province of the Austrian empire; area 9800 square miles; population in 1857, 865,403. The inhabitants are of Slavonian descent, and mostly belong to the Roman Catholic religion (in 1851, 770,656 Roman Catholics, and 88,331 United Greeks). There were, besides, 386 Lutherans, 4445 Reformed, 718 Greeks, 6 Unitarians, and 3914 Jews. Crotia is considered a part of Hungary, but formerly possessed some privileges; among others, to exclude Protestants from its borders. In 1866 the Croatian Diet passed resolutions in favor of religious toleration.

Crocius, Johannes

a German theologian, was born at Laasphe July 28, 1590; studied at Herborn and Marburg, and graduated in 1608. In 1612 he became court preacher of the Landgrave Moritz at Cassel, doctor of divinity in 1613, and in 1616 preacher at Konigsberg. Returning to Marburg, he became professor of Theology in the University. He was the leader of the evangelical state Church of Hesse-Cassel, and the Lutheran having overcome the Reformed Church, he fled to Cassel in 1624; but after the peace in 1653, he returned and became rector of the University. He died July 1,1659. His principal works are, *Erronea dogmata novorumn Arianorum in Polonia* (Bremen, 1612, 8vo); *Pacis et concordiea evangelicorum sacra defensio* (Marburg, 1623, 8vo); *Anti-Becanus i.e. controversiarum communium, quas Mart. Becanus Catholicis, Lutheri ac Calvini nomine perperam discretis, in Manuali. movit examen, ex S. S. et*

antiquitate institutum (Cassel, 1643,2 vols. 4to); *Anti-Becani alfoguntinorum theologorum calumniis justa vindicatio* (Marburg, 1654); *Anti-Weigelius* (Cassel, 1651). — Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 3, 187.

Crocodile

Picture for Crocodile

an animal doubtless referred to under the name *Leviathan* (ˆ t yw]l) in the famous description of <1840>Job 41 (<1802>Job 40:25-41), of which the following is a close rendering:

Canst thou draw out Leviathan with a hook,
Or with a cord canst thou press down his tongue?
Say, canst thou put a rush-[rope] in his nose,
Or with a tholn-[hook] canst thou bore his jaw?
Will he multiply to thee supplications;
Supposest thou he will speak to thee soft [things]?
Will he ratify a covenant with thee?
Wilt thou take him for a servant [for] ever?
Wilt thou play with him as with the sparrow,
Or tie him for thy maidens?
Shall there dig [a pit] for him partners,
[And] share him between Canaanites [i.e. merchants]?
Canst thou fill with darts his skin,
Or with a fish-spear [i.e. harpoon] his head?
Lay upon him [but] thy hand
Thou wilt remember battle no more!
Lo! his [i.e. the assailant's] hope has been belied:
At the very sight of him will he be prostrated?
None [so] bold that will rouse him!
(Then who [is] he [that] before Me shall take a stand?
Who has anticipated me [in giving], that I should repay?
Under the whole heavens to me [belongs] that!)
I will not pass in silence his members,
And famed strength, and beauteous armature.
Who has disclosed the surface of his covering?
In his double [row] of grinders who can enter?
The valves of his face who has opened?
The circuits of his teeth [are] frightful!
A pride [are his] strong shields [i.e. scales],
Shut [with] a close seal:

One in [the] other will they join,
And a breath cannot come between them:
Each in its fellow will adhere
They will cling together that they cannot be parted
[At] his sneezings a light will flash,
And his eyes [are] like the lashes of dawn:
From his mouth will flames proceed;
Sparks of fire will escape:
From his nostrils a smoke will go,
Like a pot blown with [blazing] reeds:
His breath-coals will it kindle,
And a flame from his mouth will go.
In his neck force shall lodge,
And before him terror shall run.
The flaps of his flesh have stuck [fast];
Solid upon him, it cannot be shaken:
His heart [is] solid like a stone,
Even solid like [the] under mill-stone,
From his rising [the] mighty shall fear,
From terrors they shall stray.
[One] hitting him [with the] sword, it will not at all stand [the shock]
Lance, dart, or mail:
He will regard as straw, iron;
As rotten wood, copper:
The bow-shotcannot make him flee,
To chaff have sling-stones been changed for him.
Like chaff clubs have been regarded [by him],
And he will laugh at the brandishing of the javelin.
Under him [are] points [as] of pottery,
He will strew [his spiked belly like] a threshing-sledge upon [the] mud:
He will cause [the] deep to boil like the poti
[The] sea he will make like the unguent-kettle:
Behind him lie will illuminate a path;
[One] would regard [the] main as hoary.
[There is] not upon [the] dust his ruler
The [one] made without dismayt
Everything lofty will he behold.
He, [the] king over all the sons of pride [i.e. larger beasts].

This description is in the main strikingly applicable to animals of the alligator tribe, although highly colored in the poetic style. Yet, as observed with regard to the associated animal, *SEE BEHEMOTH*, the phraseology is

perhaps rather intended generically for large amphibious monsters of the saurian or lizard family, than for anyone creature distinctively; a conclusion that is confirmed by the employment of the Hebrews term leviathan to other animals of the fishy and reptile kinds. Indeed, as in the case of the hippopotamus, despite the formidable attributes ascribed to the beast in question by the writer in Job, it appears to have been attacked without much fear by the ancients; and although held sacred in some parts of Egypt, where it is especially found, in other nomes it was hunted successfully (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg*. 1:241 sq.). The crocodile, however, is apparently elsewhere definitely referred to in Scripture by other names, especially as the *reed-beast* (Psalm 68:31; see Schramm, *De bestia arundineti*, F. ad O. 1713). *SEE RAHAB*.

"The crocodiles, constituting the order *Loricata* among reptiles, are distinguished pre-eminently by the character noticed in Holy Writ. They are clothed on the entire upper parts of the body with distinct series of bones, imbedded in the substance of the skin, and for the most part furnished with a ridge or crest, which greatly augments their strength, and constitutes the whole a coat of plate-mail which is able to resist the assaults of the most powerful enemy. The structure of the skull is remarkably solid, and it is surmounted by bony crests. There is a single row of teeth in each side of each jaw, locking into each other. The gape is enormous; the lips are altogether wanting, so that the teeth are visible when the mouth is closed; hence the animal, even when tranquil, seems to be grinning with rage. The tongue is fleshy, flat, but free only at the extreme edge, the inferior surface being adherent to the chin and throat; hence the crocodile has been erroneously represented as tongueless.

"All the species of this order are of huge size: not only are they the hugest of reptiles, but they are among the most gigantic of all animals. Crocodiles have been described as attaining a length of twenty-five feet, but no specimens have been brought to Europe of nearly that size. They are probably long-lived, and perhaps their increase of dimensions is commensurate with their age. Highly carnivorous and predaceous, fierce and cunning, they are greatly dreaded in all the tropical regions which they inhabit. Lurking in the dense reeds or tangled herbage that grows rank and teeming at the edges of rivers in hot climates, or under the mangroves that interweave their myriad roots in arches above the water, or concealed among the bleaching trunks and branches of trees that have fallen into the stream, these huge reptiles watch for the approach of a living prey, or feed

at leisure on the putrid carcasses with which the waters daily supply them. It is even affirmed that they prefer a condition of putrescence in their prey, and that their practice, when not pressed by immediate hunger, is, on seizing a living prey to plunge into the stream in order to drown it, after which it is dragged away to some hole, and stored until decomposition has commenced.

“Among the decorations of the palace of Shalmaneser, M. Botta discovered a bas-relief continued over five slabs, and representing a great naval expedition against a maritime city. A fleet of ships transport timber along a coast washed by the sea, and studded with fortified islands-perhaps the siege of Tyre by this Assyrian monarch. The sea is represented as filled with various marine animals, such as fishes of various forms, turtles, turbinate shells, crabs, and *crocodiles* (*Mon. de Ninive*). This, it is true, may have been but a license of the artist; but Mr. Lyell, in his *Principles of Geology*, observes that the gavial, a larger species than the crocodile of the Nile, inhabiting the Ganges, descends beyond the brackish water of the delta to the sea. And other species of the genus Crocodilus (as restricted) are frequently known not only to haunt the mouths of rivers, but even to swim among islands, and pass from one to another, though separated by considerable spaces of open sea.” See the *Penny Cyclopaedia*, s.v. *SEE LEVIATHAN*.

“The crocodiles consist of three varieties, or perhaps species, all natives of the Nile, distinguishable by the different arrangement of the scutae or bony studs on the neck, and the number of rows of the same processes along the back. Their general lizard-form is too well known to need particular description; but it may be remarked that of the whole family of crocodiles, comprehending the sharp-beaked gavials of India, the alligators of the West, and the crocodiles properly so called, the last are supplied with the most vigorous instruments for swimming, both from the strength and vertical breadth of their tails, and from the deeper webs of the fingers of their paws. Although all have from thirty to forty teeth in each jaw, shaped like spikes, without breadth so as to cut, or surface so as to admit of grinding, the true crocodile alone has one or more teeth. on each side in both jaws, exerted, that is, not closing within, but outside the jaw. They have no external ear beyond a follicle of skin, and the eyes have a position above the plane of the head, the pupils being contractile, like those of a cat, and in some having a luminous greenish tinge, which may have suggested the comparison of the eyes of leviathan to ‘the eyelids of the dawn’ (Job

41:10 [A. V. 18]). The upper jaw is not movable, but, as well as the forehead, is extremely dense and bony; the rest of the upper surface being covered with several rows of bosses, or plated ridges, which on the tail are at last reduced from two to one, each scale having a high horny crest, which acts as part of a great fin. Although destitute of a real voice, crocodiles when angry produce a snorting sound, something like a deep growl [or rather grunt]; and occasionally they open the mouth very wide, remain for a time thus exposed facing the breeze, and, closing the jaws with a sudden snap, cause a report like the fall of a trap-door. It is an awful sound in the stillness of the night in tropical countries. The gullet of the crocodile is very wide, the tongue being completely tied to the lower jaw, and beneath it are glands exuding a musky substance. On land the crocodile, next to the gavial, is the most active, and in the water it is also the species that most readily frequents the open sea. Of the immense number of genera examined, none reached to 25 feet in length, and the specimen in the British Museum is believed to be one of the largest. Sheep are observed to be unmolested by these animals; but where they abound no pigs can be kept, perhaps from their frequenting the muddy shores; for we have known only one instance of crocodiles being encountered in woods not immediately close to the water's side: usually they bask on sandy islands. They rarely attack men, but women are sometimes seized by them: in Nubia they are much more dangerous than in Egypt. (See Wilkinson's *Modern Egypt and Thebes*, 2:127.) As their teeth are long, but not fitted for cutting, they seize their prey, which they can not masticate, and swallow it nearly entire, or bury it beneath the waves to macerate. Having very small excretory organs, their digestion requires, and accordingly they are found to possess, an immense biliary apparatus. They are oviparous, burying their eggs in the sand; and the female remains in the vicinity to dig them out on the day the young have broken the shell. Crocodiles are caught with hooks, and they seldom succeed in cutting the rope when properly prepared. Though a ball fired point blank will penetrate between the scales which cover the body, the invulnerability of these great saurians is sufficiently exemplified by the following occurrence. One being brought well bound to the bazaar at Cawnpore on the Ganges, it was purchased by the British officers on the spot, and carried farther inland for the purpose of being baited. Accordingly, the ligatures, excepting those which secured the muzzle, being cut asunder, the monster, though it had been many hours exposed to the heat, and was almost suffocated with dust, fought its way through an immense crowd of assailants, soldiers and natives, armed with

staves, lances, swords, and stones, and worried by numerous terriers, hounds, and curs; overturning all in its way, till, scenting the river, it escaped to the water at a distance of two miles, in spite of the most strenuous opposition!

"With the ancient Egyptians the crocodile was a sacred animal, not, however, one of those revered by the whole nation, but only locally held in honor. Of old it was found in Lower as well as Upper Egypt; now it is restricted to the latter region, never descending as low as Cairo, and usually not being seen until the traveler approaches the Thebais. In hieroglyphics it bears the name *msuh*, literally 'in the egg,' as though expressing surprise that so great an animal should issue from so small an egg. From this name the Coptic and Arabic names take their origin. The crocodile was sacred to the god Sebak, represented with the head of this animal and the body of a man, and of uncertain place in the Egyptian mythology. It was not only not worshipped throughout Egypt, but was as much hated in some as venerated in other parts of the country: thus in the Ombite nome it was worshipped, and hunted in the Apollinopolite and Tentyrite nomes. The worship of this animal is no doubt of Nigritian origin, like all the low nature-worship of Egypt. It is not certain that the crocodile was an emblem of the king with the Egyptians, but it seems probable that this was the case.

"There is evidence that the crocodile was found in Syria at the time of the Crusades. A reptile of this kind has lately been discovered in the Nahr el-kelb, the ancient Lycus.

"The exploit of Dieudonné de Bozon, knight of St. John, who, when a young man, slew the dragon of Rhodes, an exploit which Schiller has celebrated in his 'Kampf mit dem Drachen,' must be regarded as a combat with a crocodile, which had probably been carried northward by the regular current of the eastern Mediterranean; for so the picture still extant in the harem of a Turkish inhabitant represents the Hayawan Keber, or Great Beast — a picture necessarily painted anterior to the expulsion of the knights in 1480. As De Bozon died Grand Master of the Order at Rhodes in 1353, and the spoils of the animal long remained hung up in a church, there is not, we think, any reason to doubt the fact, though most of the recorded circumstances may be fabulous. *SEE DRAGON*. All the ancient Greek and the later Mediterranean dragons, as those of Naples, Arles, etc.,

where they are not allegorical or fictitious, are to be referred to the crocodile.” *SEE LIZARD*.

Crocodilopolis

(κροκοδείλων πόλις), the name of a town in Syria, situated near a river of the same name (*Crocodilon flumen*, between Caesarea Palaestinae and Ptolemais (Strabo, 16, p. 758; Pliny, 5. 17, 19). Reland (*Palaest*. p. 739) thinks the latter may have been the same with the SHIHOR-LIBNATH *SEE SHIHOR-LIBNATH* (q.v.) of Joshua 19:26. It is now identified with the *Nahr Zerka* (Raumer,, *Palast*. p. 53,191), in which crocodiles have been found (Pococke, *Travels*, 2:58; Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2:244).

Croes John, D.D.,

Protestant Episcopal bishop of New Jersey, was born June 1, 1762, and ordained in 1790. Having previously acted as lay reader in the P. E. church of Swedesborough, N. J., he became its rector in 1792. He was a prominent member in the Convention of New Jersey for forty years. In 1801 he became rector of Christ Church, New Brunswick, and of St. Peter’s Church, Spotswood. In 1811 he was made D.D. by Columbia College, and in 1815 was chosen bishop of New Jersey, having declined the episcopate of Connecticut. From the time of his consecration he observed a system of annual visitations, and his last public act was an ordination in Christ Church, New Brunswick. He died July 26, 1832. He published several charges to his clergy, and a sermon on *The Duty and the Interest of contributing liberally to the Promotion of Religious and Benevolent Institutions*. — Sprague, *Annals*, v. 378.

Croft George, D.D.,

an English divine, was born at Skipton, Yorkshire, in 1747; admitted at University College, Oxford, in 1762, was elected scholar in 1768, and fellow in 1779. In the same year he became vicar of Arncliffe, Yorkshire; in 1791, lecturer of St. Martin’s, Birmingham, and finally rector of Thwing in 1802. He died in 1809. He wrote *Thoughts concerning the Methodists and the Established Clergy* (London, 1795, 8vo): — *Eight Sermons preached in 1786* (Oxf. 1786, 8vo): — *Sermons preached before the University of Oxford* (Birming. 1811, 2 vols. 8vo). — Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica* , s.v.

Crofton, Zachary

a learned Nonconformist in the seventeenth century, was born and educated in Dublin. He obtained the living of Wrensbury, Cheshire, but, being a zealous Royalist during the Commonwealth, and refusing the engagement, he was deprived. He afterwards obtained the living of St. Botolph, Aidgate, London. He was ejected for nonconformity in 1662, and died in 1672. He published *The Saint's Care for Church Communion* (Lond. 1671, sm. 8vo): *Altar Worship* (Lond. 1661, 24mo). — Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica* , s.v.

Croisiers Order of.

SEE CROSS, ORDER OF.

Croly George, LL.D.,

an English divine and writer, was born in Dublin, August, 1780, and educated at Trinity College. After his ordination he went to London, and spent some years as a writer for the newspaper press. In 1835 he was appointed rector of St. Stephen's, Walbrook, and he occupied that parish with great credit, both as preacher and pastor, up to the day of his death, Nov. 24, 1860. Dr. Croly wrote several extravagant novels and tragedies, among them *Salathiel*, *Marston*, and *Catiline*. His better reputation rests upon his fidelity and power as a preacher, after his appointment to St. Stephen's, and upon his religious writings, the more important of which are, *Divine Providence, or the thee Cycles of Revelation* (Lond. 1834, 8vo): — *The Apocalypse: Prophecy of the Rise, Progress, and Fall of the Church of Rome* (3d ed., Lond. 1838, 8vo): — *The Popish Primacy, 2 sermons* (Lond. 1850, 8vo): — *Sermons* (1848, 8vo). He also wrote a *Life of Burke* and a *Life of George IV*, both reprinted in America.

Crombie Alexander, LL.D.,

was born at Aberdeen in 1760, and was educated at Marischal College. He became pastor of a Presbyterian congregation in London, and kept a private school at Highgate, and afterwards at Greenwich, with distinguished success. He died in 1842. His principal works are, *Natural Theology*, or *Essays on the Existence of the Deity, etc.* (Lond. 1829, 2 vols. 8vo): — *SEE GYMNASIUM*, *SEE SIVE SYMBOLA CRITICA*, 5th

ed. 1834, 2 vols. 8vo; abridged, 1836, 12mo): *A Defence of Philosophical Necessity* (1793, 8vo). — Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica* , s.v.

Cromlech

a huge flat and oblong stone, placed in a sloping position, and supported by pillars of unhewn and perpendicular stones. There were many of them at one time in Ireland, and they are supposed to have been Druidic altars for sacrifice. Their massiveness has defied the ravages of time and revolutions, while the simplicity of their structure bespeaks for them a high antiquity. There is one of them yet in Glansworth, Ireland, which forms a chamber of 25 feet long and 6 feet wide. Mr. Moore (*History of Ireland*) says that remotely they were called in Irish “Bothals, houses of God.” The Druids in ancient Ireland had no temples. Instead of them, on a bill, in an oaken grove, and, if possible, near a flowing stream, they enclosed a circle, having a diameter of 70 or 100 feet, and in the center of it raised the cromlech, around which, on certain days, the people marched, and always in the direction of the sun. *SEE DRUIDS*; *SEE ALTAR*.

Crook-backed

(ˆBeegibben’, *gibbous*), a hunchbacked or deformed person (Leviticus 21:21). *SEE BLEMISH*.

Crop

(harmu, *murah’*, implying *fullfeeding*), the craw of a bird (Leviticus 1:16). *SEE SACRIFICE*.

Crosier

Picture for Crosier

(or CROZIER), properly an archbishop’s staff, terminating at the top in a floriated cross, as shown in the subjoined illustration of archbishop Warham’s crosier (1520) in the cathedral of Canterbury, England. It is gilt, sometimes even of gold. The term crosier is also applied to the bishop’s staff, which is surmounted by a crook or curved circular head. This “pastoral staff,” in the Roman Church, is carried before bishops, abbots, and abbesses as an ensign, expressive of their dignity while they are exercising the functions of their office, and the figure of which is also found in their coat of arms. The origin of the crosier is the shepherd’s

crook, the bishops being regarded as the pastors of their dioceses. By degrees this humble emblem became greatly adorned, and was made of costly materials. Some suppose the crosier to have been originally only a simple staff, which, from the earliest times, was given to judges, kings, etc., as an emblem of authority. St. Isidore says bishops bear the staff because it is their duty to correct the erring and to support the weak. *SEE STAFF*.

Cross

(σταυρός, a pointed *stake*, prob. from ἵστημι, to *stand* upright), in the New. Test., signifies properly the instrument of crucifixion; and hence (by metonymy) crucifixion itself, namely, that of Christ (<49216>Ephesians 2:16; <581202>Hebrews 12:2; <46117>1 Corinthians 1:17,18; <48511>Galatians 5:11; 6:12,14; <50318>Philippians 3:18). It is also put figuratively (in the phrases "take up [or bear] the cross," etc.) for any severe suffering, including the idea of exposure to contumely and death (<40108>Matthew 10:38; 16:24; <40834>Mark 8:34; 10:21; <42923>Luke 9:23; 14:27). (See below.)

I. *Designations*. — Except the Latin crux there was no word definitively and invariably applied to this instrument of punishment. The Greek word σταυρός properly, like σκόλοψ, means merely a stake (Homer, *Od*. 14:11; II. 24:453). So Eustathius and Hesychius both define it. The Greeks use the word to translate both *palus* and *crux*; e.g. σταυρῷ προσδεῖν in *Dion. Cass*. (49. 22) is exactly equivalent to the Latin *ad palum deligare*. In Livy even *crux* means a mere stake (28. 29), just as *vice versa* the fathers use σκόλοψ, and even *stipes*, of a cross proper. In consequence of this vagueness of meaning, impaling (Herod. 9:76) is sometimes spoken of, loosely, as a kind of crucifixion, and ἀνασκολοπίζειν is nearly equivalent to ἀνασταυροῦν (Seneca, *Consol. ad Marc*. 20; and *Ep*. 14). Other words occasionally applied to the cross are *patibulum* and *furca*, pieces of wood in the shape of II or Y and A respectively (Dig. 48, tit. 13; *Plautus Mil. Gl*. 2:47; and Sallust, *fr. ap. Non*. 4:355, seems clearly to imply crucifixion). After the abolition of this mode of death by Constantine, Trebonianus substituted *furca figendos* for *crucifigendos* wherever the word occurred. More generally the cross is called *arbor infelix* (Livy, 1:26; Seneca, *Ep*. 101), or *lignum infelix* (Cicero, *pro Rab*. 3);and in Greek ξύλον (Sept. at <052122>Deuteronomy 21:22): comp. "the accursed tree." The fathers in controversy used to quote the words ὁ Κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν, "The Lord reigned" (ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου), from <199610>Psalm 45:10, or Psalm 96, as a prophecy of the cross; but these words are a gloss (adulterina et

Christiana devotione addita), though Geuebrardus thought them a prophetic addition of the Sept., and Agellius conjectures that they read /[e for ãai(Schleusner's *Thesaur.*). The Hebrews had no word for a cross more definite than /[e"wood" (01409Genesis 40:19, etc.), and so they called the transverse beams br,[wytæ] "warp and woof" (Pearson, *On the Creed*, art. 4), like ξύλον δίδυμον, of the Sept. Crux is the root of *crucio*, and is often used proverbially for what is most painful (as Colum. 1:7; Terence, Phorm. 3, 3, 11), and as a nickname for villains (Plautus, *Poan*. 2:5, 17). Rarer terms are ἴκριον (Eusebius, 8:8), σάνις (?), and *gabalus* (Varro ap. Non. 2:373; Macrinus ap. Capitol. *Macr*. 11). This last word is derived from lbg; "to complete."

II. *Forms of the Cross*. — In its simplest shape, consisting of two pieces of wood, one standing erect, the other crossing it at right angles, the cross was known at an early age in the history of the world. Its use as an instrument of punishment was probably suggested by the form so often taken by branches of trees, which seem to have been the first crosses that were employed. It was certainly customary to hang animals on trees. Cicero (*Rabir*. 3) appears to consider hanging on a tree and crucifixion as of the same import, and Seneca (*Ep*. 101) uses similar language. (See above.) Trees are known to have been used as crosses (Tertull. *Ap*. 8:16), and to every kind of hanging which bore a resemblance to crucifixion, such as that of Prometheus, Andromeda, etc., the name was commonly applied. Among the Scythians, Persians, Carthaginians, Greeks, Romans, and the ancient Germans, traces are found of the cross as an instrument of punishment. The sign of the cross is found as a holy symbol among several ancient nations, who may accordingly be named, in the language of Tertullian, "*crucis religiosos*," devotees of the cross. Among the Indians and Egyptians the cross often appears in their ceremonies, sometimes in the shape of the letter T, at others in this shape +. At Susa, Ker Porter saw a stone cut with hieroglyphics and cruciform inscriptions, on which in one corner was the figure of a cross, thus, $. The cross, he says, is generally understood to be symbolical of the divinity or eternal life, and certainly a cross was to be seen in the temple of Serapis as the Egyptian emblem of the future life, as may be learned in Sozomen and Rufinus. Porter also states that the Egyptian priests urged its being found on the walls of their temple of Serapis as an argument with the victorious army of Theodosius to save it from destruction. From the numerous writings on this subject by

La Croze, Jablonski, Zoega, Visconti, Pococke, Pluche, Petit Radel, and others, the symbol of the cross appears to have been most various in its significations. Sometimes it is the Phallus, sometimes the planet Venus, or the Nilometer, or an emblem of the four elements, or the seasons (Creuzer's *Symbolik*, p. 168-9). It is therefore not surprising that ancient and even modern Christian writers should on this subject have indulged in some degree of refinement and mysticism. Justin Martyr (*Apol*. 1, § 72) says, "The sign of the cross is impressed upon the whole of Nature. There is hardly a handicraftsman but uses the figure of it among the implements of his industry. It forms a part of man himself, as may be seen when he raises his hands in prayer." In like manner Minutius Felix (c. 29): "Even Nature itself seems to have formed this figure for us. We have a natural cross on every ship whose sails are spread, in every yoke that man forms, in every outspreading of his arms in prayer. Thus is the cross found both in the arrangements of Nature and among the heathen."

We may tabulate thus the various descriptions of cross. (Lipsius, *De Cruce*, 1; Godwyn's *Moses and Aaron*, lib. 5, cap. 9, and Carpzov's *Annotations* thereon):

Picture for Cross 1

1. The *crux simplex*, or mere stake "of one single piece without transom," was probably the original of the rest. Sometimes it was merely driven through the man's chest, but at other times it was driven longitudinally (Hesych. s.v. σκόλοψ), coming out at the mouth (Seneca, *Ep*. xiv), a method of punishment called ἀνασκινδύλευσις, or *infixio*. The *afixio* consisted merely of *tying* the criminal to the stake (*ad palum deligare*, Liv. 26:13), from which he hung by his arms: the process is described in the little poem of Ausonius, "*Cupido crucifixus*." Trees were naturally convenient for this purpose, and we read of their being applied to such use in the Martyrologies. Tertullian, too, tells us (*Apol*. 8:16) that the priests of Saturn were thus punished by Tiberius (comp. Tacit. *Germ*. 12).

2. The *crux decussata* is called St.Andrew's cross, although on no good grounds, since, according to some, he was killed with the sword; and Hippolytus says that he was crucified upright on an olive-tree. It is in the shape of the Greek letter X (Jerome, in *Jer*. 31; Isidor. *Orig*. 1:3). Hence Justin Martyr (*Dial. c. Tryph*. p. 200) quotes Plato's expression (ἐχίαζν ἀυτὸν ἐν τῷ πάντι) with reference to the cross. The fathers, with their

usual luxuriant imagination, discover types of this kind of cross in Jacob's blessing of Joseph's sons (χέρσιν ἐνηλλαγμέναις; comp. *Tert. de Baptismo*, 8); in the anointing of priests "decussatively" (Sir T. Browne, *Garden of Cyrus*); for the Rabbis say that priests were distinctively thus anointed (yk ^ymk, i.e. *adformam X Graecorum*, Schottgen's *Hor. Heb. et Talm*. 4, ad f.); and in the crossing of the hands over the head of the goat on the day of expiation (Targum. *Jonath. ad* Leviticus 16:21, etc.).

3. The *crux commissa*, or St. Anthony's cross (so called from being embroidered on that saint's cope; Mrs. Jameson's *Sacred Art*, 1, 35), was in the shape of a T. Hence Lucian (in his Δίκη φωνηέντων) jocosely derives σταυρός from the letter Ταῦ, and makes mankind accuse it bitterly for suggesting to tyrants the instrument of torture (*Jud. Vocal*. 12). This shape is often alluded to as "the mystical Tau" (Tertullian, *adv. Marc.* 3, 22; Jerome, in *Ezech*. 9, etc.). As that letter happens to stand for 300, opportunity was given for more elaborate trifling: thus the 300 cubits of the ark are considered typical (Clemens Alexand. *Strom*. 6; S. Paulin. *Ep*. 2); and even Abraham's 318 servants (!); since 318 is represented by τιη (Barnabas, *Ep*. 9; Clemens Alex. *Strom*. 6; Ambrose, Prol. in *l. i. de Fide*.; see Pearson, *On the Creed*, art. 4).

Picture for Cross 2

A variety of this cross (the *crux ansata*, "crosses with circles on their heads") is found in the sculptures from Khorsabad and the ivories from Nimrud. M. Lajard (*Observations sur la Croix ansee*) refers it to the Assyrian symbol of divinity, the winged figure in a circle; our Egyptian antiquaries quite reject the theory (Layard's *Nineveh*, 2:170, note). In the Egyptian sculptures, a similar object, called a *crux ansata*, is constantly borne by divinities, and is variously called "the key of the Nile" (Dr. Young in *Encycl. Britan*.), "the character of Venus," and more correctly (as by Lacroze) "the emblem of life." Indeed this was the old explanation (Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* 6:15; so, too, Rufinus [2. 29], who says it was one of the "ἱερατικαὶ *vel sacerdotales litterae*"). "The Egyptians thereby expressed the powers and motion of the spirit of the world, and the diffusion thereof upon the celestial and elemental nature" (Sir T. Browne, *Garden of Cyrus*). This, too, was the signification given to it by the Christian converts in the army of Theodosius, when they remarked it on the temple of Serapis, according to the story mentioned in Suidas. The same

symbol has been also found among the Copts, and (perhaps accidentally) among the Indians and Persians.

4. The *crux immissa* (or Latin cross) differed from the former by the projection of the upright post (δόρυ ὕψηλον, or *stipes*) above the transverse beam (κέρας ἐγκάρσιον, or *patibulum*, Eusebius, *de V. Constant*. 1:31). That this was the kind of cross on which our Lord died is obvious (among other reasons) from the mention of the "title" (q.v.), as placed *above* our Lord's head, and from the almost unanimous tradition; it is repeatedly found on the coins and columns of Constantine. Hence ancient and modern imagination has been chiefly tasked to find symbols for this sort of cross, and has been eminently successful. They find it typified, for instance, in the attitude of Moses during the battle of Rephidim (<02172>Exodus 17:12), saying that he was bidden to take this posture by the Spirit (Barnabas, *Ep*. 12; Justin *Mart. Dial. c. Tryph*. 89; Tertull. *adv. Marc*. 3, 18). *Firmicius Maternus* (*de Errore*, 21) says (from the Talmudists?) that Moses made a cross of his rod in order to secure greater success (*ut facilius impetraret quod magnopere postularet, crucem sibi fecit ex virgo*). He also fantastically applies to the cross expressions in <35303>Habakkuk 3:3-5; <23906>Isaiah 9:6, etc. Other supposed types are Jacob's ladder (Jerome, *Com. in Psalm* 91; Augustine, *Serm. de Temp*. 79); the paschal lamb, pierced by transverse spits (Justin Martyr, *Dial. c. Tryph.* 40); and "the Hebrew *Tenupha*, or ceremony of their oblations waved by the priest into the four quarters of the world after the form of a cross" (Vitringa, *Obs. Sacr*. 2:9; Schöttgen, 1. c.). A truer type (<43014>John 3:14) is the elevation (Chald. twpyqy) of the fiery serpent (<04208>Numbers 21:8, 9). For some strange applications of texts to this figure, see Cypr. *Testim*. 2:20 sq. In <40518>Matthew 5:18, the phrase "a single jot or tittle" is also made to represent a cross (Theophyl. ad loc., etc.). To the four ἄκοα or extremities of the cross they also applied the four dimensions of <49017>Ephesians 3:17 (as Gregory *Nyss. and Augustine*, Ephesians 120); and another of their fancies was that there was a mystical significance in this four-angled piece of wood (Nonnius, *in Joh*. 19:18), because it pointed to the four corners of the world (Sedul. 3). In all nature the sacred sign was found to be indispensable (Justin *Mart. Apol*. 1:72), especially in such things as involve dignity, energy, or deliverance; as: the actions of digging, plowing, etc., the human face, the antennce of a ship in full sail, etc. (Jerome, in *Marc*. 11; *Minutius Fel. Oct*. 29). Similar analogies are repeated elsewhere (*Firm. Maten. de Errore*, 21; Tertull. *adv. Nat*. 1:12; *Apol*. 16; *de Coron. Mil*. 3);

and, in answer to the sneers of those to whom the cross was "foolishness," they were considered sufficient proof of the universality of this sign, both in nature and religion. The types adduced from Scripture were valuable to silence the difficulties of the Jews, to whom, in consequence of Deuteronomy 21:22, the cross was an especial "stumbling-block" (Tertullian, *adv. Jud*. 9). Many such fancies (e.g. the harmlessness of cruciform flowers, the southern cross, etc.) are collected in *Communications with the Unseen World*.

Besides the four corners (ἄκρα, or *apices*, Tert.) of the cross was a fifth (πῆγμα), projecting out of the central stein, on which the body of the sufferer rested (Justin Mart. *Tryph*. 91, who [*nore suo*] compares it to the horn of a rhinoceros; *sedilis excessus*, Tertull. *adv. Nat*. 1:12; Iren. *adv. Haeres*. 1:12). This was to prevent the weight of the body from tearing awiay the hands, since it was impossible that it "should rest upon nothing but four great wounds" (Jeremy Taylor, Life of Christ, 3, 15:2). This projection is probably alluded to in the famous lines of Maecenas (ap. Sen. *Ep*. 101). Lipsius, however, thinks otherwise (*De Cruce*, 1:6). Whether there was also a ὑποπόδιον, or support to the feet (as we see in pictures), is doubtful. Gregory of Tours mentions it; but he is the earliest authority, and has no weight (Voss, *Harm. Passion.* 2:7, 28). *SEE LABARUM*.

III. *Accessories of the Cross*. — An inscription, *titulus* or *elogium* (ἐπιγραφή, Luke 23; αἰτία, Matthew 27; t); ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ τὴς αἰτίας, Mark; τίτλος, John 19; *Qui causam poenoe indicavit*, Sueton. Cal. 32; πίναξ, Euseb.; γράμματα τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς θανατώσεως δηλοῦντα, Dion Cass. liv. 3; πτυχίον ἐπίγραμμα ἔχον, Hesych.; jWl), was generally placed above the person's head, and briefly expressed his guilt (e.g. ο υτός ἐστιν ῎Ατταλος ὁ Χριστίανος," Euseb. v. 1; *Impie locutus parmularius*," Sueton. *Dom*. 10), and generally was carried before the criminal (*praecedente titulo*, Sueton.). It was covered with white gypsum, and the letters were black; hence Sozomen calls it λεύκωμα (*Hist. Eccl.* 2:1), and Nicephorus a λευκὴ σανίς (*Hist. Eccl.* 8:29). But Nicquetus (*Tit. Sanct. Crucis*, 1:6) says it was white, with red letters. (See below.)

It is a question whether binding or absolute pinning to the cross was the more common method. In favor of the first are the expressions *ligare* and *deligare*; the description in Ausonius (*Cupido Crucif*.); the Egyptian custom (Xenoph *Ephes*. 4:2); the mention by Pliny (28. 11) of *spartum e cruce* among magical implements; and the allusion to crucifixion noted by

the fathers in <43B19 24>John 19:24 (Theophyl. and Tertull.). On the other side we have the expression προσηλοῦσθαι, and numberless authorities (Senec. *De Vit. Beata*, 19; Artemidor. *Oneirocr*., in several passages; Apul. *Met*. 3, 60; Plautus, *Mostel*. 2:1, 13, et passim). That our Lord was *nailed*, according to prophecy, is certain <43B20 25>John 20:25, 27, etc.; <38B12 10>Zechariah 12:10; <19B22 16>Psalm 22:16; comp. Tertull. *adv. Marc.* 3, 19, etc.; Sept. ὤρυξαν; although the Jews maintain that in the latter text yrak, "like a lion," is the true reading; Sixt. Senensis, *Bibl. Sact.* 8:5, p. 640). It is, however, extremely probable that both methods were used at once (see Lucan, 6:547 sq.; and Hilary, *De Trin*. x). We may add that in the crucifixion (as it is sometimes called, Tertull. *adv. Marc.* 1:1; comp. Manil. *de Androm*. v) of Prometheus, *A*Eschylus, besides the nails, speaks of a girth (μασχαλιστήρ, *Prom*. 79). When either method was used alone, the tying was considered more painful (as we find in the Martyrologies), since it was a more tedious suffering (*diutinus cruciatus*).

It is doubtful whether three or four nails were employed. The passage in Plautus (*Most*. 2:1, 13) is, as Lipsius (*De Cruce,* 2:9) shows, indecisive. Nonnus speaks of the two feet (ὁμοπλοκὲες) being fastened with one nail (ἄζυγι γόμφῳ), and Gregory Naz. (*de Christ. pat*.) calls the cross "three-nailed" (ξύλον τρίσηλον); hence on gold and silver crosses the nails were represented by one ruby or carbuncle at each extremity (Mrs. Jameson, 1. c.). In the "invention" of the cross, Socrates (*Hist. Ev*. 1:17) only mentions the hand-nails; and that only two were found has been argued from the τὰ μέν, τὰ δέ (instead of τοὺς μέν) in Theodoret (*Hist. Ev*. 1:17). Romish writers, however, generally follow Gregory of Tours (*de Glor. Mart*. 6) in maintaining four, which may indeed be implied by the plural in Cyprian (*de Passione*), who also mentions three more, used to nail on the title. Cyprian is a very good authority, because he had often been a witness of executions. (See below.)

Besides the copious monograph of Lipsius (*De Cruce,* Antwerp, 1596; Amst. 1670; Brunsw. 1640), there are works by Salmasius (*de Cruce*, Epp. 3); Kippingius (*de Cruce* et *Cruciariis*, Brem. 1671); Bosius *(de Cruce triumphante et gloriosa*, Antw. 1617); Gretser (*de Cruce Christi*); and Bartholinus (*Hypomnemata de Cruce*); very much may also be gleaned from the learned notes)e bishop Pearson (*On the Creed*, art. 4). *SEE CRUCIFIXION*.

IV. *The Cross as a Symbol.* — The word *cross* was early used in Roman literature to represent any torture, pain, or misfortune, or anything causing pain or misfortune. Christ adopted this use of the word when he says (of course before his crucifixion had taken place, or was foreseen by his followers) that they must be willing to take up their cross and follow him (<40>16<24>Matthew 16:24), meaning that they must be willing to endure such sufferings as the service of God may bring. After the death and resurrection of Christ, the cross is spoken of, especially in the epistles of Paul, as the representative of Christ's whole sufferings from his birth to his death (<49>2<16>Ephesians 2:16; <58>12<2>Hebrews 12:2), and for the whole doctrines of the Gospel (<46>1<18>1 Corinthians 1:18; <48>6<14>Galatians 6:14). The opposers of the Gospel are spoken of as enemies of the cross (<50>3<18>Philippians 3:18). As a symbol of Christianity, its doctrines, and its duties, the cross has become a familiar figure of speech in the expression of experimental Christianity, in the preaching of Christian ministers, and in the hymns and songs of Christian poets. Very early in the history of the Church it became the custom for Christians to make the sign of the cross. *SEE CROSS, SIGN OF*. That the early Christians had a high regard for the cross is shown by the replies that Tertullian and Octavius made to the pagans who charged Christians with worshipping the cross. It is not easy, however, to fix the date at which Christians commenced to have material representations of the cross. There exist no earlier preserved examples than some rings of stone, with the cross engraved on them, the style of which seems to indicate that they were made before the time of Constantine. The martyr Procopius and a Christian soldier named Orestes are said to have had crosses attached to their necks before going to their execution. A single example of the *crux commissa*, **T**, is preserved, of the date A.D. 370. On tombs, no cross of any kind is found before the same century. No crux immissa, **+**, or Greek cross, **+**, is found earlier than the fifth century. As far as yet examined, no cross is found of very early date in the Catacombs, those existing there having been traced by pilgrims centuries later. Such signs of the cross as properly belong to the monogram of Christ (q.v.) date back for their origin to the time of Constantine. Ancient texts have often spoken of this monogram under the name of cross, giving rise to many misunderstandings. In the more distant provinces of the Roman empire, as in Carthage, marbles marked by the cross have been found of the fourth century. Zeno of Verona, made bishop in 362, states that he placed a **T** cross on a basilica which he built. This same cross appears on the coins and medals of the emperor Valentinian I (died 375), and on bronzes struck by

Constantine at Aquileia and at Treves, although many consider that these were Egyptian in origin, though adopted by the Christians. Constantine is stated to have placed a cross of gold on the tomb of St. Peter in the Vatican. Our Lord resting on a cross is seen on the tombstone of Probus and Proba (A.D. 355). Paulinus of Nola (died 432) had in his church paintings of crosses surrounded by crowns. Other similar ones are found in old mosaics, as in those of San Vitale of Ravenna (A.D. 547). Over the summit of an arch are two angels holding a crown, in the midst of which is a cross adorned with gems. Some diptychs of the fifth century also contain such crosses. The cross on tombstones was an attribute of a martyr, and on the early sarcophagi is specially used to designate St. Peter, as he died on the cross. After his vision of the cross in the heavens, Constantine (q.v.) changed the standard of the Roman empire to a cross. *SEE LABARUM*. From the sixth century the consuls began to have a cross on their scepters. Valentinian III and his queen Eudoxia were the first (A.D. 445) to wear a cross on their crown. About A.D. 400 the cross called crux stationalis was first borne at the head of processions. A number of Christian cities and villages in the neighborhood of Antioch, Aleppo, and Apamea, which were suddenly deserted on the invasion of Syria by the Saracens, and which remain in the form in which they were left by their inhabitants, show how extremely general had become the custom at that time — in the early part of the sixth century — to paint the cross and the monogram of Christ, αXω, over the doors, windows, posts, and on the walls of the houses. It was also used on all domestic objects, as weights, vases, chairs, and all articles of furniture, and was put on ships to keep off disaster and the evil eye. After the fall of the Roman empire, when the labarum ceased to be used, the ensign of many cities became a real cross. The cross-bearer often held two lighted torches, under which were suspended by a chain the letters A and Q. These *cross-standards* were soon decorated with great magnificence, containing scenes from the Old and New Testament, or busts of sacred or patriotic persons, either painted or sculptured, or adorned with gold and precious stones. This ensign was then borne into the thickest of the battle, being the rallying-point for the army, while a priest on the cart on which the ensign or gonfalone was placed, cheered on the soldiers to fight, or declared absolution to the dying. Many Christian kings on the eve of battle, or of any great enterprise, erected a cross, and, bowing before it, offered up prayer to God for success. Oswald had a wooden cross erected before he fought with Cadwallon, his soldiers all kneeling devoutly, while he himself held the cross as the earth was stamped down around it. The

stones that formed the cromlechs (q.v.) were sometimes placed in the form of a cross, it is not known whether originally with any significance. But after the introduction of Christianity in England and Ireland these crosses were appropriated as Christian monuments, and, like other crosses erected for the purpose, served as marks of the boundary of property, of parishes, and sanctuaries; as monuments of battles, murder or other crimes, or disastrous events; to indicate places of public gathering to hear proclamations, sermons, and prayers; to mark the spot where the corpse of any famous person rested on its way to interment, "that passers-by might pray for his soul;" to mark the spot where some person had been delivered from great danger; to line the way to a cemetery or a church; and at cross-roads in the country, or in a market-place, to furnish protection from a passing storm. (Beggars often took their station at these crosses, asking alms in the name of Jesus, giving rise to the expression, "He begs like a cripple at a cross.") Crosses were sometimes erected on the tops of houses, tenants thus claiming the privileges of templars-hospitallers, of being free from the claims of their lords or landlords. Many of these crosses were very costly, and built in the highest architectural taste of the age. Political and religious upheavals have removed many of these crosses; time has destroyed others. Of the 360 crosses formerly existing in the small but historic island of Iona, but one now remains. Of the numerous series by the road leading from Paris to St. Denis, where the kings of France were buried, all are destroyed. Of the fifteen famous crosses that marked the resting-places of the corpse of queen Eleanor (died A.D. 1290), on its removal from Grantham to Westminster, but three now remain. Among the most famous preaching-crosses were those of St. Paul's in London and of Spitalfields, London, where the noted Spital Easter sermons were preached. Crosses are used freely on the vestments of priests, and on all parts of the interior and exterior of Greek, Armenian, and Romish houses of worship, and other ecclesiastical establishments. The Church of England and the Lutheran Church use them to crown their houses of worship; some other Protestant denominations use them thus at the discretion of the individual society; while others still, especially those who hold the views of the original Puritans, reject the use of the visible and material cross in any form or place. — Those Christian bodies, that use the cross freely, place it upon the tombs of the dead. The cross we have hitherto spoken of is the passion cross — the representative of Christ's suffering. In the Catacombs, Christ is represented as coming forth from his tomb bearing a cross, the symbol of his triumph over death, and of the ultimate triumph of his

doctrines. This triumphal cross, also called Cross of the Resurrection, never bearing Christ upon it as a crucifix, is used as a symbol of the authority and jurisdiction of different officials in certain branches of the Church. See CROSIER.

V. *The Cross as a Signature*. — As early as the sixth century had it become the custom to put three crosses (✙✙✙) near the signature of important documents, these having the value of an oath on the part of the signer. Priests never omitted to add it to their signature, and bishops, as a sign of the dignity of their office, placed it before their signature. In diplomatic documents, crosses were used extensively as early as the fifth century. The appropriate use of crosses (σταυρολογία) was an important part in diplomatic knowledge. They were sometimes the ordinary cross, ✙, or the St. Andrew's cross, **X**, the starry cross, ✵, the rhomboid cross, ⊕, or of other ornamental forms. They were usually made with black ink. The Byzantine emperors used red ink till they were imitated by other sovereigns, when they adopted the green color. The Anglo-Saxon kings used a golden cross, dispensing with the signature and the seal. Blue and silver crosses are also met with. The crosses were marked with a stile or pen, or were stamped, or were sometimes made of a thin plate of ivory, bone, or metal. By tradition the cross is now used as a signature, but only by those who cannot write. Crosses were often presented to cloisters by pious visitors, and are preserved in many of their manuscripts. They were used to mark the beginning and end of books, letters, documents, of chapters, paragraphs, references, and critical remarks in books. They are especially used in many countries at the head of letters announcing a death. The cross was early adopted for the groundplan of churches. In the later Gothic period the apsis was turned out of the line of the axis of the nave to represent the drooping of the head of Christ at his death.

Cross, Christ's.

The question as to "the *true cross*" upon which our Savior suffered has been much agitated, especially among Protestants, for the relies shown as such are generally credited among Romanists. (See the controversy revived in modern times by Mr. Williams, in favor of the tradition, *Holy City*, 2:123; and against it, by Dr. Robinson, *Bibl. Res*. 2:12 sq.) True, on this subject exact information ought to be accessible, since four ecclesiastical historians (Socrates, 1:13; Sozomen, 2:1; Rufinus, 1:7; Theodoret, 1:18) concur in stating that the cross was found by Helena, mother of

Constantine the Great. This event is assigned to the year of our Lord 326. Eusebius is silent on the discovery. The ether writers state that Helena, when seventy-nine years of age, was induced by the warmth of her piety to visit the places which the Savior had rendered sacred by his presence and sufferings. The hatred of the heathen had led them to obliterate as much as possible all traces of the memorable events which the life and death of Jesus had hallowed, and to cover Mount Calvary with stones and earth, and raise thereon a temple to the goddess Venue. A Jew, however, had treasured up what traditions he could gather, and was thus enabled to point out to Helena the spot where our Lord had been buried. The place Being excavated, three crosses were found, and the title which that of Jesus bore was also found lying apart by itself. The question arose how the cross of Christ was to be distinguished from the other two. Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem, suggested that their respective efficacy should be tried as to the working of miracles. Sick persons were brought forward and touched by each separately. One only wrought the desired cures, and was- accordingly acknowledged to be the true cross. A full view of all the authorities on this matter may be seen in Tillemont (*Mem. Eccl*. chapter on Helena). Having built a church over the sacred spot, Helena deposited within it the chief part of the real cross. The remainder she conveyed to Constantinople, a part of which Constantine inserted in the head of a statue of himself, and the other part was sent to Rome and placed in the church of Sta. Croce in Gerusalemme, which was built expressly to receive the precious relic. When, subsequently, a festival to commemorate the discovery had been established, the bishop of Jerusalem, on Easter Sunday, exhibited to the grateful eyes of eager pilgrims the object to see which they had traveled so far and endured so much. Those who were persons of substance were farther gratified by obtaining, at their full price, small pieces of the crossses in gold and gems; and, that wonder might not pass into incredulity, the proper authorities gave the world an assurance that the holy wood possessed the power of self-multiplication, and, notwithstanding the innumerable pieces which had been taken from it for the pleasure and service of the faithful, remained intact and entire as at the first (Paulinus, *Ep.* 11 *ad Sev*.). The capture of Jerusalem by the Persians, A.D. 614, placed the remains of the cross in the hands of Chosroes II, who mockingly conveyed them to his capital. Fourteen years afterwards Heraclius recovered them, and had them carried first to Constantinople, and then to Jerusalem, in such pomp that, on his arrival before the latter city, he found the gate barred and entrance forbidden. Instructed as to the cause of this

hindrance, the emperor laid aside the trappings of his greatness, and, barefooted, bore on his own shoulders the sacred relic up to the gate, which then opened of itself, and allowed him to enter, and thus place his charge beneath the dome of the sepulcher. *SEE CALVARY*. From. this time no more is heard in history of the true cross, which the advocates of its genuineness claim may have been destroyed by the Saracens on their conquest of Jerusalem, A.D. 637. Fragments only of it are now exhibited in various parts of Europe. (See below.) The whole story is justly regarded by Protestants as containing unmistakable evidence of being at best a pious fraud on the part of Helena, or a trick on the part of her guides. *SEE HELENA*. But, even if the story were not so intrinsically *absurd* (for, among other reasons, it was a law among the Jews that the cross was to be burned; Othonis, *Lex. Rab.* s.v. *Supplicium*), it would require far more probable evidence to outweigh the silence of Eusebius. It clearly was to the interest of the Church of Rome to maintain the belief and invent the story of its miraculous; multiplication, because the sale of the relics was extremely profitable. To this day the supposed title, or rather fragments of it, are shown to the people once a year in the church of Sta. Croce in Gerusalemme at Rome. On the capture of the true cross by Chosroes II, and its rescue by Heraclius, with even the seals of the case unbroken, and the subsequent sale of a large fragment to Louis IX, see Gibbon, 4:326; 6:66. Those sufficiently interested in the annals of such imposture may see farther accounts in Baronius (*Ann. Ecc. A. D.* 326, No. 42-50), Jortin, and Schmidt (*Problem. de Crucis Dominicae Inventione, Helmst.* 1724); and on the fate of the true cross, a paper read by Lord Mahon before the Society of Antiquaries, Feb. 1831.

Picture for Cross 3

According to Ambrosius (*Oratio de Obitu Theodor*. p. 498), the piece which bore the title stood on the top of the cross of our Lord (John 19:19-22, ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ; comp. Matthew 27:37; Mark 15:26; Luke 18:18): the form then would be somewhat thus, μ This fact would lead to the expectation of more accurate information from those who are said to have found the cross. But the conduct of Helena in dividing the cross, setting aside one part for Jerusalem, another for Constantinople, and another as a phylacterion for her son, and the subdivisions thereof which subsequently took place, rendered it impossible to ascertain in any satisfactory manner not only whether the alleged was the real cross, but also of what wood and in what shape it had been made. This only, then, as

to the shape of the Savior's cross, can be determined, that the prevalent form was that of the crux capitata, and that this form is generally found on coins and in the so-called monogram (Munter's *Sinnbilder*, 1. 4). The wooden title, however, is said to be still preserved in Rome — not entire, indeed, for only fragments remain of the Hebrew letters, so that they are illegible. The Greek and Latin, except the letter *z*, are both written after the Eastern manner, from right to left. This is said to have happened either because they were written by a Jew, following a national custom, or from a desire on the part of the writer, if a Roman, to accommodate himself to what was usual among the Jews. Nicetus (*Titulus sanct. Crucis*) holds that it is not all the work of one hand, since the Roman letters are firmly and distinctly cut, but the Greek letters very badly. He thinks that a Jew cut the Hebrew (or Aramaean) and Greek, and a Roman the Latin. All that remains of the Greek is Ναζαρενους β - [i.e. Ναζαρηνός βασιλεύς], of the Latin *Nazarenus Re* [*Rex*], i.e. "Nazarene, King." This tablet is said to have been sent by Constantine to Rome, and there deposited in a leaden chest, above the vaulted dome of the church of Sta. Croce, in a little window, and then bricked into the wall, its position being recorded by a Mosaic inscription without. Time rendered the inscription almost illegible; and the window, owing to the carelessness of workmen engaged in repairing the church, was accidentally broken open, when the relic was discovered. A bull was issued by pope Alexander III commemorating the discovery and authenticating the title. The whole story is evidently of a piece with the foregoing. Monographs on the subject and relic in question have been written in Latin by Alberti (Lips. 1690; Jen. 1748), Altmann (Bern. 1739), Felter (Lips. 1725), Freiesleben (Lips. 1664), Hanke (Jen. 1672), Hiller (Tubing. 1696), Nicqueti (Antw. 1770), Reichmann (Viteb. 1655), Reyper (Kilon. 1694; also in Menthenii *Diss.* 2:241 sq.), Weselius (L. B. 1712). *SEE TITLE*.

Much time and trouble have been wasted in disputing as to whether three or four nails were used in fastening the Lord to his cross. (See above.) Nonnus affirms that three only were used, in which he is followed by Gregory Nazianzen. The more general belief gives four nails, an opinion which is supported at much length and by curious arguments by Curtius (*De Clavis Dominics*). Others have carried the number of nails as high as fourteen. Of the four original nails, the empress Helena is reported (Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* 1:17) to have thrown one into the Adriatic when furiously raging, thereby producing an instant calm. The second is said to have been put by Constantine into either his helmet or crown, or (as

Zonaras says) on the head of the statue which he intended to be the palladium of Constantinople, and which the people used to surround with lighted torches (Mosheim, *Eccl. Hist.* 2:1, 3, and notes). This nail, however, was afterwards to be found in a mutilated state in the church of Sta. Croce. In the Duomo of Milan is a third nail, which Eutropius affirms was driven through one of Jesus's hands, and which Constantine used as a bit, intending thereby to verify the prophecy of Zechariah (14:20): "In that day shall be upon the bells (margin, bridles) of the horses, Holiness unto the Lord." Treves possesses the fourth nail, which is alleged to have been driven through the sufferer's right foot (Lipsius, *De Cruce*, 2:9). Those who maintain the number of nails to have been more than four have had no difficulty in finding as many nails as their hypothesis in each case needed, and as many sacred places for their safe keeping. There are monographs on this subject, in Latin, by Fontanus (Amst. 1643), Frischmuth (Jen. 1663), Semler (Dresd. 1741), Winer (Lips. 1845), Curtius (Monaci. 1622; Antw. 1670; also in the *Symb. litt. Brem.* 3, 309); in German, by Bahr (in Heydenreich's *Zeitschr*. 2:309), Paulus (*Memorabil*. 4:3664). *SEE NAIL*.

Another dispute has been agitated relative to the existence of a *hypopodium* or tablet whereon the feet were supported. Gregory of Tours, who had seen the alleged true cross, affirms that it had such a footstool; but his dictum has been called in question. It is, however, doubted whether the hands alone, without a prop beneath, could sustain the weight of the body and some have supposed that a kind of seat was placed, on which the sufferer may be said to have in some way sat. The controversy is treated at length in the first of the four *Hypomnemata de Cruce* of Bartholinus (Hafn. 1651, Anmst. 1670, L. B. 1695).

A common tradition assigns the perpetual shiver of the aspen to the fact of the cross having been formed of its wood. Lipsius, however (*De Cruce*, 3, 13), thinks it was of oak, which was strong enough, and common in Judaea. Few will attach any consequence to his other reason, that the relics appear to be of oak. The legend to which he alludes,

"Pes crucis est cedrus, corpus tenet alta cupressus,
Palma manus retinet, titulo laetatur olive"

(The foot is cedar, cypress forms the shaft,
The arms are palm, the title olive bears),

hardly needs refutation. It must not be overlooked that crosses must have been of the meanest and readiest materials, because they were used in such marvelous numbers. Thus we are told that Alexander Jannaeus crucified 800 Jews (Josephus, *Ant.* 13:14, 2), and Varus 2000 (ib. 17:10, 10), and Hadrian 500 a day; and Titus so many that "room failed for the crosses, and crosses for the bodies" (Josephus, *War*, 6:28, where Reland rightly notices the strange retribution, "so that they who had nothing but 'crucify' in their mouth were therewith paid home in their own bodies," Sir T. Browne, *Vulg. Err.* 5. 21). In Sicily, Augustus crucified 600 (Orosius, 6:18). *SEE CRUCIFIXION*.

Cross, Bull of the

(*Cruzada*), a bull by which pope Calixtus III, in 1487, granted very extensive indulgences to all who would take up arms, under king Henry of Castile, against the inlidels, or pay to that king a certain sum for defraying: the expenses of the war. The indulgence was at first granted for only five years, but was from time to time renewed and enlarged, so as to include many privileges, such as exemption from the commandment of abstinence. The proceeds of the Bull of the Cross constituted a considerable portion of the public revenue. The last renewal of the bull is of the year 1753. A similar bull was issued in 1514 by pope Leo, in favor of king Sebastian of Portugal, to whom, in consideration of his endeavors for the conversion of infidels in Africa, the third part of the tithes and the tenth part of the taxes due to the churches and ecclesiastical benefices of the kingdom was conceded. — Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 6:265.

Cross, Exaltation of the

a festival in the Roman Catholic Church, instituted in commemoration of the exaltation of the supposed cross of Christ at Jerusalem, after its recovery from the Persians. The latter, when conquering Jerusalem in 614, carried off with them the relic which, since its "invention", *SEE CROSS, CHRIST'S*, by the empress Helena, had been venerated as the "Holy Cross." With a view to a heavy sum of ransom, they had it sealed up by the patriarch Zacharias with the patriarchal seal, and took it to a strong castle in Armenia. When, in 627, the emperor Heraclius conquered the Persians, he stipulated in the treaty of peace for the restoration of the Holy Cross, and took it with him to Constantinople. From there, in 629 (according to others in 680), he took it himself, accompanied by a large retinue, to

Jerusalem, where it was again set up with great solemnities. It is this restoration of the cross to Jerusalem which is annually commemorated on Sept. 14 in the Church of Rome as the Exaltation of the Cross. — Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 6:268.

Cross, Invention of the

the name given in the Roman Catholic Church to a festival which commemorates the finding of the alleged true cross of our Savior, and which is celebrated on the 3d of May. An order of friars, founded in honor of the invention of the cross, and carrying in their hand a staff, on the top of which was a cross, received the name of *Croisiers* (Fr. *croix*, cross), corrupted into Crouched or Crutched Friars. They came to England in the 13th century, and had monasteries in London, Oxford, and Ryegate. The festival of the Elevation of the Cross (September 14) commemorates its re-erection in Jerusalem by the emperor Heraclius, after it had been carried away by the Persians. *SEE CROSS, EXALTATION OF*.

Cross, Metaphorical Sense of

This word (1), in its most comprehensive sense, as figuratively used in N.T., designates not only the whole passion of Christ, culminating in the death on the cross, but also the whole Gospel system, as a means of reconciliation with God through Christ. (2) It is also used to designate the sufferings and trials sent upon Christians for their moral improvement, and which have the effect of strengthening faith, and teaching humility, love, and submission. The command to “take up the cross” daily (Luke 9:23) signifies that we are cheerfully to submit to all the evils of life, circumstance, and position, which God, in his wisdom, sees fit that we should encounter; we are even to rejoice at misfortune, as the discipline of suffering brings fruits of sanctification to those who patiently submit for Christ’s sake, remembering that all things work for good to them that love God (Romans 8:28). Four kinds of “crosses” have been recognized: I, the cross of martyrdom, the witness unto death for Christ and the Gospel; 2, the cross of trials, for the preservation of faith, love, and hope; 3, the cross of discipline, for the purification of the heart and the subjection of sinful desires and inclinations; 4, the cross of punishment, for the chastisement of sin; though the aim of punishment also is the improvement of the sinner. God is love, and therefore lays the “cross” on every one as he needs it. He chasteneth whom he loveth. It is a sad mistake to consider

suffering as the result of caprice or anger on the part of God (<47046>2 Corinthians 4:1618; 12:7; <581201>Hebrews 12:1-12; <480614>Galatians 6:14; <490216>Ephesians 2:16, 17; <510119>Colossians 1:19-22; <460117>1 Corinthians 1:17, 18; <480511>Galatians 5:11; <500318>Philippians 3:18). — Krehl, *N.T. Handworterbuch*, s.v. Kreuz.

Cross, Orders of the in the Roman Church.

Picture for Cross 4

Picture for Cross 5

1. *Canons Regular of the Congregation of the holy Cross*, founded in 1211 by Theodore de Celles, a descendant of the dukes of Bretagne. It was confirmed by Innocent IV in 1248, and was exempted from the jurisdiction of the bishops by John XXII in 1318. The order spread especially in the Netherlands, Western Germany, and France, and still exists in the Netherlands and Belgium, whence in 1850 a colony was sent over to the United States, where they have an establishment in the diocese of Milwaukee. See Helyot, who calls them Croisiers or Porte-Croix; *American Catholic Almanac*.

2. *Croisiers (Cross-bearers) of Italy*, another congregation of the same order, the origin of which is unknown, but which was renewed by pope Alexander III in 1169, and is now extinct.

3. *Croisiers of Bohemia*, *SEE KNIGHTS, TEUTONIC*.

4. *Daughters of the Cross*, founded by Madame de Villeneuve, in France, in 1640, under the direction of Vincent de Paul, and confirmed by pope Clement IX. They devote themselves principally to the instruction of girls, and have their principal establishment, with more than 100 members, at Paris. The order is rapidly increasing in France, and has one establishment in the United States, in the diocese of Natchitoches, founded in 1854. — Fehr, *Geschichte der Minchsorden*, 2:319.

5. Another congregation of *Daughters of the Cross* was founded in 1835 at Liege, by Habets, a Belgian priest. They teach, keep asylums for fallen women, etc., and have established several houses in Belgium and Germany. — Fehr, *Geschichte der Monchsordmn*, 2:322.

6. *Sisters of the Cross*, also *called "Sisters of St. Andrew"*, founded in 1806 by Mademoiselle Bechier, in the diocese of Poitiers. They devote themselves to the instruction of children, and to the nursing of the sick in the country. They are very numerous in France.

7. Another congregation of *Sisters of the Cross*, also called "*Sisters of the Immaculate Heart of Mary*," was founded by Abbe Moreau, at Mans, about 1834, and approved by the pope in 1857. They came to the United States in 1843, and have establishments in the dioceses of Fort Wayne, Philadelphia, and Chicago.

8. A *Congregation of Regular Clerks of the Holy Cross* was founded in 1835, together with the congregation mentioned under No. 7, by Abbe Moreau. It was afterwards united with the "*Brothers of St. Joseph*," founded about the same time by Very Rev. Mr. Dujarier, and the rule of the united congregations was approved by Pius IX in 1857. They had, in 1867, 82 houses and missions, of which 58 were in France, 12 in America, 7 in Bengal, 2 in Algeria, and 1 each in Rome, Poland, and Austria.

Cross, Sign Of The

a rite in the Roman Church, and in the Greek and other Eastern churches. It is used by officiating priests as a form of blessing at all liturgical actions and consecrations, and by all the members of the Church at the beginning of a prayer during divine service, on entering a church, on passing the host, and on many other occasions. It is always made with the right hand. In the 6th century it became customary to make the sign of the cross with the thumb on forehead, mouth, and chest. Since the 8th century the so-called "large" or "Latin" cross has been in common use among the laity. It is made with the palm of the hand by touching first the forehead; next, in direct line downward, the chest; next, in horizontal line, the left and the right shoulder. The same form of cross is used in liturgical actions, if the cross is to be made over the object to be blessed without touching it. While among the Latins the cross beam is drawn from the left to the right, the reverse is the case among the Greeks and Russians. In making the sign of the cross, it is common to pronounce the words, "In the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen." Formerly there were also other forms in common use (Binterim enumerates eight), but all have been displaced by the above. The different ways of making the sign of the cross, and the number of fingers used, have called forth in the Church of Rome

the most fanciful and mystical significations, and a special power has commonly been attributed to the sign of the cross. It is, therefore, also made over water, salt, oil, etc. In the Greek Church the sign of the cross is of even more frequent use than in the Roman Catholic. Among the Protestants it is almost universally abandoned (in the Lutheran Church of Saxony it was in use until the introduction of a new liturgy in 1812). In the Church of England and in the Protestant Episcopal Church its use in baptism is optional.

Cross, Way Of The

(*Via Crucis*), the collective name of a certain number of pictures or stations in or near Roman Catholic churches and sanctuaries, to represent an equal number of events in the history of the Passion of the Savior. Generally the number of the pictures is 14 or 15, but sometimes less. The people who “walk the way of the cross” stop a little while at each picture, reciting a prayer, until they have, in turn, visited every station, and thus completed the commemoration of the Passion. In some Roman Catholic countries, as in Southern Germany, the “Way of the Cross” can be met with in almost every church. This practice was invented by the Franciscan monks, who offered it to the people as a substitute for the pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and justly calculated that, by obtaining numerous indulgences from the popes for those who would adopt this peculiar kind of worship, they would achieve a great popularity for the churches of their order. Their expectation was realized. The popes granted to the visitors of the “Way of the Cross” all the indulgences which had formerly been granted to the visitors of different places in the Holy Land, thus enabling the people to gain in a few minutes several “plenary” indulgences, besides a number of partial. Every “Way of the Cross” must be instituted by a Franciscan monk, and it requires a special permission from the pope if any one who is not a Franciscan is to introduce it. Many special books of devotion have been published for the *Via Crucis*.

Cross-bearer

(*cruciger*).

1. In the Romish Church, the designation of the chaplain of an archbishop, or a primate, who bears a cross before him on solemn occasions. The pope has the cross borne before him everywhere; a patriarch anywhere out of Rome; and primates, metropolitans, and those who have a right to the

pallium, throughout their respective jurisdictions. A prelate wears a single cross, a patriarch a double cross, and the pope a triple cross on his arms.

2. The name *cross-bearers* (“cruciferi”) was also applied to the *Flagellants* in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. *SEE FLAGELLANTS*.

Croswell Henry, D.D.,

a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born in West Hartford, Conn., June 16, 1778. While quite young he entered his brother’s printing-office in Catskill; N. Y., and soon became editor of a newspaper published in that place. About 1800 he established a paper at Hudson, N. Y.; called *The Balance*. He removed to Albany in 1809, where his paper attained a still wider circulation and influence. Finally he turned his attention to the Christian ministry. Though brought up among Congregationalists, he determined to unite with the Protestant Episcopal Church, and prepared to enter its ministry. In the year 1814 he was ordained deacon. After preaching a short time in Hudson, he removed to New Haven, when he took charge of Trinity Church, and in February, 1816, he was ordained priest. He remained in the same parish 43 years. It is stated that in a period of 41 years he officiated at 1844 burials, administered 2553 baptisms, and married 833 couples. He died March 13, 1858.

Croswell William, D.D.

(son of Henry), was born in Hudson, N. Y., Nov. 7, 1804, and graduated at Yale College in 1822. After studying at the General Theol. Seminary, N. Y., he was ordained in 1828, and in May, 1829, he accepted the rectorship of Christ Church, Boston. In 1840 he became rector of St. Peter’s Church, Auburn, N.Y., but, after somewhat more than four years, he returned to Boston, and connected himself with a new enterprise — the Church of the Advent, which proved very successful. With this church he continued till the close of his life. In 1846 the degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by Trinity College, Hartford, and on Nov. 9,1851, he died suddenly, after the partial delivery of a beautiful sermon, addressed to the children of his church, in connection with a baptism. His productions, especially on poetry, were published soon after his death by his father, in an extended Memoir, but he had strictly forbidden the publication of any of his sermons. — Sprague, *Annals*, v. 697.

Crothers Samuel, D.D.,

a Presbyterian minister, was born near Chambersburg, Pa., October 22, 1783. His father removed to Lexington, Ky., in 1787. In February, 1798, he entered the Lexington Academy, and in 1804 placed himself under the care of the Kentucky Presbytery as a candidate for the ministry. He entered the New York Theological Seminary in 1805, and, returning to Kentucky in 1809, was there licensed to preach. He settled in Chilicothe in 1810, where he remained for three years, removing to Greenfield in 1813. At this time the Associate Reformed Church was greatly agitated with controversies respecting intercommunion and psalmody. With Dr. Mason and most of his students, Mr. Crothers opposed close communion, and the exclusive use of what has been called inspired psalmody. Troubles growing out of these things, he resigned his charge, and removed to Winchester, Ky. In 1820 he returned to Greenfield, where he remained 36 years. He died suddenly in Oswego, Ill., at the house of his son, on July 20, 1856. — Wilson, Presbyterian *Hist. Almanac*, 1864.

Crow

Picture for Crow

(κορώνη), Baruch 6:54, prob. the jackdaw. *SEE RAVEN*.

Crowell, Joshua

an early Methodist Episcopal minister in New England, was born in Massachusetts in 1777, of Presbyterian parents, was converted through the agency of Methodist preaching at about 20, entered the itinerancy in 1801, located in 1809, and died at Sturbridge, Mass., July, 1858, in the fifty-seventh year of his ministry. He had a strong intellect, sound judgment, generous emotions, and an earnest love of Methodism. He was an able and successful minister. He was one of the founders of the Wesleyan Academy, Wilbraham, and in many ways was of eminent service to the Church. — Sherman, *Sketches of New-England Divines*, p. 389.

Crowell, Seth

a Methodist Episcopal minister of more than ordinary talents. was born at Tolland, Conn., in 1781, entered the New York Conference in 1801, was returned superannuated in 1813, re-entered upon work as a missionary in 1816, located in 1819, and was readmitted as superannuated in 1824. He

died in 1826 in New York city. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1:542; Stevens, *Memorials of Methodism*, 2, ch. 18.

Crowing

SEE COCK-CROWING.

Crowl John F.,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Salem, N. Y., about 1823. He removed with his parents when quite young to Troy, N. Y.; was converted in 1839, and in 1843 united with the Troy Conference. For some time during his ministry he located and labored as an evangelist. His labors were abundant and highly successful to the close of his life, Sept. 14, 1875. Mr. Crowl was a sweet singer, powerful in exhortation, and mighty in prayer. He had a deeply emotional nature, and his soul seemed greatly burdened for souls. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1876, p. 81.

Crown

an ornament often mentioned in Scripture, and in such a manner as in most cases to indicate the circumstances under which and the persons by whom it was worn; for crowns were less exclusively worn by sovereigns than among modern nations. Perhaps it would be better to say that the term "crowns" was applied to other ornaments for the head than those exclusively worn by royal personages, and to which modern usage would give such distinctive names as coronet, band, mitre, tiara, garland, etc. This ornament, which is both ancient and universal, probably originated from the fillets used to prevent the hair from being disheveled by the wind. Such fillets are still common, and they may be seen on the sculptures of Persepolis, Nineveh, and Egypt; they gradually developed into turbans (Josephus, *Ant*. 3, 7, 7), which, by the addition of ornamental or precious materials, assumed the dignity of mitres or crowns. The use of them as ornaments was probably suggested by the natural custom of encircling the head with flowers in token of joy and triumph ("Let us crown ourselves with rosebuds," Wisdom of Solomon 2:8; 3 Maccabees 7:16; Judah 15:13, and the classical writers, *passim*). *SEE WREATH*. The first crown was said to have been woven for Pandora by the Graces (comp. στέφανος Χαρίτων, Proverbs 4:9). According to Pherecydes, Saturn was the first to wear a crown; Diodorus says that Jupiter was first crowned by the gods after the conquest of the Titans. Pliny, Harpocration, etc., ascribe its

earliest use to Bacchus, who gave to Ariadne a crown of gold and Indian gems, and assumed the laurel after his conquest of India. Leo Egyptius attributes the invention to His, whose wreath was cereal. These and other legends are collected by Tertullian from the elaborate treatise on crowns by Claud. Saturninus. Another tradition says that Nimrod was the first to wear a crown, the shape of which was suggested to him by a cloud (Eutychius Alexandr. *Ann*. i, p. 63). Tertullian, in his *tract De Cor. Militis* (c. vii sq.), argues against them as unnatural and idolatrous. He is, however, singularly unsuccessful in trying to disprove the countenance given to them in Scripture where they are constantly mentioned. *SEE BONNET*.

Picture for Crown 1

1. The word רזנ *ne'zer* (lit. *consecration*; hence *consecrated hair*, as of a Nazarite, and then generally *long hair*), is supposed to denote a *diadem* (Greek διάδημα, <661203>Revelation 12:3; 13:1; 19:12). It is applied to the inscribed plate of gold in front of the high-priest's mitre, which was tied behind by a ribbon (<022906>Exodus 29:6; 39:30), and which was doubtless something of the same kind that we see in figs. 8,11. This word is also employed to denote the diadem which Saul wore in battle, and which was brought to David (<100110>2 Samuel 1:10), and also that which was used at the coronation of the young Joash (<121112>2 Kings 11:12); and, as another word is applied elsewhere to the crown used in this ceremonial, the probability is that the Hebrew kings wore sometimes a diadem and sometimes a crown, and that the diadem only was accessible to the high-priest, by whom Joash was crowned, the crown itself being most likely in the possession of Athaliah. Both the ordinary priests and the high-priest wore head-dresses of this ornamental description. The common mitre (הנגמ, Sept. κίδαρις, <022837>Exodus 28:37; 29:6, etc.; Josephus, ταινία; Hesych. στρόφιον ὅ οἱ ἱερεῖς φοροῦσι) was a flat cap (πῖλος ἄκωνος), forming a sort of linen *toenia* or crown (στεφάνη), Josephus, *Ant.* 3, 7. The ceremonial mitre (הנעמ, Sept. βυσσίνη τιάρα) of the high-priest (used also of a regal crown, <262126>Ezekiel 21:26) was much more splendid (<022836>Exodus 28:36; <030809>Leviticus 8:9; "an ornament of honor, a costly work, the desire of the eyes," Ecclesiasticus 45:12; "the *holy* crown," <030809>Leviticus 8:9, so called from the Tetragrammaton inscribed on it, Sopranes, *De re Vest. Jud*., p. 441). It had a second fillet of blue lace (ἐξ ὑακίνθου πεποικιλμένος, the color being chosen as a type of heaven), and over it a golden diadem (רזנ <022906>Exodus 29:6), "on which blossomed

a golden calyx like the flower of the ὑοσκύαμος," or hyoscyamus (Josephus, *Ant.* 3, 6). The gold band (/yxæ; Sept. πέταλον; Origen, ἱλαστήριον) was tied behind with blue lace (embroidered with flowers), and being two fingers broad, bore the inscription (not in bas-relief, as Abarbanel sys) "Holiness to the Lord." (Comp. Revelation 17:5; Braunius, *De Vest. Sacerd*. 2:22; Maimon. *De Apparatu Templi*, 9:1; Reland, *Antig*. 2:10; Carpzov, *Appar. Crit*. p. 85; Josephus, *War*, 5:5,7; Philo, *De Vit. losis*, 3, 519.) Some suppose that Josephus is describing a later crown given by Alexander the Great to Jaddua (Jennings's *Jewish Ant.* p. 158). The use of the crown by priests and in religious services was universal, and perhaps the badge belonged at first "rather to the *pontficalia* than the *regalia*." Thus Q. Fabius Pictor says that the first crown was used by Janus *when sacrificing*. "A striped head-dress and queue," or "a short wig, on which a band was fastened, ornamented with an asp, the symbol of royalty," was used by the kings of Egypt in religious ceremonies (Wilkinson's *Anc. Egypt*. 3, 354, fig. 13). The crown worn by the kings of Assyria was "a high mitre . . . frequently adorned with flowers, etc., and arranged in bands of linen or silk. Originally there was only one band, but afterwards there were two, and the ornaments were richer" (Layard, 2:320, and the illustrations in Jahn, *Arch. Germ. ed*., pt. 1, vol. 2, tab. 9:4 and 8). *SEE MITRE*.

The royal crown originated in the diadem, which was a simple fillet fastened round the head, and tied behind. This obviously took its rise among a people who wore long hair, and used a band to prevent it from falling over the face. The idea occurred of distinguishing kings by a fillet of different color from that usually worn; and being thus established as a regal distinction, it continued to be used as such even among nations who did not wear the hair long, or was employed to confine the head-dress. We sometimes see this diadem as a simple fillet, about two inches broad, fastened round the otherwise bare head; we then find it as a band of gold (first cut, above, figs. 2, 5). In this shape it sometimes forms the basis of raised ornamental work (figs. 6, 7, 8, 10), in which case it becomes what we should consider a crown; and, indeed, the original diadem may be traced in most ancient crowns. Fig. 10 is curious, not only from the simplicity of its form, but on account of the metallic loop to be passed under the chin-a mode of securing the crown probably adopted in war or in the chase. Then we find the diadem surrounding the head-dress or cap

(figs. 3, 9, 13), and when this also is ornamented, the diadem may be considered as having become a crown. *SEE DIADEM*.

Picture for Crown 2

Picture for Crown 3

2. The more general word for a crown is הָרָטָה *atarah'* (a *circlet*, Gr. στέφανος); and it is applied to crowns and head ornaments of different sorts, including those used by the kings. When applied to their crowns, it appears to denote the state crown as distinguished from the diadem. Such was probably the crown, which, with its precious stones, weighed (or rather "was worth") a talent, taken by David from the king of Ammon at Rabbah, and used as the state crown of Judah (2 Samuel 12:30). Some groundlessly suppose that, being too heavy to wear, it was suspended over his head. The royal crown was sometimes buried with the king (Schickard, *Jus Reg*. 6:19, p.421). Idolatrous nations also "made crowns for the head of their gods" (*Ep.* Jer. 9). The Rabbins allege that the Hebrew state-crown was of gold, set with jewels. Of its shape it is impossible to form any notion, unless by reference to the examples of ancient crowns contained in the preceding cut. These figures, however, being taken mostly from coins, are not of that very remote antiquity which we would desire to illustrate matters pertaining to the period of the Hebrew monarchies. In Egypt and Persia there are sculptures of earlier date, representing royal crowns in the shape of a distinguishing tiara, cap, or helmet, of metal, and of cloth, or partly cloth and partly metal. The diadem of two or three fillets (figs. 4, 5, first cut, above) may have been similarly significant of dominion over two or three countries. In Revelation 12:3; 13:1; 19:12, allusion is made to "many crowns" (διαδήματα) worn in token of extended dominion. Thus the kings of Egypt used to be crowned with the "*pshent*," or united crowns of Upper and Lower Egypt (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt*. 3, 351 sq.; comp. Layard, 2:320); and Ptolemy Philometor wore two diadems, one for Europe and one for Asia. This would, in fact, form three crowns, as his previous one was doubtless the double crown of Upper and Lower Egypt. Similarly the three crowns of the papal tiara mark various accessions of power: the first corona was added to the mitre by Alexander III in 1159; the second by Boniface VIII in 1303; and the third by Urban V in 1362. These Egyptian tiaras were worn in war and on occasions 'of state, but on ordinary occasions a fillet or diadem was used. It is important to observe that the *mitre* of the high-priest, which is also called a crown (Exodus

39:30), was of similar construction, if not shape, with the addition of the golden fillet or diadem.

Picture for Crown 4

3. Similar also in construction and material, though not in form, was the ancient Persian crown, for which there is a distinct name in the book of Esther (1. 11; 2:17; 6:8), viz., רֶתֶר, *ke'ther* (*chaplet*), which was doubtless the *cidaris* or *citaris* (κίδαρις or κίταρις), the high cap or tiara so often mentioned by the Greek historians. From the descriptions given of it, this seems to have been a somewhat conical cap, surrounded by a wreath or fold; and this would suggest a resemblance to fig. 12 (of the first cut, above), which is, in fact, copied from a Parthian or later Persian coin. This one is worthy of very particular attention, because it forms a connecting link between the ancient and modern Oriental crowns, the latter consisting either of a cap, with a fold or turban, variously enriched with aigrettes as this is; or of a stiff cap of cloth, studded with precious stones. It must often occur to the student of Biblical antiquities that the modern usages of the East have more resemblance to the most ancient than have those which prevailed during that intermediate or classical period in which its peculiar manners and institutions were subject to much extraneous influence from the domination of the Greeks and Romans. So, in the present instance, we are much impressed with the conviction that such head-tires and caps as those represented in the above cut more correctly represent the regal "crowns" of the Old Testament than those figured in the first cut, above (with the exception of fig. 12 and the simple diadems); which, however, may be taken to represent the style of the crowns which prevailed in and before the time of the New Testament. *SEE TURBAN*.

Picture for Crown 5

4. Other Hebrews terms rendered "crown" are זֵר, *zer*, a *wreath* or border of gold around the edge of the ark of the covenant (Exodus 25:11, etc.); and קָדְקֹד, *kodkod'*, the *scalp* or crown of the human head (Genesis 49:26, etc.; κορυφή, Bel, 36). There are several words in Scripture for a crown (but not so rendered) besides those mentioned, as פְּאֵר, *peer'*, the headdress of bridegrooms (Isaiah 61:10; Bar. 5:2; Ezekiel 24:17), and of women (Isaiah 3:20); צְפִירָה, *tsephiroth'*, a head-dress of great splendor (Isaiah 28:5); צְבִיָּה, *tsebiyah'*, a wreath of

flowers (Proverbs 1:9; 4:9); such wreaths were used on festal occasions (Isaiah 28:1); ãynæ, *tsaniph'*, a common tiara or turban (Job 29:14; Isaiah 3:23); alÞrÞKi, *karbela'* ("hat," Daniel 3:21, rather *mantle*). Στέμμα occurs in the N.T. only once (Acts 14:13) for the garlands used with victims. In the Byzantine court this word was confined to the imperial crown (Du Fresne, *Gloss. Grec*. p. 1442). *SEE GARLAND*.

The Jews boast that three crowns were given to them: hr;T rtK, the crown of the law; hNhK] rtK, the crown of priesthood; and tWklÞmi, the royal crown; better than all which is b/f µver tK, the crown of a good name (Carpzov, *Apparat. Critic*. p. 660; Othonis *Lex . Rabb*. s.v. Corona). Crowns were so often used symbolically to express honor and power that it is not always safe to infer national usages from the passages in which they occur. Hence we would scarcely conclude from Ezekiel 23:42 that crowns were worn by Jewish females, although that they wore some ornament which might be so called is probable from other sources. Mr. Lane (*Arabian Nights*, 1:424) mentions that until about two centuries ago a kind of crown was worn by Arabian females of wealth and distinction. It was generally a circle of jeweled gold (the lower edge of which was straight, and the upper fancifully heightened to a mere point), surmounting the lower part of a dome-shaped cap, with a jewel or some other ornament at the summit. It is certain that "crowns" of this or some similar kind were worn at marriages (Song of Solomon 3:11; Isaiah 61:10); and it would appear that at feasts and public festivals "'crowns of rejoicing" were customary. These were probably garlands (Wisdom of Solomon 2:8; 4:2; Ecclesiasticus 1:11).

Picture for Crown 6

With the ancients generally the crown was the symbol of victory and reward, it being customary for conquerors to be crowned, as were also victors in the Grecian games. From ancient coins and medals we may observe that these crowns or wreaths usually consisted of leaves of trees, to which were added flowers. The crown worn by the victor in the Olympian games: was made of the wild olive; in the Pythian games, of laurel; in the Nemean games, of parsley; and in the Isthmian games, *SEE CORINTH*, of the pine. Indeed, Claudius Saturninus says there was hardly any plant of which crowns had not been made. The Romans had several kinds of crowns or wreaths which were bestowed for various services; but

the noblest was the civic crown, given to him who had saved the life of a citizen; it was made of oak leaves, and was presented by the person who had been saved to his preserver. These were all corruptible, for they began to wither as soon as they were separated from the trees or plucked out of the earth. In opposition to these, there is an incorruptible crown, a crown of life, hid up for those who are faithful unto death (<59112>James 1:12; <60504>1 Peter 5:4; <66210>Revelation 2:10; see *Am. Presb. Rev.* July, 1863). Pilate's guard platted a crown of thorns, and placed it on the head of Jesus Christ (<402729>Matthew 27:29) with an intention to insult him, under the character of the king of the Jews (see below). The laurel, pine, or parsley garlands given to victors in the great games of Greece are finely alluded to by Paul (<461025>1 Corinthians 9:25; -<550205>2 Timothy 2:5, etc.). *SEE GAMES*. They are said to have originated in the laurel-wreath assumed by Apollo on conquering the Python (Tertull. *de Cor. Mil*. 7, 15). (On the Greek and Roman honorary crowns, see Smith, *Dict. of Class Antiq.*, s.v. Corona.) *SEE AMA-RANTHINE*. "Crown" is often used figuratively in "the Bible as a general emblem of an exalted state (<202104>Proverbs 12:4; 17:6; <232805>Isaiah 28:5; <500401>Philippians 4:1, etc.). The term is also applied to the rims of altars, tables, etc. (<022525>Exodus 25:25, etc.; <052208>Deuteronomy 22:8; comp. Vitr. 2:8; Q. Curt. 9:4, 30). The ancients as well as the moderns had a coin called "a crown" (τὸν στέφανον ὃν ὀφείλετε, 1 Maccabees 13:39; 10:29; A. V. "Crown-tax," v. Suid., s.v. στεφανικὸν τέλεσμα); so called, doubtless, because coins usually bore the head of the sover. cign encircled with a wreath. *SEE COIN*.

The chief writers on crowns are Gaschalius (*De Coronis*, lib. 10) and Meursius (*De Coronsi*, Hafniae, 1671). For others, see Fabricilis, *Bibl. Ant*. 14:13. *SEE HEAD-DRESS*.

Crown Of Thorns

(στἐφανος ἐξ ἀκανθῶν, <402729>Matthew 27:29). Our Lord was crowned with thorns in mockery by the Roman soldiers. The object seems to have been insult, and not the infliction of pain, as has generally been supposed. The Rhamnus, or Spina Christi, although abundant in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, cannot be the plant intended, because its thorns are so strong and large that it could not have been woven (πλέξαντες) into a wreath. The large-leaved acanthus (bear's-foot) is totally unsuited for the purpose. Had the acacia been intended, as some suppose, the phrase would have been ἐξ ἀκάνθης. Obviously some small, flexile thorny shrub is meant;

perhaps cappares spinosce (Reland's *Palaest.* 2:525). Hasselquist (*Travels*, p. 260) says that the thorn used was the Arabian nulk. "It was very suitable for their purpose, as it has many sharp thorns which inflict painful wounds; and its flexible, pliant, and round branches might easily be plaited in the form of a crown." It also resembles the rich dark green of the triumphal ivy-wreath, which would give addition. al pungency to its ironical purpose (Rosenmüller, *Botany of Script.* p. 202, Eng. ed.). Another plant commonly fixed upon is the "southern buckthorn," which was very suitable to the purpose. *SEE BRAMBLE*. On the empress Helena's supposed discovery of the crown of thorns, and its subsequent fate, see Gibbon, 2:306; 6:66, ed. Milman. — Smith, s.v. Treatises on the crown in question have been written in Latin by Bartholin (Hafn. 1651), Bottier (in the *Bibl. Brem*. 8:942), Frenzel (Viteb. 1667, 1679), Gitsch (Altdorf, 1694), Gonsager (Hafn. 1713), Lüdemann (Viteb. 1679), Sagittarius (Jena, 1672), Wedel (Jena, 1696), Glauch (Lips. 1661), Hallmann (Rost. 1757), Müller (in Menthenii *Thes.* 2:230-233). *SEE THORN*.

Crucifix

(Low Latin *crucifixum*; from *cruci*, to a cross, and *fixum*, fastened), a representation of Christ on the cross, executed in wood, ivory, metal, or other hard material.

I. *History of Crucifixes*. — Among the many symbols which the early Christians used to represent Christ as the central object of their faith, the lamb was among the most predominant. In the beginning of the 6th century the lamb bears a triumphal cross; then it is lying on an altar at the foot of a cross; then it appears with blood flowing from a wound in its side, as well as from its feet; and finally, by the end of this century, a lamb is painted in the center of the cross, where the body of Christ was later placed. On the celebrated "cross of the Vatican," on which this lamb thus appears, are two busts of the Savior: one above, holding a book in his left hand, and giving a benediction (q.v.) in the Latin manner with the right, while the one below holds a scroll in the right hand, and a little cross in the left. The sixth OEcumenical Council (A.D. 680) ordered that Christ should be represented with his proper human body rather than under the symbol of the paschal lamb, and in the following century crucifixes multiplied greatly throughout all Christendom. The way to this decision had evidently been prepared by several intermediate steps, by which the aversion and horror of the death by the cross, though abolished as a mode of execution by

Constantine, were gradually overcome in the minds of the Christian world. Thus, on the viols of Monza, which Gregory the Creat gave to queen Theodelinda, there is a head of Christ in a nimbus containing a cross. A mosaic of St. Etienne, of about the same period, contains in addition one of the thieves on each side of the head of Christ, with a highly ornamented cross below and in the center of the vial, with an ornamented ediculum below, crowned by a cross, with an angel on one side, and the two women bringing spices to the tomb of Christ on the other side, indicating the resurrection of Christ. On another, Christ is represented with his arms extended — like the praying persons of the Catacombs — with the two thieves on crosses at his side, and the sun and moon, or other emblems, added to the representation. In the pictorial cross of Monza, said to be a present from Gregory the Great to the empress Theodelinda, and in others of the most ancient crucifixes, the figure of Christ was scratched in on the metal with some sharp-pointed instrument. Later, it was painted. It is in the 9th century that the figures first appeared in relief. The first crucifix used in a church, of which we have any proof, is spoken of by Gregory of Tours as being in the church of Narbonne (A.D. 593). After the council of 692 the Greek Church used painted crucifixes freely. Pope John VII, a Greek by birth (elected A.D. 705), first used the crucifix in St. Peter's Church, Rome. A single crucifix is found in the Catacombs, and this is considered to date from the 8th century. The crucifix soon assumed the most prominent place in the Romish church edifice, being placed over the center of the high altar, overtowering the tapers, and being removed only at the elevation of the Host. This altar-crucifix is often made in the most costly and artistic way, being usually of gold or silver, and adorned with pearls or precious stones. Crucifixes are also placed at the doors of churches, in cloisters, in chapels by the roadside, and at every place where crosses (q.v.) are erected. They are constantly used by Roman Catholics, both ecclesiastics and laymen, and especially are kept in the bedchamber. The reason given for this abundant use of the crucifix is "to keep the sufferings and death of Christ, and the fact of atonement, ever before the minds of believers." Among the Protestant churches, the Lutheran has not rejected the use of the altar crucifixes, though Protestants generally consider the use of crucifixes to lead to a worship of the material of which they are made, and to a forgetting of the true spiritual meaning of the Savior's death; hence they reject them altogether, regarding them as only valuable, whether sculptured or painted, as marking a phase of the development of ritualistic worship, or as works of art.

II. *Details*. — Until the 11th century Christ was represented as living, and usually with his head crowned with a nimbus or other symbol of his triumphal resurrection. His head was erect, his eyes open, indicating his divine nature, which is not subject to death; or, more probably, his triumph over his death. Though Christ was crucified, in accordance with the law, in an entirely naked condition, the earliest crucifixes represent him clothed with a colobium, a tunic without arms, and reaching to the feet. At the close of the 8th century, this was modified to a tunic bound around the waist and extending about to the knees; and by the close of the tenth century, the tunic was almost universally contracted to a simple band of cloth around the loins. This has been universally adopted by artists: till the present lime. The crucifix of the church St. Genes, at Narbonne, is the only example extant of this type being adopted before the 9th century. A manuscript in the Laurentian library at Florence, dating about the year 1060, contains the first example extant of Christ being represented as dead. All the crucifixes from that time represent the head as drooping, and life as just extinct. A stream of blood is sometimes reps resented flowing, from the wounds in the hands and the side, and falling upon the head of some of the characters represented, symbolizing thus the effects of the atonement. Nearly all of the great artists of the Middle Ages have painted the scene of the crucifixion, these being sometimes their master-pieces. Cimabue and Margaritone, in the 13th century, made the first representations extant of a crucifix with but three nails, the feet being crossed, in their paintings of the crucifixion in the church of St. Maria Novella in Florence. The Romish Church now usually prefers this type of the crucifix, though the former method, adopted by this church also till the 13th century, was without doubt the more in accordance with historical accuracy. The *suppedaneum* to support the feet is usually represented, though some later artists have placed a globe in place of this tablet or shelf. The *support for the body* has never been represented in art. The *title of the cross* was placed on a tablet which was attached to the head of the **T** cross. There are but one or two cases in which artists have given the full inscription in the three languages, and these are modern. Many crucifixes have no titles. In most it is indicated by a few meaningless marks. In the Greek Church the monogram of Christ, or I C . X C, or A, ω, is generally used.

III. *Accessories*. — These are either such as pertain to the literal circumstances of the crucifixion, or are symbolical figures having reference to the Atonement. The Virgin Mary and St. John are often represented as

standing one on each side of the cross, with the head bent forward and resting on the hand — a posture of grief common in all antiquity. The names of the two are usually given either in Latin or Greek. The two soldiers are often given, one holding a lance, and the other the sponge filled with vinegar. The very earliest crucifixes have not these soldiers, but they became common after the 8th century. A single example exists of their drawing lots for the Savior's garments. The sun and the moon, the former with a face surrounded by a circle, and giving out rays, and the latter in the form of a crescent, are often given, being to the right and left of the head of the Savior. These are sometimes replaced by the human demi-figures, one with a royal diadem, and the other crowned with a crescent or holding a torch, while both have one hand supporting the head in an attitude of grief. Rays of light often stream, from both the sun and the moon, upon the figure of Christ. These heavenly bodies are consideredly many to represent the darkness which suddenly came over nature, concealing the sun and moon. But a better interpretation is that they represent the divine and human nature of Christ, as the same figures do on other monuments. The redemption of man from sin by the death of Christ is symbolized in some crucifixes by a naked man rising up from the ground below the cross, while a hand above him is reached out from a cloud. Another represents a man lying on the ground, while a woman, with one knee on the ground, is taking hold of the hand in the cloud. This is to indicate Adam and Eve. A crucifix in St. John Lateran, in Rome, has a gate (of paradise) on one side, while on the other is a tree (of good and evil). showing that man, lost by partaking of the forbidden fruit, is restored by the cross to the paradise from which he was driven out. The emblems of the four evangelists and angels in adoration are often placed near the upper part of the crucifix. The skull and cross-bones at the foot of the cross is altogether a modern addition. The crucifix of a diptych of Rambona contains a wolf under the cross nourishing Romulus and Remus, supposed to symbolize the subjection of the Roman empire and the world to the cross of Christ, or to the city of Rome as the seat of the Romish Church. Other symbols relating to the truths of Christianity, or to the traditions relating to this central event in the history of the world, occur in various crucifixes. Many other modifications exist of the presentation of the crucifixion, whether given in full relief, or high or low relief, or whether painted in miniature, in mosaic, on fresco, or on canvas.

(prop. σταύρωσις, but in the N.T. the noun does not occur, the act being designated by some form of the verb σταυρόω, to *apply the cross*; once προσπήγνυμι, to *fasten*, i.e. to the cross, Acts 2:23; the classical writers use σταυροῦν, ἀνασταυροῦν σκολοπίζειν, προσηλοῦν, and, less properly, ἀνασκινδυλεύειν; *cruci* or *patibulo afficere*, *suffigere*, or simply *figere* [Tertull. *de Pat.* 3], *cruciare* [Auson.] *ad palun alligare*, *crucen alicui statuere*, *in crucemn agere*, *tollere*, etc.; the sufferer was called *cruciarius*). *SEE PASSION*.

I. *History*. — The variety of the phrases shows the extreme commonness of the punishment, the invention of which is traditionally ascribed to Semiramis. It was in use among the Egyptians (as in the case of Inarus, Thuc. 1:30; comp. Genesis xl, 19), the Carthaginians (as in the case of Hanno, etc., Val. Max. 2:7; Polyb. 1:86; Sil. Ital. 2:344; Plutarch, *Paral*. 24; Justin, 18:7; Hirt. *Bell. Afric*. 66), the Persians (Polycrates, etc.; Herod. 3, 125; 4:43; 7:194; Ctesias, *Excerpt*. 5; comp. Esther 7:10), the Assyrians (Diod. Sic. 2:1), Scythians (id. 2:44), Indians (id. 2:18), Germans (possibly *Tacit. Germ*. 12), and very frequent from the earliest times (Livy, 1:26) among the Romans. Cicero, however, refers it, not (as Livy) to the early kings, but to Tarquinius Superbus (pro Rab. 4); Aurel. Victor calls it *vetus vetersrinmumque (? teterr.) patibualorum supplicium*. Both κρεμᾶν and *suspendere* (Ovid, *Ibis*, 299) refer to death by crucifxion; thus, in speaking of Alexander's crucifixion of 2000 Tyrians, ἀνεκρέμασεν in Diod. Sic. answers to the *crucibus affixus* in Q. Curt. 4:4. The Greeks (Strabo, 14:647) and Macedonians (Appian, *Mithr*. 8; Curt. 7:11, 28; 9:8, 6) also sometimes resorted to this mode of punishment.

This accursed and awful mode of punishment was happily abolished by Constantine (Sozom. 1:8) probably towards the end of his reign (see Lipsius, *De Cruce*, 3, 15), although it is curious that we have no more definite account of the matter. Examples of it are found in the early part of that emperor's reign, but the reverence which, at a later period, he was led to feel for the cross, doubtless induced him to put an end to the inhuman practice (Aurel. Vict. *Coes*. 41; Niceph. 7:46; Firmic. 8:20). "An edict so honorable to Christianity," says Gibbon, "deserved a place in the Theodosian Code, instead of the indirect mention of it which seems to result from the comparison of the 5th and 18th titles of the 9th book" (ii. 154, note). *SEE PUNISHMENT*.

II. *As a Jewish Custom*. — Whether this mode of execution was known to the ancient Jews is a matter of dispute (see Bormitius, *De Cruce num Ebroeor. supplic. fuerit*, Viteb. 1644; Chaufepie, in the *Miscell. Duisb*. 2:401 sq.). It is asserted to have been so by Baronius (*Annal*. 1, 34), Sigonius (*De Rep. Hebr*. 6:8), etc., who are refuted by Casaubon (c. Baron. *Exero*. xvi), Carpzov (*Apparat. Crit*. p. 591). The Hebrew words said to allude to it are hl;T; talah’ (sometimes with the addition of /[eh; l[i “upon the tree;” hence the Jews in polemics call our Lord ywlt, and Christians ywlt ydbw[, “worshippers of the crucified”), and [qy; *yaka’*, both of which in the A. Vers. are generally rendered “to hang” (<10810>2 Samuel 18:10; <05122>Deuteronomy 21:22; <04504>Numbers 25:4; <18607>Job 26:7); for which σταυρόω occurs in the Sept. (<17010>Esther 7:10), and *crucifixerunt* in the Vulg. (<10206>2 Samuel 21:6, 9). The Jewish account of the matter (in Maimonides and the Rabbis) is, that the exposure of the body tied to a stake by its hands (which might loosely be called crucifixion) took place *after* death (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. in Matt*. 27:31; Othonis *Lex. Rabb*., s.v. Supplicia; Reland, *Ant*. 2:6; Sir T. Browne, *Vulg. Errors*, v. 21). Even the placing of a head on a single upright pole has been called crucifixion. This custom of crucifixion after death (which seems to be implied in <05122>Deuteronomy 21:22, 23) was by no means rare; men were first killed in mercy (Sueton. *Coes*.; Herod. 3, 125; Plutarch, Cleom. 38). According to a strange story in Pliny (36. 15, § 24), it was adopted by Tarquin as a post-mortem disgrace, to prevent the prevalence of suicide. It seems, on the whole, that the Rabbis are correct in asserting that this exposure is intended in Scripture, since the Mosaic capital punishments were four (viz., the sword, Exodus 21; strangling, fire, Leviticus 20; and stoning, Deuteronomy 21). Philo, indeed, says (*De leg. spec*.) that Moses adopted crucifixion as a murderer’s punishment because it was the worst he could discover; but the passage in <05123>Deuteronomy 21:23 does not prove his assertion. Probably, therefore, the Jews borrowed it from the Romans (Josephus, *Ant*. 20:6, 2; *War*, 2:12, 6; *Life*, 75, etc.), although there may have been a few isolated instances of it before (Josephus, *Ant*. 13:14, 2). *SEE HANGING*.

It was unanimously considered the most horrible form of death, worse even than burning, since the “cross” precedes “burning” in the law-books (Lipsius, *De Cruc*. 2:1). Hence it is *called crudelissimum teterrimumque supplicium* (Cicero, *Verr*. v. 66), *extrema poana* (Apul. *de Aur. Asin*. 10), *summum supplicium* (Paul. *Sent*. v, tit. xxi, etc.); and to a Jew it would

acquire factitious horror from the curse in <5212 3>Deuteronomy 21:23. Among the Romans also the degradation was a part of the infliction, since it was especially a servile supplicium (Tacitus, *Hist.* 4:11; Juvenal, 6:218; Horace, *Sat*. 1:3, 8, etc.; Plautus, *passim*), or "a slave's punishment" (*De Infasmi quo Chr. adfectus est cru. supp*., in Lange's *Observatt. Sacr*. [Lubec, 1731], p. 151 sq.; also Hencke, *Opusc*. p. 137 sq.), so that even a freedman ceased to dread it (Cicero, *pro Rab*. 5); or if applied to freemen, only in the case of the vilest criminals (Joseph. *Ant.* 17:10, 10; *War*, 5:11, 1; Paul. *Sent*. v, tit. xxiii; Lamprid. *Alex. Sev*. 23), such as persons guilty of robbery, piracy (Seneca, *Ep.* vii; Cicero, *Petron*. 71), assassination, perjury (Firmic. 6:26), sedition, treason, and (in the case of soldiers) desertion (Dion, v. 52; Joseph. *Ant.* 13:22; Apuleius, *Asin*. 3). Indeed, exemption from it was the privilege of every Roman citizen by the *jus civitatis* (Cicero, *Verr*. 2:1, 3). Our Lord was condemned to it by the popular cry of the Jews (<4027 3>Matthew 27:23, as often happened to the early Christians) on the charge of sedition against Caesar (<4230 2>Luke 23:2), although the Sanhedrim had previously condemned him on the totally distinct charge of blasphemy. Hundreds of Jews were crucified on the former charge, as by Floras (Joseph. *War*, 2:14, 9) and Varus, who crucified 2000 at once (*Ant.* 17:10, 10). *SEE EXECUTION*.

III. *Process*. — The scarlet robe, crown of thorns, and other insults to which our Lord was subjected, were illegal, and arose from the spontaneous petulance of the brutal soldiery. But the punishment properly commenced with scourging, after the criminal had been stripped; hence, in the common form of sentence, we find "summove, lictor, *despolia*, verbera," etc. (Livy, 1:26). For this there is a host of authorities — Livy, 26:13; Q. Curt, 7:11; Lucan, *de Piscat*. 2; Jerome, *Comment. ad Matt.* 27:26, etc. It was inflicted, not with the comparatively mild virgae, but the more terrible *flagellum* (Horace, *Sat*. 1:3; comp. <4712 4>2 Corinthians 11:24, 25), which was not used by the Jews (<5250 3>Deuteronomy 25:3). Into these scourges the soldiers often stuck nails, pieces of bone, etc., to heighten the pain (the μάστιξ ἀστραγαλωτή mentioned by Athenaeus, etc.; *flagrum pecuinis ossibus catenatumn*, Apul.), which was often so intense that the sufferer died under it (Ulp. *de Poenis*, 1, 8). The scourging generally took place at a column, and the one to which our Lord was bound is said to have been seen by Jerome, Prudentius, Gregory of Tours, etc., and is shown at several churches among the relics. In our Lord's case, however, this infliction seems neither to have been the legal scourging after the

sentence (Val. Max. 1:7; Josephus, *War*, 5:28; 2:14, 9), nor yet the examination by torture (<42224>Acts 22:24), but rather a scourging *before* the sentence, to excite pity and procure immunity from further punishment (<42322>Luke 23:22; <43901>John 19:1); and if this view be correct, the reference to it (φραγέλλωσας) in <40726>Matthew 27:26, is retrospective, as so great an anguish could hardly have been endured twice (see Poli *Synopsis*, ad loc.). How severe it was is indicated in prophecy (<19515>Psalm 35:15; <23006>Isaiah 1:6). Vossius considers that it was partly legal, partly tentative (*Harm. Pass.v.* 13). *SEE SCOURGE*.

The criminal carried his own cross, or, at any rate, a part of it (Plutarch, *De iis qui sero*, etc., 9; Artemid. *Oneirocr*. 2:61; see <43917>John 19:17; comp. "patibulum ferat per urbem, deinde affigatur cruci," Plaut. *Carbonar*.). Hence the term *furcifer*, cross-bearer (q.v.). This was prefigured by Isaac carrying the wood in <01226>Genesis 22:6, where even the Jews notice the parallel; and to this the fathers fantastically applied the expression in <23906>Isaiah 9:6, "the government shall be upon his shoulder." They were sometimes scourged and goaded on the way (Plaut. *Mostel*. 1:1, 52). "In some old figures we see our Lord described with a table appendent to the fringe of his garment, set full of nails and pointed iron" (Jeremiah Taylor, *Life of Christ*, 3, 15:2; *Haerebas ligno quod tuteras*, Cypr. *de Pas*. p. 50). *SEE SIMON (OF CYRENE)*.

The place of execution was outside the city ("post urbem," Cicero, *Verr*. v. 66; "extra portam," Plaut: *Mil. Gl*. 2:4, 6; comp. <12113>1 Kings 21:13; <44758>Acts 7:58; <58312>Hebrews 13:12; and in camps "extra vallum"), often in some public road (Quinct. *Decl*. 275) or other conspicuous place like the Campus Martins (Cicero, *pro Rabirio*), or some spot set apart for the purpose (Tacitus, Ann. xv). This might sometimes be a hill (Val. Max. vi); it is, however, rather an inference to call Golgotha a *hill*; in the Evangelists it is called "*a place*" (τόπος). *SEE CALVARY*. Arrived at the place of execution, the sufferer was stripped naked (Artemidorus, *Oneirocr*. 2:58), the dress being the perquisite of the soldiers (<40735>Matthew 27:35; Dig. 48:20, 6); possibly not even a cloth round the loins was allowed him; at least among the Jews the rule was "that a man should be stoned naked" (Sanhedr. 6:3), where the context shows that "naked" must not be taken in its restricted sense. The cross was then driven into the ground, so that the feet of the condemned were a foot or two above the earth (in pictures of the crucifixion the cross generally much too large and high), and he was lifted upon it (*agere, excurrere, tollere, ascendere in crucenm; Prudent*.

περὶ στεφ.; Plautus, *Mostel*. "*Crucisalus*;" id. Bacch. 2, 3, 128; ἀνῆγον, ηγον, ηγον εἰς ἄκρον τέλος, *Greg. Naz.*), or else stretched upon it on the ground, and then lifted with it, to which there seems to be an allusion in a lost prophecy quoted by Barnabas (*Ep.* 12), ὅταν ξύλον κλιθῇ καὶ ἀναστῇ (Pearson, *On the Creed*, Acts 4). The former method was the commoner, for we often read (as in <17010>Esther 7:10, etc.) of the cross being erected beforehand *in terrorem*. Before the nailing or binding took place, a medicated cup was given out of kindness to confuse the senses and deaden the pangs of the sufferer (<19106>Proverbs 31:6), usually of bitter wine (οἶνος ἐσμυρμισμένος or λελιβανωμένος), as among the Jews (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. ad latt*. xxvii), because myrrh was soporific. Other bitter herbs were also employed (Pipping, *Exercit. Acad*. p. 55). Our Lord refused it that his senses might be clear (<402734>Matthew 27:34; <411523>Mark 15:23; Maimonides, *Sanhed*. xiii). Matthew calls it "vinegar mingled with gall" (ὄξος μέτα χολῆς, /mhn), an expression used in reference to <19912>Psalm 79:21, but not strictly accurate. This mercifully intended draught must not be confounded with the spoonful of vinegar (or *posca*, the common drink of Roman soldiers, Spart. *Hadr*.; Plaut. *Mil. Gl*. 3, 2, 23), which was put on a hyssop-stalk and offered to our Lord in mocking and contemptuous pity (<402748>Matthew 27:48; <422336>Luke 23:36); this he tasted to allay the agonies of thirst (<431929>John 19:29).

The body was affixed to the cross by nails (see Corn. Curtius, *De clavis Domini*, Antw. 1760) driven into the hands, and more rarely into the feet; sometimes the feet were fastened by one nail driven through both (Tertull. *adv. Jud. x; Senec. De Vita Beat*. 19; Lactant. 4:13). The feet were occasionally bound to the cross by cords; and Xenophon asserts that it was usual among the Egyptians to bind in this manner not only the feet, but the hands. An inscription (*titulus*) was written upon a small tablet (σανίς, Socrat. *Hist. Eccl.* 1:17) declaring the crime (see Alberti, *De Inscript. crucis Chr*. Lips. 1725), and placed on the top of the cross (Sueton. *Cal*. 38; *Dom*. 10; Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.v.* 1). The body of the crucified person rested on a sort of seat (πῆγμα) (Iren. *adv. Haer*. 2:42). The criminal died under the most frightful sufferings — so great that even amid the raging passions of war pity was sometimes excited. Josephus (*War*, 5:11, 1) narrates of captives taken at the siege of Jerusalem that "they were first whipped, and tormented with all sorts of tortures, and then crucified before the walls of the city. ,The soldiers, out of the wrath and the hatred they bore the Jews, nailed those they caught one after one way and another after

another to crosses, by way of jest, when their multitude was so great that room was wanting for the crosses and crosses wanting for the bodies. This miserable procedure made Titus greatly pity them." Sometimes the suffering was shortened and abated by breaking the legs of the criminal — *crura fracta* (Cicero, Philippians 13:12). The execution took place at the hands of the *carnifex*, or hangman, attended by a band of soldiers, and in Rome under the supervision of the Triumviri Capitales (Tacit. *Ann*. 15:60; Lactant. 4:26). The accounts given in the Gospels of the execution of Jesus Christ are in entire agreement with the customs and practices of the Romans in this particular (Tholuck, *Glaubwurdigkeit der evangel*. Gesch. p. 361).

Our Lord was crucified between two "thieves" (λῃσταί, *robbers*) or "malefactors" (then so common in Palestine, Josephus, *War*, 2:6, etc.), according to prophecy (<253312>Isaiah 53:12); and was watched according to custom by a party of four soldiers (<491923>John 19:23), with their centurion (κουστωδία, <401766>Matthew 27:66; *miles qui cruces assurabat*, Petr. *Sat*. 3, 6; Plutarch, *Vit. Cleom*. 38), whose express office was to prevent the surreption of the body (Seneca, *Ep*. 101). This was necessary from the lingering character of the death, which sometimes did not supervene even for three days and was at last the result of gradual benumbing and starvation (Euseb. 8:8; Seneca, Proverbs 3). But for this guard, the persons might have been taken down and recovered, as was actually done in the case of a friend of Josephus, though only one survived out of three to whom the same careful nursing (θεραπεία ἐπιμελεστάτη) was applied (*Life*, 75). Among the Convulsionnaires in the reign of Louis XV, women would be repeatedly crucified, and even remain on the cross three hours; we are told of one who underwent it twenty-three times (*Encycl. Metr*., s.v. Cross); the pain consisted almost entirely in the *nailing*, and not more than a basinful of blood was lost. Still we cannot believe from the Martyrologies that Victorinus (crucified head downward) lived three days, or Timotheus and Maura nine days (compare Bretschneider, in the *Studien u. Krit.*, 1832, 2:625; Paulus, in the *Darmnst. Kirchenszeit*. 1833, No. 8, 9). Fracture of the legs (Plaut. *Pan*. 4:2, 64) was especially adopted by the Jews (<052122>Deuteronomy 21:22) to hasten death (<431931>John 19:31), and it was a mitigation of the punishment (Casaub. *Exerc. Antib*. p. 537), as observed by Origen. But the unusual rapidity of our Lord's death was due to the depth of his previous agonies (which appears from his inability to bear his own cross far), and to his mental anguish (Schöttgen, *Hor. Heb*. 6:3; *De*

pass. Messioe), or it may be sufficiently accounted for simply from peculiarities of constitution. There is no need to explain the "giving up of the ghost" as a miracle (Hebrews 5:7?), or say with Cyprian, *Prevento carnifcis offcio, spiritum sponte cimisit (Adv. Demetr*). Still less can the common cavil of infidelity be thought noteworthy, since, had our Lord been in a swoon, the piercing of his pericardium (proved by the appearance of lymph and blood) would have ensured death. (See Eschenbach, *Opusc. Med. de Servatore non apparenter sed vere mortuo*, and Gruner, *De morte Christi non synoptica*, quoted by Jahn in his *Bibl. Arch*.) (See below.) Pilate expressly satisfied himself of the actual death by questioning the centurion (Mark 15:44); and the omission of the breaking of the legs in this case was the fulfillment of a type (Exodus 12:46). Other modes of hastening death were by lighting fires under the cross (hence the nicknames *Sarmentitii* and *Semaxii*, Tert. *Apolog*. 50), or letting loose wild beasts on the crucified (Suet. *Ner*. 49).

Generally the body was suffered to rot on the cross (Cicero, *Tusc. Q*. 1:43; Sil. Ital. 8:486) by the action of sun and rain (Herod. 3, 12), or to be devoured by birds and beasts (Apul. *de Aur. Asin*. 6; Horace, *Ep*. 1:16, 48; Juvenal, 14:77). Sepulture was generally therefore forbidden (Pliny, *Hist. Nat*. 36:24), though it might be granted as a special favor or on grand occasions (Up. 1. 9, *De off. Pascons*.). But, in consequence of Deuteronomy 21:22, 23, an express national exception was made in favor of the Jews (Matthew 27:58; comp. Joseph. *War*, 4:5, 2).

IV. PATHOLOGY. — It only remains to speak of the manner of death, and the kind of physical suffering endured, which we shall very briefly abridge from the treatise of the physician Richter (in Jahn's *Bibl. Arch*.) These are,

1. The unnatural position and violent. tension of the body, which cause a painful sensation from the least motion.

2. The nails, being driven through parts of the hands and feet which are full of *nerves* and *tendons* (and yet at a distance from the heart), create the most exquisite anguish.

3. The exposure of so many wounds and lacerations brings on inflammation, which tends to become gangrene, and every moment increases the poignancy of suffering.

4. In the distended parts of the body more blood flows through the arteries than can be carried back into the veins: hence too much blood finds its way from the aorta into the head and stomach, and the blood-vessels of the head become pressed and swollen. The general obstruction of circulation which ensues causes an internal excitement, exertion, and anxiety more intolerable than death itself.

5. The inexpressible misery of *gradually increasing* and lingering anguish. To all this we may add, 6. Burning and raging thirst.

Death by crucifixion (physically considered) is therefore to be attributed to the sympathetic fever which is excited by the wounds, and aggravated by exposure to the weather, privation of water, and the painfully constrained position of the body. Traumatic fever corresponds, in intensity and in character, to the local inflammation of the wound. In the first stage, while the inflammation of the wound is characterized by heat, swelling, and great pain, the fever is highly inflammatory, and the sufferer complains of heat, throbbing headache, intense thirst, restlessness, and anxiety. As soon as suppuration sets in, the fever somewhat abates, and gradually ceases as suppuration diminishes and the stage of cicatrization approaches. But if the wound be prevented from healing, and suppuration continue, the fever assumes a hectic character, and will sooner or later exhaust the powers of life. When, however, the inflammation of the wound is so intense as to produce mortification, nervous depression is the immediate consequence; and if the cause of this excessive inflammation of the wound still continues, as is the case in crucifixion, the sufferer rapidly sinks. He is no longer sensible of pain, but his anxiety and sense of prostration are excessive; hiccough supervenes, his skin is moistened with a cold clammy sweat, and death ensues. It is in this manner that death on the cross must have taken place in an ordinarily healthy constitution. The wounds in themselves were not fatal; but, as long as the nails remained in them, the inflammation must have increased in intensity until it produced gangrene. The period at which death occurred was very variable, as it depended on the constitution of the sufferer, as well as on the degree of exposure and the state of the weather. It may, however, be asserted that death would not take place until the local inflammation had run its course; and though this process may be much hastened by fatigue and the alternate exposure to the rays of the sun and the cold night air, it is not completed before forty-eight hours, under ordinary circumstances, and in healthy constitutions; so that we may consider thirty-six hours to be the earliest period at which crucifixion

would occasion death in a healthy adult. It can not be objected that the heat of an Eastern climate may not have been duly considered in the above estimate, for many cases are recorded of persons having survived a much longer time than is here mentioned, even as long as eight or nine days. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* 3, 8) says that many of the martyrs in Egypt, who were crucified with their heads downward, perished by hunger. The want of water was a much more important privation. It must have caused the sufferer inexpressible anguish, and have contributed in no slight degree to hasten death.

Several eminent writers had occupied themselves with the physiology of our Savior's passion, if we may so express ourselves, before the "scientific" method of treating it was resorted to; such were Scheuchzer, Mead, Bartholinus, Vogler, Triller, Richter, and Eschenbach. But a much fuller and more exact investigation has since been made by the two Gruners, father and son, the latter of whom first wrote under the direction, and by the advice of the former. These earlier authors have collected all that medical analogies could furnish towards establishing the character of our Savior's sufferings and the reality of his death. "The pulmonary, and other veins and arteries about the heart and chest, by the abundance of blood flowing thither, and there accumulating, must have added frightful bodily suffering to the anguish of mind produced by the overpowering burden of our sins" (G. G. Richteri *Dissertationes Qiatuor Medicoe*, Gotting. 1775, p. 57). But this general suffering must have made a relative impression upon different individuals; and, as Charles Gruner well observes, the effect it produced upon two hardy and hardened thieves, brought out fresh from prison, must naturally have been very different from that on our Savior, whose frame and temperament were of a very opposite character; who had been previously suffering a night of tortures and restless fatigue; who had been wrestling with mental agony till one of the rarest phenomena had been caused — a bloody sweat; who must have felt to the most acute degree of intensity all the mental aggravation of his punishment — its shame and ignominy, and the distress of his pious mother, and few faithful friends (C. F. *Gruneri Commentatio Antiquaria Medicoi de Jesu' Cristi rtorte vera non simulata,* Halae, 1805, p. 30-45). To these he might have added other reflections, as that our Savior was evidently weakened beyond other persons in similar circumstances, seeing he was not strong enough to carry his cross, as criminals led to execution were always able to do; and if the men whom we are answering suppose

our Lord to have, only fallen into a trance from exhaustion, they have manifestly no right to judge from other cases, for in them even this did not occur. The younger Gruner goes minutely into all the smallest circumstances of the passion, examining them as objects of medical jurisprudence, and particularly takes cognizance of the stroke inflicted by the soldier's lance. He shows the great probability of the wound having been in the left side, and from below transversely upward; he demonstrates that such a stroke, inflicted by the robust arm of a Roman soldier, with a short lance, for the cross was not raised much from the ground, must, in any hypothesis, have occasioned a deadly wound. Up to this moment he supposes our Savior may have been still faintly alive, because otherwise the blood would not have flowed, and because the loud cry which he uttered is a symptom of a syncope from too great a congestion of blood about the heart. But this wound, which, from the flowing of blood and water, he supposes to have been in the cavity of the chest, must, according to him, have been necessarily fatal. Tirinus and other commentators, as well as many physicians, Gruner, Bartholinus, Triller, and Eschenbach, suppose this water to have been lymph from the pericardium. Vogler (*Physiologia Historie Passionis*, Helmst. 1693, p. 44) supposes it to have been serum separated from the blood. But from the manner in which the apostle John mentions this mystical flow, and from the concurrent sentiment of all antiquity, we must admit something more than a mere physical event. Richter observes that the abundant gush of the blood and water, "*non ut in mortuis fieri solet, lentum et grumosum, sed calentenm adhuc et flexilem; tamquam ex calentissimo misericordiae fonte*," must be considered preternatural, and deeply symbolical. Christian Gruner goes over the same ground, and answers, step by step, the additional objections of an anonymous impugner. He shows that the words used by John to express the wound inflicted by the lance are often used to denote a mortal one; he proves that, even supposing the death of Christ to have been in the first instance apparent, the infliction of merely a slight wound would have been fatal, because, in syncope or trance arising from loss of blood, any venesection would be considered such (*Vindicice Mortis Jesu Christi verce*, p. 67, 77, sq.); and that, in fine, so far from the spices or unguents used in embalming, or the close chamber of the tomb, being fitting restoratives to a person in a trance, they would be the most secure instruments for converting apparent into real death, by suffocation. To this we may add Eschenbach's observation (*Scripta Medi.-biblica*, Rostock, 1779, p. 128) that there is no well-recorded instance of syncope lasting

more than one day, whereas here it must have lasted three; and also that even this period would not have been sufficient to restore to strength and health a frame which had undergone the shattering tortures of crucifixion and the enfeebling influence of syncope from loss of blood. A consideration not noticed by any of these authors seems to decide the point of the depth of the wound, and place beyond doubt that it could not be superficial, but must have entered the cavity. Our Savior distinguishes the wounds in his hands from that of his side by desiring Thomas to measure the former by his finger, and the latter by the insertion of his hand (⁴⁸⁰⁷John 20:27). This, therefore, must have been of the breadth of two or three fingers on the outside. But for a lance, which tapered very gently from the point, to leave a scar or incision on the flesh of such a breadth, at least four or five inches must have penetrated into the body, a supposition quite incompatible with a superficial or flesh wound. Of course, this reasoning is with those who admit the entire history of the passion and subsequent appearance of our Savior, but deny his real death; and such are the adversaries of the Gruners.

It is not inappropriate here to introduce a case which may confirm some of the foregoing observations. It is an account of a crucified Mameluke, or Turkish servant, published by Kosegarten (*Chrest. Arab*. Lips, 1828, p. 63-65), from an Arabic manuscript entitled "*The Meadow of Flowers and the fragrant Odour*." The narrative, after quoting the authorities, as is usual in Arabic histories, proceeds as follows "It is said that he had killed his master for some cause or other, and he was crucified on the banks of the river Barada [Burada], under the castle of Damascus, with his face turned towards the east. His hands, arms, and feet were nailed, and he remained so from midday on Friday to the same hour on Sunday, when he died. He was remarkable for his strength and prowess; he had been engaged with his master in sacred war at Askelon, where he slew great numbers of the Franks; and when very young he had killed a lion. Several extraordinary things occurred at his being nailed, as that he gave himself up without resistance to the cross, and without complaint stretched out his hands, which were nailed, and after them his feet: he in the meantime looked on, and did not utter a groan, or change his countenance, or move his limbs." Thus we see a person, in the flower of his age, remarkable for his hardihood and strength, inured to military fatigue, nay, so strong that we are told, in another part of the narrative, that "he moved his feet about, though nailed, till he loosened the fastenings of the nails, so that, if they had not been well secured in the wood, he would have drawn them out;"

and yet he could not endure the suffering more than eight-and-forty hours. But the most interesting circumstance in this narration, and the illustration of the scriptural narrative principally in view, is the fact, not mentioned by any ancient describer of this punishment, that the principal torture endured by this servant was that of thirst, precisely as is intimated in the Gospel history (<43 19 28>John 19:28). For the Arabic narrator thus proceeds: "I have heard this from one who witnessed it — and he thus remained till he died, patient and silent, without wailing, but looking around him to the right and to the left, upon the people. But he begged for water, and none was given him; and the hearts of the people were melted with compassion for him, and with pity on one of God's creatures, who, yet a boy, was suffering under so grievous a trial. In the mean time, the water was flowing around him, and he gazed upon it, and longed for one drop of it . . . and he complained of thirst all the first day, after which he was silent, for God gave him strength."

Various theories have therefore been proposed to account for the speedy death of Christ upon the cross. That it did not occur simply and directly from the crucifixion is evident from the above statements, and from the surprise of Pilate that it had taken place so soon, when the thieves crucified at the same time had not expired. The usual theory attributes his sudden death to a voluntary surrender of his own life, which is supposed to be favored by the expression "yielded or 'gave' up the ghost," ἀφῆκε [παρέδωκε] τὸ πνεῦμα, <40 27 50>Matthew 27:50; <43 19 30>John 19:30), and also by his declarations concerning his "laying down his life" (τίθημι τὴν ψυχήν, <43 10 11>John 10:11, 15, 17). But, aside from the inappositeness of these passages (the same terms being often used of ordinary decease and of voluntary submission to a violent death), this view is derogatory to the character of Christ (who is thus, in effect, made a suicide), and inconsistent with the expressions concerning the guilt of his murderers (who are thus made only accessories or assistants). The most probable explanation of the sudden death of Christ is that proposed and extensively argued by Dr. Stroud (*Treatise on the Physical Cause of the Death of Christ*, Lond. 1847), who attributes it to a proper rupture of to heart, a pathological accident, which he thus describes (p, 88): "The immediate cause is a sudden and violent contraction of one of the ventricles, usually the left, on the column of blood thrown into it by a similar contraction of the corresponding auricle. Prevented from returning backward by the intervening valve, and not finding a sufficient outlet forward in the

connected artery, the blood reacts against the ventricle itself, which is consequently torn, open at the point of greatest distention, or least resistance, by the influence of its own reflected force. A quantity of blood is hereby discharged into the pericardium, and, having no means to escape from that capsule, stops the circulation by compressing the heart from without, and induces almost instantaneous death. In young and vigorous subjects, the blood thus collected in the pericardium soon divides into its constituent parts, namely, a pale, watery liquid called serum, and a soft clotted substance of a deep red color, called crassamentum; but, except under similar circumstances of extravasation, this distinct separation of the blood is seldom witnessed in the dead body." This explanation meets all the circumstances of Christ's passion. The violence of his emotions was sufficient to burst open the heart, as Dr. Stroud shows by a multitude of examples of immediate death from sudden mental, affections; and this, as a secondary cause, is confirmed by the occurrence of the sanguineous perspiration in the garden from similar emotions. *SEE BLOODY SWEAT*. It explains the suddenness of Christ's death, so evident in all the evangelical narratives, as well as its early occurrence, so surprising to Pilate. The loud shrieks that immediately preceded dissolution were at once the expression of the mental paroxysm (<40275>Matthew 27:50; <41537>Mark 15:37), and the effort of nature to relieve the system from the sense of suffocation consequent upon the congestion of blood at the heart. This will also account for the presence of "water" (serum), as well as "blood" (crsassamentmnz), in a commingled yet distinct state, within the pericardium, and discharged at the orifice made by the soldier's spear (<43934>John 19:34), since no blood would flow from a wound in a corpse's veins. *SEE BLOOD AND WATER*.

V. *Literature*. — An explanation of the other circumstances attending the crucifixion belongs rather to a commentary than a dictionary. The assertion of Paulus and others, that the feet were not nailed (Curtius, *De clavis Domini*, Antw. 1670), is amply refuted by Winer (*De pedum affxione*, Lips. 1845) and others. For the detailed incidents in our Savior's case, see JESUS; and compare Hase, *Leben Jesul*, § 115. On the types and prophecies of it, besides those adduced, see *Cypr. Testim*. 2:20. On the resurrection of the saints, see Lightfoot, ad. <40275>Matthew 27:52 (there is a monograph by Gebaverius — *Dissert. de Resur. sanctorum cum Christo*, in his *Comment. Miscell*. No. 6). *SEE RESURRECTION*. On other concomitant prodigies, see Schöttgen, *Hor. Heb*. et Talmud. 6:3, 8. *SEE*

DARKNESS; *SEE EARTHQUAKE*. The chief ancient authorities may be found in Lipsius, *De Cruce* (Antwerp, 1589, 1594, and since); see also in Fabric. *Bibliogr. Antiquar.* (Hamb. 1760), p. 755 sq.; and especially Friedlieb, *Archaologie der Leidensgeschichte* (Bonn, 1843). On the points in which our Lord's crucifixion differed from the ordinary Jewish customs, see *Othonis Lex. Rabbinicum, s.v., Supplicia*; Bynseus, *De Morte J. Christi*; Vossius, *Harm. Passionis*; Carpzov, *Apparat. Crit.* p. 591, sq. etc.; Salmasius, *De Cruce* (L. B. 1646); Bartholinus, *De latere Christi aperto* (L. B. 1646); also *De Cruce Christi* (Amst. 1670, L. B. 1693); Zobel, in the *Magaz. fur bibl. Interpret.* 2:321 sq. *SEE CROSS*.

There are monographs in Latin on the following points connected with the subject: on the cross itself, by Baudissus (Viteb. 1673), Cellarius (Ziz. 1677), Cyprian (Helmst. 1699), Freiesleben (Jen. 1662), Germar (Thorun. 1787), Gezelius (Upsal. 1692), Gleich (Lips. 1704), Liperuis (Sedin. 1675), Ortlob (Viteb. 1655), Nihusius (Colon. 1644), Paschius (Viteb. 1686), Richter (Zittau, 1775), Verporten (Fracft. ad V. 1759), Gretser (Ingolst. 1598-1605), id. (ib. 1610), Lipsius (Antwerp, 1595, 1606, Amst. 1670), Bosius (Antw. 1617), Bornitius (Vit. 1644), Salmasius (L. B. 1646), Lange (Vit. 1669), Lamy (Ilarm. Ev. p. 573 sq.); on the crucifixion gen. erally, by Buddseus (Jen. 1707), Dilher (Norimb. 1642), Gerhard (Rost. 1662), Vogler (Helmst. 1693), Versteeg (Traj. ad Rh. 1700), Lydius (Dortrac. 1672, Zutphen, 1701), id. (Tr. ad R. 1701), Medhurst (Bibl. Brem. I, i; III, in), Margalitha (Freft. ad V. 1706), Merchenius (Duisb. 1722), two anonymous fasciculi (Dusseldorf, 1730), Westhovius (L. B. 1733), Sturm (Hal. 1763), Hessler (Sondersh. 1770), Fremery (1788), Zobel (in Germ. Mag. fur bibl. Interpret. 1:2), Essner (in Germ. Nilrnb. 1818), Jongh (Tr. ad Rh. 1827), Hug (in Germ. Freib. Zeitschr. 1831), Scharf (Leucop. 1606), Engelmann (Cygn. 1679), Haberkorn (Gress. 1656), Kor, tholt (Kilon. 1687), Pritius (Lips. 1697), Habichorst (Rost. 1681), Mieg (Heidelb. 1681), Niepeneck (Rost. 1700), Haferung (Viteb. 1739), Moebius (Lips. 1689), Scharf (Leucopetr. 1666), Stosch (Freft. ad V. 1759), Vitringa (Obss. sacr. 2:384 sq.); on the infamy of the punishment, by Henke (Helmst. 1785), Jetze (Starg. 1761), Lange (Lubec, 1729); on the time of Christ's crucifixion (in reconciliation of the discrepancy between <41155>Mark 15:25, and <43914>John 19:14), by Kieil (Lips. 1778-1780), Liebknecht (Giess. 1726), Michaelis (in Germ. Hamb. Bibl. 3, 2), Reyper (*Thes. Diss.* 2:241), Schwarz (Lips. 1778), Morinus (Lugd. B. 1686, 1698), Osiander (Tubingen, 143), Pauli (Halle, 1744, 1752),

Woerger (in Menethen. *Thesaur.* 2:277), Wolf (Lips. 1750), Zeibich (in German, Lpz. 1713); Zeltner (three diss., Altorf. 1720, 1721, 1724), Knittel (in German, Wolfenb. 1755), Horn (Havn. 1780), Rhein (in Germ., Lpz. 1832); on Christ's thirst and drink on the cross, by Bauer (Viteb. 1714), Deyling (Obss. 1:227), Faber. (London, 1660), Hutten (Guben. 1671), Leo (Leucop. 1721), Neumann (Viteb. 1683), Pipping (Lips. 1688), Rausch (Jena, 1733), Schlegel (in German, Henke's Magaz. 4:288-291), Walch (Obss. in Maatth. p. 101-138); on his prayer for his murderers, by. March (Syll. Diss. p. 308, 328), Pfaff (Tub. 1746); on his despairing cry, by Hoepfner (Lips. 1641), Frischmuth (Jen. 1663), Niemann (Jen. 1671), Schearf (Vit. 1671), Lockerwitz (Viteb. 1680), Olearius (Lips. 1683), the same (ib. 1683, 1726), Deutschmann (Viteb. 1695), Winslow (Havre, 1706), Engestrom (Lund. 1738), Luger (Jena, 1739), Leucke (Lips. 1753), Weissmann (Tub. 1746), Sommel (Lund. 1774), Wickenhofer (in Germ., Zimmermann's *Monatssch*. 1822, No. 24); on his commending his spirit to the Father, by Wolle (Lips. 1726; again Gott. 1744); on his so-called "last seven words," by Froerysen (Argent. 1625), Dannhauer (ib. 1641), Lange (Lips. 1651), Mayer (Gryph. 1706), Criiger (Vit. 1726), Vincke (Tr. ad Rh. 1846); on the presence of Mary, by Zorn (Opusc. 2:316-322); on the perforation of the hands and feet, by Fontanus (Amst. 1641), Stemler (Dresd. 1741); on the puncture by the spear, by Sagittarius (Jena, 1673; also in *Thes. Diss. Amst*. 2:381-7), Bartholinus (L. B. 1646, Lips. 1664, 1683, Frcf. 1681), Faes (Helmst. 1676), Quenstedt (Viterb. 1678), Wedel (Jen. 1686), Jacobi (Lips. 1686), Suantenius (Rost. 1686), Loescher (Vit. 1697), Triller (Vit. 1775); on the discharge from the wound, by Kocher (Dresd. 1597), Ritter (Vit. 1687), Eschenbach (Rost. 1775), Calovius (Vit. 1679); on the medical aspects of the death, by Vogler (Helmstadt, 1673), Westphal (Grypesv. 1771), Richter (Gott. 1757), Kiesling (Erlang. 1767), Gruner (Sen., Jen. 1800, Jun., Hal. 1805), Stroud (in English, London, 1847), Bruhier (in French, Paris, 1749), Swieten (Vien. 1778), Hufeland (Germ., Weim. 1791), Taberger (Germ., Hannov. 1829); on the attestation of the by-standers, by Dietelmaier (Altdorf, 1749), Schottgen (German, in Bidermann's Schulsachen, in; 16). For other dissertations on associated incidents, *SEE PASSOVER*; *SEE PILATE*; *SEE MOCKERY (OF CHRIST)*; *SEE CROWN (OF THORNS)*; *SEE THIEF (ON THE CROSS)*; *SEE SABACTHANI*; *SEE ECLIPSE*; *SEE EARTHQUAKE*; *SEE VAIL*; *SEE CENTURION*; *SEE PRISONER*, etc.

Cruciger Caspar,

one of the most faithful and useful of Luther's coadjutors in the Reformation, was born at Leipsic Jan. 1:1504, of religious parents, who took pains with his education. In his sixteenth year he embraced the doctrines of the Reformation, and about 1521 he began to study theology at Wittenberg with Luther and Melancthon. He became profoundly skilled in Hebrew. In 1524 he was called to, Magdeburg, and there taught with great success till 1527, when he returned to Wittenberg, where he lectured on the Scriptures, and aided Luther in his translation of the Bible. He was very expert in shorthand writing, and to this faculty we are indebted for many of Luther's precious remains. He died at Wittenberg Nov. 16, 1548. His letters may be found in the *Corpus Reformatorum*. — Middleton, *Evang. Biog*.; Adam, *Vitae Theologorum*; Piper, *Evangel. Kalender*, 1854; Pressel, *Caspar Crucige nach gleichzeitigen Quellen* (Elberfeldt, 1862).,

Cruden Alexander,

author of the well-known *Concordance*, was born in Aberdeen May 31, 1701, and was educated at Mareschal College with a view to the ministry, but aberration of mind caused his temporary confinement in an asylum, and prevented his entering on the ecclesiastical career. in 1732 he went to London, and was employed as a classical tutor and corrector of the press. He was appointed bookseller to the queen, to whom in 1737 he dedicated his *Complete Concordance to the Holy Scriptures of the O. and N. Test.*, which first appeared in that year. Pecuniary difficulties growing out of the publication of this work now increased his insanity, and led to his temporary confinement, but he escaped from Bethnal Green, and brought an action against the proprietor and physician of the asylum, who of course obtained a verdict in their favor. For the rest of his life he was permitted to remain at liberty, and he returned with zeal to his learned and severe labors, manifesting his strange eccentricity in a thousand forms — soliciting knighthood from the king, a seat in Parliament from the people of London, and courting the daughter of the lord mayor, but preserving unchanged his piety and benevolence. He made a verbal index to Milton's poems, a *Scripture Dictionary*, and several religious works, continuing to the last the emendation of his *Concordance*. Many editions of this work have since appeared. On November 1, 1770, he was found dead in his chamber in the attitude of prayer. *SEE CONCORDANCE*.

Crumbaugh John Samuel,

a Lutheran minister, was born in Frederick County, Md., November 7, 1831. He graduated at Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, in 1851, and the same year was appointed principal of the High School, Lancaster, Pa., a position to which he seemed specially adapted. While thus engaged, he also pursued his theological studies under the direction of Reverend Dr. Baker, and in 1853 was licensed to preach the Gospel. His first and only pastoral charge was St. John's (Lutheran) Church, Lancaster. His health, never very vigorous, began to fail under his labors, to which he had so assiduously and successfully devoted himself. He resigned his charge in 1857, and accepted the office of superintendent for common schools of Lancaster County, in the expectation that an opportunity would be afforded, in the active exercise required, for the resuscitation of his health. His zeal and success in the discharge of his varied and difficult duties were regarded by the board as unsurpassed. He was a man of more than ordinary ability, and as a

teacher possessed peculiar qualifications. He died Jan. 13, 1859. “His brief life,” says Dr. Burrowes, “was a record of learning, usefulness, and honor.” He published an address on *God in History*, delivered before the literary societies of Franklin and Marshall College in 1855.

Crusades

the name given to the religious wars carried on from the close of the eleventh to the close of the thirteenth century by the Christian countries of Europe against the Mohammedans for the conquest of the Holy Land. (In this article we make free use of the article in Chambers’s *Encyclopaedia*.) From an early period in the history of the Church it was considered a pious act to make a pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulchre, and to visit the various spots which the Savior had consecrated by his presence. When Palestine was conquered by the Arabs in the seventh century, that fierce but generous people respected the religious spirit of the pilgrims, and allowed them to build a church and a hospital in Jerusalem. Under the Fatimides of Egypt, who conquered Syria about 980 A.D., the position both of the native Christian residents and of the pilgrims became less favorable; but the conquest of Jerusalem in 1078, and the subjugation of the country by brutal hordes of Seljuk Turks from the Caucasus, rendered it intolerable. The news of their atrocities produced a deep sensation over the whole of Christendom, and kindled a general desire for the liberation of the Holy Land from the hands of the infidels. The popes encouraged this movement to the best of their ability. They saw in it an opportunity to extend the Church, to re-enforce their power, and to turn the warlike ardor of the Western princes, which so often led to conflicts between Church and State, against the infidels. In 1073, the Greek emperor, Manuel VII, sent to supplicate the assistance of the great pope, Gregory VII, against the Turks, accompanying his petition with many expressions of profound respect for his holiness and the Latin Church. Gregory cordially responded, but circumstances prevented him from ever carrying the vast designs which he entertained into execution. The idea of a crusade was, however, revived by his successor, Urban II, an able and humane man, whose sympathies were kindled by the burning zeal of Peter the Hermit, a native of Amiens, in France, who had made a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, witnessed the cruelties perpetrated by the Turks, and was now traversing Europe, preaching every where to crowds in the open air, and producing the most extraordinary enthusiasm by his impassioned descriptions of how pilgrims were murdered, robbed, or beaten, how shrines and holy places were

desecrated, and how nothing but greed restrained the ruffian Turks (who made the Christians pay heavy taxes for their visits to Jerusalem) from destroying the Holy Sepulchre, and extirpating every vestige of Christianity in the land.

First Crusade, 1096-1099. — When, by the addresses of Peter the Hermit and others, the feelings of Europe had been sufficiently heated, two councils were held in 1095, one at Piacenza, in May, and the other at Clermont, in France, in November, to organize the war. At the second, at Clermont, a crusade was definitely resolved on. The pope himself delivered a stirring address to a vast multitude of clergy and laymen, and as he proceeded, the pent-up emotions of the crowd burst forth, and cries of *Deus vult* (God wills it) rose simultaneously from the whole audience. These words, *Deus vult*, by the injunction of Urban, were made the war-cry of the enterprise, and every one that embarked in it wore, as a badge, the sign of the cross; hence the name Crusade (Fr. *croisade*, from Lat. *crux*, a *cross*). From all parts of Europe thousands upon thousands hurried at the summons of the pope to engage in the holy war. In May, 1096, the crusade was actually begun by an undisciplined force of about 20,000 foot, commanded by a Burgundian gentleman, Walter the Penniless. It marched through Hungary, but was cut to pieces by the natives of Bulgaria, only a few, among whom was Walter himself, escaping to Constantinople. The second, consisting of 40,000 men, women, and children, was led by Peter the Hermit. It followed the same route as its predecessor, and reached Constantinople greatly reduced. Here the two united, crossed the Bosphorus, and were utterly defeated by the Turks at Nice, the capital of Bithynia A third expedition of a similar kind, composed of 15,000 Germans, led by a priest named Gottschalk, was slaughtered or dispersed in Hungary, which also proved the grave of the *fourth*, a terrible horde, consisting of about 200,000 wretches from France, England, Flanders, and Lorraine, who had swept along through Germany, committing horrible ravages, especially against the Jews, whom they murdered without mercy. Now, however, the real Crusaders made their appearance-the gentry, the yeomanry, and the serfs of feudal Europe, under chiefs of the first rank and renown. Six armies appeared in the field, marching separately, and at considerable intervals of time. Their respective leaders were Godfrey of Bouillon, duke of Lorraine; Hugh the Great, count of Vermandois, and brother of Philippe, king of France; Robert Curthose, duke of Normandy, the son of William the Conqueror; count Robert of Flanders; Bohemond,

prince of Tarentum, son of the famous Guiscard, under whom was Tancred, the favorite hero of all the historians of the Crusade; and, lastly, count Raymond of Toulouse. The place of rendezvous was Constantinople. The Greek emperor, Alexius, afraid that so magnificent a host — there were in all not less than 600,000 men, exclusive of women and priests — might be induced to conquer lands for themselves, cajoled all the leaders, excepting Tancred and count Raymond, into solemnly acknowledging themselves his liegemen. After some time spent in feasting, the Crusaders crossed into Asia Minor (accompanied by the unfortunate Peter the Hermit). Here their first step was the siege and capture of Nice, the capital of Sultan Soliman, June 24, 1097. This monarch was also defeated by Bohemond, Tancred, and Godfrey, at Dorylaeum. Baldwin, brother of Godfrey, now crossed into Mesopotamia, where he obtained the principality of Edessa. After some time the Crusaders reached Syria, and laid siege to Antioch. For seven months the city held out, and the ranks of the besiegers were fearfully thinned by famine and disease. Many, even brave warriors, lost heart, and began to desert. Melancholy to relate, among the list of cowards was the poor enthusiast who had planned the enterprise. Peter was actually several miles on his way home when he was overtaken by the soldiers of Tancred, and brought back to undergo a public reprimand. At length, on the 3d of June, 1098, Antioch was taken, and the inhabitants were massacred by the infuriated Crusaders, who were in their turn besieged by an army of 200,000 Mohammedans sent by the Persian sultan. Once more famine and pestilence did their deadly work. Multitudes also deserted, and, escaping over the walls, carried the news of, the sad condition of the Christians back to Europe. But again victory crowned the efforts of the besieged. On June 28, 1098, the Mohammedans were utterly routed, and the way to Jerusalem opened. It was on a bright summer morning (1099) that 40,000 Crusaders, the miserable remnant of that vast array which two years before had laid siege to Nice, obtained their first glimpse of Jerusalem. On July 15, after a siege of rather more than five, weeks, the grand object of the expedition was realized. Jerusalem was delivered from the hands of the infidel. Eight days after the capture of the city, Godfrey of Bouillon was unanimously elected king of Jerusalem.

Second Crusade, 1147. — In 1144 the principality of Edessa was conquered by the emir of Mosul, and the Christians slaughtered. His son Noureddin advanced to destroy the Latin kingdoms of Syria and Palestine. Europe once more trembled with excitement. A second crusade was

preached by the famous St. Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux, in Champagne; and early in 1147 two enormous armies, under the command of Louis VII, king of France, and Conrad III, emperor of Germany, marched for the Holy Land. Their united numbers were estimated at 1,200,000 fighting-men. The expedition, nevertheless, proved a total failure. The Greek emperor, Manuel Comnenus, was hostile; and through the treachery of his emissaries the army of Conrad was all but destroyed by the Turks near Iconium, while that of Louis was wrecked in the defiles of the Pisidian Mountains. After a vain attempt to reduce at first Damascus and subsequently Ascaion, the relics of this mighty host returned to Europe.

Third Crusade, 1189-1192. — The death-blow to the kingdom of Jerusalem was given by Salah-Eddin, commonly called Saladin, a young Kurdish chief, who had made himself sultan of Egypt, and who aspired to the presidency of the Mohammedan world, in October, 1187, Jerusalem itself capitulating after a siege of fourteen days. The news of this led to a third crusade, the chiefs of which were Frederick I (Barbarossa), emperor of Germany, Philippe Auguste, king of France, and Richard Cour-de-Lion, king of England. Barbarossa took the field first in the spring of 1189, but accidentally lost his life by fever caught from bathing in the Orontes. His army, much reduced, joined the forces, of the other two monarchs before Acre (or Ptolemais), which important city was immediately besieged, and after a beleaguering of twenty-three months surrendered. But the Crusaders were not united among themselves. Philippe soon after returned to France; and Richard, after accomplishing prodigies of valor, which excited the admiration of the Saracens, concluded a treaty with Saladin, by which “the people of the West were to be at liberty to make pilgrimages to Jerusalem, exempt from the taxes which the Saracen princes had in former times imposed.” On October 25, 1192, Richard set sail for Europe.

Fourth Crusade, 1203. — In 1203 a fourth expedition was determined upon by pope Innocent III, although the condition of the Christians was by no means such as to call for it. It assembled at Venice, the government of which republic, from political reasons, promised to support the movement by its navy. The army never went to Palestine at all, but preferred to take possession of the Byzantine empire. The leader of this host of pseudo-Crusaders, Baldwin, count of Flanders, was seated on the throne of the East in 1204, where he and his successors maintained themselves for fifty-six years. Some writers do not number this expedition- among the regular crusades, but count as the fourth crusade another expedition, in 1217,

which king Andrew II of Hungary was prevailed upon by pope Honorius III to undertake. He was supported by the kings of Jerusalem and Cyprus, conquered a fortress on Mount Tabor and some small forts, but in 1218 returned home. In the same year count William of Holland, being allied with the kings of Jerusalem and Cyprus, landed in Egypt. He conquered in 1219 Damietta, but in 1221 this town and all other conquests were lost again.

Fifth Crusade, 1228-1229. — This was commanded by Frederick II, emperor of Germany. It began in 1228, and terminated in a treaty of ten years between that monarch and the sultan of Egypt, by which Palestine was ceded to Frederick, who, after being crowned king of Jerusalem in 1229, returned to Europe, leaving his new possessions in a state of tranquillity.

Sixth Crusade, 1248. — In 1244 a new race of Turks burst into Syria, and once more the Holy Land fell into the hands of these ferocious barbarians. Jerusalem was burned and pillaged. In 1248, Louis IX of France (St. Louis) headed a crusade against them. At the head of 40,000 soldiers he embarked from Cyprus, and from there went to Egypt, conquering the coast and the town of Damietta, but when he advanced further he was utterly defeated, and taken prisoner by the sultan of Egypt. By the payment of a large ransom he obtained his liberty (1250), and that of the other prisoners. On his return to Europe he was regarded as a sort of martyr in the cause of Christ.

Seventh Crusade, 1270. — This also was primarily undertaken by St. Louis, but he having died at Tunis in 1270, on his way to Palestine, prince Edward of England, afterwards Edward I, who had originally intended to place himself under the command of St. Louis, marched direct for Palestine, where his rank and reputation in arms gathered round him all who were willing to fight for the Cross. Nothing of consequence, however, was accomplished, and Edward soon returned to England, the last of the Crusaders. Acre, Antioch, and Tripoli still continued in the possession of the Christians, and were defended for some time by the Templars and other military knights; but in 1291 Acre capitulated, the other towns soon followed its example, and the knights were glad to quit the country, and disperse themselves over Europe in quest of new employment, leaving Palestine in the undisturbed possession of the Saracens.

Since that time there have been no further crusades, although the popes have more than once attempted to excite the Christians to the undertaking. Some writers do not hesitate to affirm that the popes, under this device, aimed at universal power over the kings and armies employed in their service, which were numerous, because a plenary indulgence was the reward of a Crusader. The Christian princes were exhausted in the struggle, while the pope became omnipotent both over clergy and people. The people sold their property for a mere trifle, or made a gift of it to monasteries and abbeys. It is computed that nearly two millions of Christians lost their lives during the crusades by slaughter, hunger, pestilence, etc.

It is impossible to overlook the fact that, in some respects, the crusades exercised a most beneficial influence on modern society. M. Guizot, in his *Lectures on European Civilization,* endeavors to show their design and function in the destinies of Christendom. “To the first chroniclers,” he says, “and consequently to the first Crusaders, of whom they are but the expression, Mohammedans are objects only of hatred: it is evident that those who speak of them do not know them. The historians of the later crusades speak quite differently: it is clear that they look upon them no longer as monsters; that they have to a certain extent entered into their ideas; that they have lived with them; and that relations, and even a sort of sympathy, have been established between them.” Thus the minds of both, but particularly of the Crusaders, were partly delivered from those prejudices which are the offspring of ignorance. “A step was taken towards the enfranchisement of the human mind.” Secondly, the Crusaders were brought into contact with two civilizations, richer and more advanced than their own — the Greek and the Saracenic; and it is beyond all question that they were mightily struck with the wealth and comparative refinement of the East. Thirdly, the close relationship between the chief laymen of the West and the Church occasioned by the crusades enabled the former “to inspect more narrowly the policy and motives of the papal court.” The result was very disastrous to that spirit of veneration and belief on which the Church lives, and in many cases an extraordinary freedom of judgment and hardihood of opinion were induced, such as Europe had never before dreamed of. Fourthry, great social changes were brought about. A commerce between the East and West sprang up, and towns — the early homes of liberty in Europe-began to grow great and powerful. The crusades, indeed, “gave maritime commerce the strongest impulse it had

ever received." As the crusades were a rising of the Christian nations of Europe for the triumph of the Church under the direct control of the popes, they naturally gave a powerful influence to the hierarchical plans of the popes. The emperors and kings, by following the exhortations of the popes and taking the cross, acknowledged the claims of the popes that the ecclesiastical power was higher than the secular. As the popes did not personally join the crusades, but were represented by lea gates, the system of papal legates was developed, which became in the hands of the popes a powerful weapon for curtailing the jurisdiction of archbishops and bishops. The origin of bishops in partibus infidelium can also be traced to the crusades. The raising of immense armies was a good pretext for the popes to extort large sums of money from princes and nations. The warlike enthusiasm against the Mohammedans kindled the popular fanaticism against all heretics, and stimulated the bloody persecutions of the Cathari, Waldenses, and other sects in Western Europe.

The influence of the crusades upon scientific theology was only indirect. The better acquaintance with the philosophical and theological literature of the Greek Church and the Mohammedans could but yield a favorable influence. In particular, the study of Aristotle was greatly promoted by the crusades, and several of his works were then first made known in the western countries of Europe. See Chambers, *Cyclopaedia*, s.v.; Brockhaus, *Conversations-Lex*, 9:76; *Christian Remembrancer* 1:44, 5; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:68; Mosheim, *Church History*, 2:112, 141, 233, etc.; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vol. 4; Wilken, *Geschichte der Kreuzziuge* (Leips. 1807-26, 4 vols.); Michaud, *Histoire des Croisades* (Paris, 1825; translated by Robson, London, 3 vols. 12mo, 1854); Mills, *History of the Crusades* (Lond. 1828, 4th ed. 2 vols. 8vo); Keightley, *The Crusades* (London, 1847, 2 vols. 12mo); Hume, *History of England*, 1:226 et al.; 2:60 et al.; Hase, *Ch. Hist.* p. 196, 220, 269; Sybel, *Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzuges* (Leipsic, 1841); Kugler, *Studien zur Geschichte des zweiten Kreuzzuges* (Stuttgardt, 1866). A list of writers on the subject is given by Michaud, *Bibliotheque des Croisades* (Paris, 1830, 4 vols.).

Cruse

Picture for Cruse

This now obsolete English word denotes a small vessel for holding water or other liquids. Three Hebrew words are thus translated in the A. V. *SEE CUP*.

1. tjPxj *tsappach'ath* (lit. something *spread out*), is applied to a utensil (usually considered a flask, but more probably a shallow cup) for holding water (<09611>1 Samuel 26:11, 12, 16 <11906>1 Kings 19:6) or oil (<11712>1 Kings 17:12,14, 16). Some clew to the nature of this vessel is perhaps afforded by its mention as being full of water at the head of Saul when on his night expedition after David (<09611>1 Samuel 26:11, 12, 16), and also of Elijah (<11906>1 Kings 19:6). In a similar case in the present day this would be a globular vessel of blue porous clay — the ordinary Gaza pottery — about nine inches diameter, with a neck of about three inches long, a small handle below the neck, and opposite the handle a straight spout, with an orifice about the size of a straw, through which the water is drunk or sucked. The form is common also in Spain, and will be familiar to many from pictures of Spanish life. A similar globular vessel probably contained the oil of the widow of Zarephath (<11712>1 Kings 17:12, 14, 16). For the "box" or "horn" in which the consecrated oil was carried on special occasions, *SEE OIL*. Some writers have supposed that the cruse of water mentioned in the first passage (when Saul's life was spared by David) was a *clepsydra*, or one of those water-watch measures used by the ancients, by which timewas measured by the falling of water from one vessel into another, the undermost vessel containing a piece of cork, the different altitudes of which, as it gradually rose upon the rising water, marked the progress of time. But we can hardly suppose that such time measures were known at that early period. It is usual for persons in the East in the present day, when they travel, to take with them a flask for holding water, and also, when they sleep in the open air, to have a small vessel of water within their reach (Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2:21). These flasks are of various forms, and are sometimes covered with a wicker-case, *SEE DISH*.

2. qWBqBj *bakbuk'* (from the gurgling sound in emptying), perhaps a bottle (as it is translated in <24901>Jeremiah 19:1,10) for holding any liquid, as honey (<11403>1 Kings 14:3), but more probably a PITCHER *SEE PITCHER* (q.v.).

3. tyjaex] *tselochith'* (lit. that into which fluids are poured out), a platter (<122020>2 Kings 2:20). This was probably a flat metal saucer of the form still common in the East. It occurs in <122020>2 Kings 2:20, "cruse;" 21:13, "dish;" <143513>2 Chronicles 35:13, "pan';" also <201924>Proverbs 19:24; 26:15, where the figure is obscured by the choice of the word "bosom." *SEE PAN*; *SEE PLATTER*, etc.

Cruse, Christian F., D.D.,

a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born June 27, 1794, in Philadelphia, of Lutheran parentage. He entered the University of Pennsylvania in 1812, and graduated Jan. 10, 1815, with distinguished honors. He was appointed professor in the University in 1831, and resigned in 1833. He was ordained by bishop White about 1822; became rector of Trinity Parish, Fishkill, N.Y., in April, 1846, but resigned the cure in 1851, and afterwards had no parish. He soon after removed to the General Theological Seminary, where, as librarian, he had ample opportunities for those studies in which he was so successful. In the ancient languages — Syriac, Hebrew, and Greek — Dr. Cruse was very well informed. He translated and edited Eusebius's *Church History*, and his edition is the best in English. He died in New York October 5,1865. — *Church Review*, January, 1866.

Crusius Christian August,

a German theologian, was born at Leuna, near Merseburg, January 10, 1715. He studied at Leipzic, where he afterwards became professor of philosophy in 1744, of theology in 1750, and primarius of theology in 1757. He died October 18, 1775. Dissatisfied with the existing philosophical systems, he attempted a new one, which he sought to bring into harmony with orthodox theology. The school which he represented in Leipzig may be designated by the name of a Philosophico-Biblical Realism. As a philosopher, lie was one of the most important opponents of the idealism and mechanism of the Leibnitz-Wolffian philosophy, while, as a Bible theologian, he maintained the historical and literal as opposed to an exclusively spiritualistic exegesis. In *morals* "he drew his conclusions, not from the conceptions of the intellect, but the suggestions of the will and conscience. He derived the notion of duty from moral necessity or *obligation*. He asserted the free-agency of the human mind (which he contemplated principally in a negative point of view, i.e. as uninfluenced by

physical or material laws), and developed the formal conditions of our free-will actions and the motives of them. The principle of a moral law led him to that of a moral Governor and Legislator, and consequently to the hypothesis which ascribes all moral obligations and laws to the divine authority, deducing, as the school-men had done, the principles of morals from the will of God. That which is consistent with the nature of the divine perfections, and accords with the designs of God, is good, and becomes obligatory on all rational beings. God demands of his rational creation, in the first place. that they should be good; and also wills their happiness as a consequence of virtue" (Tennemann). His principal works are: *Logik o. d. Weg z. Gewissheit u. Zuverlissigkeit d. menschlichen Erkenntniss* (Lpz. 1747; 2d ed. 1762); *Entwurf d, nothwsiendigen Vernunftwahrheiten* (Lpz. 1745; 3d ed. 1766); *Anweisung, verniinftig a. leben* (Lpz. 1744; 3d ed. 1767); *Anleitung, u. natiurliche Begebenheiten ordentlich u. vorsichtig nachzudenken* (Lpz. 1749, 2 vols., 1772); Begriffd. *christlichen Moral-theologie* (Lpz. 1772, 2 vols.). See Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, s.v.; Kahnis, *German Protestantism* (Edinb. 1856, 12mo, p. 107); Delitzsch, *Die biblish-prophetische Theologie, ihre Fortbildung durch Chr. Crusius*, etc. (Lpz. 1845); Tennemann, *Manual Hist. Philippians* § 368.

Cryer, Thomas

a Wesleyan missionary of rare piety and usefulness, was born at Bingley, in Yorkshire, in 1800. At 20 he was converted, and was called into the ministry about seven years after, and labored for a few months in an English circuit. He was then appointed a missionary to India, and embarked for that country in 1829. For 22 years he labored for the salvation of the heathen, and his name will be long remembered in the East. In spite of opposition and of the long delay of prosperity, which is the great and peculiar trial of the Eastern missionary — in spite of the most acute personal and family afflictions, his heart was undaunted and his faith unsubdued. Few of his fellow-missionaries excelled him in power of utterance, in the adroitness and effect with which he exposed the sophisms of the Brahmin, or in searching and persuasive appeals to the conscience. He "determined to know nothing but Christ and him crucified." Such a minister could hardly fail of winning souls; and many will be the crown of his rejoicing in the day of Jesus Christ, not only from among the natives of India, but also from among the Europeans resident in that country. He died of cholera, October 5, 1852. *Wesleyan Minutes*, 1853.

Crypt

(Gr. κρύπτη, a *concealed* place; Lat. *crypta*; Fr. *crypte*).

I. Among the ancient Greeks and Romans a crypt was primarily a long, narrow gallery, above the level of the ground, surrounding a court-yard, and having walls on both of its sides, with windows in the wall facing the court. These crypts had often a portico lining them or running between them and the open court. They served as a place of promenade during the hot or wet weather, and were finally so extensively used that they were even built for the officers near the Praetorian camps in Rome. Crypts similar in construction and location were built for storing wines, vegetables, and other articles, like the modern subterranean cellar. When all the windows were closed they were dark and cool, and hence the word was applied even by the ancients to any dark and long chamber or passage, as the dark stables where horses were kept under the amphi-theater, the cloaca maxima at Rome, the tunnel at Naples, and to a grotto where Quartilla offered sacrifice.

II. The word *crypt* was applied by the early Christians to those subterranean burial-places which were afterwards called Catacombs (q.v.). The term was later limited to the larger chambers in the Catacombs where one or more martyrs were buried. These crypts were larger than the other rooms in the Catacombs, and were often ornamented, and devoted to divine worship. For this purpose they were double, one part serving for the men and the other for the women, with small antechambers for the catechumens. Some of these crypts had openings into the fields above.

III. When persecution ceased, and Christians built church edifices above ground, the custom was adopted of placing the remains of martyrs — later of archbishop, bishops, abbots, and other high church officials — in crypts under the intersection of the cross in the plan of the church. In the Basilican period of architecture these crypts were often called by the name confessio. In. the Romanesque period the name crypt was resumed. In the churches of this period, the crypt extended under the high altar and back under the entire choir or apsis, sometimes even including the space under the transept. This crypt formed almost a separate church, and caused the floor above it of the main body of the church to be raised higher than that of the nave, to which the audience had access. Churches founded in the latter part of the Romanesque period, and thereafter, had no crypts. The

reason of their disappearance from church architecture is not well understood. — Liibke, *Geschichte der Architektur*; Rich, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities.*

Crypto-Calvinistic Controversy

the name given to a dispute within the Lutheran Church of Germany (1552-1574) concerning the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. The followers of the Melancthonian doctrine, as distinguished from the strict Lutherans, were styled *Crypto-Calvinists* (also Philippists, Melancthonians).

1. Melancthon, it is well known, earnestly desired a union of the Lutheran and Calvinistic divisions of the Protestant body. His tendency towards the Calvinistic view of the Lord's Supper was early shown in the difference between the Augsburg Confessio *invariata* (1530) and the *variata* (1542). In the former, *art. 10, de cona Domini*, it is stated that the "body and blood of Christ are truly present in the Lord's Supper (in the form of bread and wine), and are there distributed and received (*distribuuntur vescentibus*); therefore the opposite doctrine is rejected." In the variata (Liltin of 1540) the reading is "*cum pane et vino vere exhibentur corpus et sanguis Christi vescentibus in coena Domini*." The condemnation of the "opposite doctrine," i.e. the Zwinglian, is omitted. This alteration did not meet the approbation of Luther, who nevertheless tolerated Melancthon's change of doctrine. But many Lutherans (e.g. Flacius, q.v.) were less tolerant; and during Melancthon's lifetime he was held by many to be a concealed (*crypto*-) Calvinist. The truth seems to be fairly stated by Hase, as follows: "As Melancthon was convinced that neither Luther's nor Calvin's doctrine of the sacranient was an insuperable bar to saving communion with Christ, he thought he might allow both of them to continue in the Church. But when the doctrine of the omnipresence of Christ's body (ubiquity, q.v.) was proposed as the only saving basis of the Holy Supper, and made, by Brentz, *SEE BRENTIUS*, the law of the Church in Wirtemberg, he expressed disapprobation of such novel doctrines in provincial Latin being introduced into the symbols of faith" (*Church History*, § 350). Melancthon and Luther never quarreled on the subject; but the controversy, even during Melancthon's lifetime, began to be bitter. He did not live, however, to see the fierce strife which finally arose on the subject within the bosom of the Church (died 1560).

2. But the controversy, as such, began in the year 1552, when Joachim Westphal, a preacher in Hamburg, proclaimed the Calvinistic doctrine of the Lord's Supper heretical. The controversy was especially violent at Bremen, between Tilemann Heshusius and Albert Hardenberg, cathedral preacher, who acted for the Calvinistic doctrine, and it went on until Hardenberg was dismissed from his position. Shortly after Heshusius shared a like fate. In 1558 Heshusius was made general superintendent at Heidelberg, and he soon detected "Crypto-Calvinism" in deacon Wilhelm Krebitz. In both cities Lutheranism was finally expelled, and Frederick III, elector of the Palatinate, went over to the Reformed Church. In Wuirtemberg Brentz urged the ultra-Lutheran doctrine (see above); but Christoph, duke of Wiirtemberg, endeavored to allay the strife, and finally succeeded, in 1561, at the Fiirstentag (Diet of Princes) at Naumburg, in obtaining the recognition of the *altered* Augsburg Confession. The elector Frederick III of the Palatinate withdrew from the controversy, and introduced, in 1563, in his dominions a mixed doctrine of Melancthonian tendency, by the incorporation of the Heidelberg Catechism into the state law.

In the Saxon electorate the Wittenberg and Leipzig theologians undertook a like combination of the doctrines. Kaspar Peucer, son-in-law of Melancthon, Cracow, Schiitz, and Stossel; G. Major, P. Eber, Paul Crell, and, later, P. Cruciger, Pezel, Moller, and others, in their writings, and also in the well-known Katechesis, favored the view, and these Melancthonian theologians were called Philippists. The Thuringian theologians in Jena, especially Flacius, also Wigand, Colestrin, Kirchner, and others, were strict Lutherans, and bitterly opposed the electorate Saxons. A conference between the Wittenberg and Jena theologians was held at Altenburg (October, 1568, to March, 1569), in which very intemperate accusations were made against the Philippists. The rupture was widened. The electoral duke Augustus of Saxony called his theologians together in Dresden on the 7-10th of October, 1571. They agreed upon the *Consensus Dresdensis* and the *Wittenberg Catechism*, which opposed the doctrine of ubiquity, but used Lutheran language in moderate terms, Melancthonian in spirit; for the time it was thought that the strife was ended. But in 1574 appeared an anonymous work entitled *Exegesisperspicua ct ferme integra controversioe de sacra coena*, which strongly advocated the Calvinistic view of the Supper. (It has been shown by Heppe, *Geschichte des deutsch. Prot.* 2:468, that this work was written by the physician Joachim Cureus

[died 1573], and was not originally intended for publication.) The work caused a bitter renewal of the controversy, and the elector determined to suppress Calvinism, and he deposed or imprisoned the leaders, and commanded subscription to the Confession of Torgau (May, 1574). Peucer was imprisoned for twelve years. In 1586 the elector died, and his son, Christian I, succeeded him. Chancellor Nicolas Crell (q.v.) and others influenced him to favor the Calvinistic view. After his death, the duke Frederick William of Saxc-Weimar, who was regent, put down Philippism by brute force, even executing Crell in 1601. See Loscher, *Histor. motuum*, 1723; Heppe, *Geschichte des deutschen Protestantismus*, 1852, 2 vols.; Zeitschr. *f. d. hist. Theol*. 1865, iv; Gieseler, *Church History* (Smith's), iv, § 37, 38; Gass, *Geschichte d. prot. Theol*. 1:63 sq.; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, § 215; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop*. 8:127.

Crystal

There are several words which appear to have this meaning in the Bible. *SEE ICE*; *SEE PEARL*.

1. jrq, *ke'rach* (properly *ice*, as it is rendered Job 6:16; 38:29; "frost," Genesis 31:40; Job 37:10; Jeremiah 36:30; Sept. κρύσταλλος), occurs in Ezekiel 1:22, where the epithet "terrible" seems to be added by way of distinction from the ordinary signification of the word.

2. vybg, *gabish'* (properly *ice*; Sept. γαβίς), occurs only in Job 28:18, where it is rendered "pearls" in our version.

3. tykwzq, *zekukith'* (lit. what is pure or *transparent*; Sept. ὕαλος), occurs only in Job 18:17, where some regard it as denoting *glass*.

4. Κρύσταλλος (prop. *ice*) occurs in Revelation 4:6; 21:11; 22:1, evidently in the sense of *crystal*, and in such connections as to identify it in a good degree with the preceding terms.

" Crystal was anciently held to be only pure water, congealed by great length of time into ice harder than the common (Diod. Sic. 2:52; Pliny *Hist. Nat*. 37:2), and hence the Greek word for it, in its more proper signification, also signifies ice. From this it necessarily followed that crystal could only be produced in the regions of perpetual ice, and this was accordingly the ancient belief; but we now know that it is founding the

warmest regions. Theophrastus (54) reckons crystal among the pellucid stones used for engraved seals. In common parlance we apply the term crystal (as the ancients apparently did) to a glass-like transparent stone, commonly of a hexagonal form, which, from being found in rocks, is called by mineralogists rock-crystal. It is a stone of the flint family, the most refined kind of quartz." *SEE GLASS*.

Cubit

(in *Heb.* hMa; *ammah'*, lit. mother, i.e. of the arm, the fore-arm; Greek πῆχυς, an *ell*) is a word derived immediately from the Latin *cubitus*, the lower arm. The length of the cubit has varied in different nations and at different times. Derived as the measure is from a part of the human body, and as the human stature has been of very dissimilar length, the cubit must of necessity have been various. The lower arm, moreover, may take in the entire length from the elbow to the tip of the third or longest finger, or it may be considered as extending from the elbow merely to the root of the hand at the wrist, omitting the whole length of the hand itself. If the definition of Celsus (8. 1) is taken, and the cubit is identified with ,the ulna, the under and longer of the two bones of which the arm consists, still a fixed and invariable measure is not gained. That the cubit among the Hebrews was derived as a measure from the human body is clear from (Deuteronomy 3:11 — "after the cubit of a man" (vyaæ Ma; see Bottcher, *Proben alttest. Schrift*. p. 288). But it is difficult to determine whether this cubit was understood as extending to the first or the end of the third finger. As, however, the latter seems most natural, since men, when ignorant of anatomy, and seeking in their own frames standards of measure, were likely to take both the entire foot and the entire fore-arm, the probability is that the longer was the original cubit, namely, the length from the elbow to the extremity of the longest finger. The: Egyptian cubit, which it is likely the Hebrews would adopt, consisting of six hand-breadths, is found on the ruins of Memphis (*Journal des Savans*, 1822, Nov., Dec.; comp. Herod. 2:149). The Rabbins also (Mishna, Chelim, 17:9) assign six hand-breadths to the Mosaic cubit. By comparing Josephus (*Ant.* 3, 6,5) with Exodus 25:10, it will, moreover, be found that the weight of his authority is in the same scale. According to him, a cubit is equal to two spans. Now a span is equal to three hand-breadths (Schmidt, *Bibl. Mathemat*. p. 117; Eisen-Schmidt, *De Ponderibus*, p. 110); a cubit, therefore, is equal to six hand-breadths, The hand-breadth is found as a

measure in 1 Kings 7:26; comp. Jeremiah 3:21. In the latter passage the finger-breadth is another measure. The span also occurs Exodus 28:16. So that, it appears, measures of length were, for the most part, borrowed by the Hebrews from members of the human body. Still no absolute and invariable standard presents itself. If the question, What is a hand or finger-breadth? be asked, the answer can be only an approximation to fact. If, however, the palm or hand-breadth be taken at 3 inches, then the cubit will amount to 21 inches. In addition to the common cubit, the Egyptians had a longer one of six palms four inches. The Hebrews also have been thought to have had a longer cubit, for in Ezekiel 40:5, we read of a cubit which seems to be an ordinary "cubit and an handbreadth;" see also Ezekiel 43:13, where it is expressly said, "the cubit is a cubit and an hand-breadth." The prophet has been supposed to refer here to the then current Babylonian cubit, a measure which it is thought the Jews borrowed during the period of their captivity. The Rabbins make a distinction between the common cubit of five hand-breadths and the sacred cubit of six hand-breadths-a distinction which is held to be insufficiently supported by De Wette (*Archaologie*, p. 178). Consult Lamy, *De Tabernaculo*, c. 8; Carpzov, *Apparat*. p. 676. — Kitto, s.v. An ancient Egyptian cubit now in the Royal Museum of Paris measures 20.484 inches. The Hebrew cubit, according to Bishop Cumberland and M. Pelletier, is twenty-one inches; and the Talmudists observe that the Hebrew cubit (meaning probably the longer or sacred measure) was larger by one quarter than the Roman, which would make it contain 21.843 inches. Many writers fix it at eighteen inches, confounding it with the Greek and Roman measure of a foot and a half. The most approved computation assigns each kind of Jewish cubits the same length as the corresponding Egyptian namely, 20.24 inches for the ordinary one, and 21.888 for the sacred, which is confirmed by the mean length of several ancient cubits marked on the Egyptian monuments (Wilkinson's *Anc. Egyptians*, 2d series, 1:30), by a comparison of the dimensions of the Pyramids with those given in ancient authorities (Vyse's *Pyramids of Gizeh*, 3, 104, 105), and which we shall find to correspond remarkably with the Talmudical statement of the circuit of the Temple. In a later edition of his Ancient Egyptians, however ("*Popular Account*," 2:258), Wilkinson makes the ordinary Egyptian cubit to have consisted of seven palms or twenty-eight digits, and gives nine exact computations of its length, varying from 20.4729 to 20.7484 inches, which yield an average of 20.6169 inches; and he states the cubit on the Nilometer at Elephantine, from actual measurement, to be 20.625 inches.

This last is perhaps the most accurate dimension attainable for the standard cubit. (See Bockh, *Metrol. Uitersuch. Berl*. 1838, p. 12; Thenius, in the *Stud. u. Krit*. 1846, 1:770; 2:299; Lepsius, *Die alt-dgyptische Elle, Berl*. 1865.) *SEE METROLOGY*.

In <070316>Judges 3:16, the term translated “cubit” is in the original rmGo, *go’med* (literally, a *cut*), a rod or staff, as the measure of a cubit. In the New Testament our Lord characteristically employs the term cubit (<402706>Matthew 27:6; <421225>Luke 12:25) for the enforcement of a moral and spiritual lesson. The term also occurs in <432108>John 21:8, and in <662117>Revelation 21:17; and in the Apocrypha (2 Maccabees 13:5). *SEE MEASURE*.

Cucius

SEE KAUTZ.

Cuckoo

Picture for Cuckoo 1

Picture for Cuckoo 2

(ãjvi, *shach’aph*, prob. from its *leanness*; Sept. and Vulg. sea-gull, A.V. “cuckow”) occurs only in <031116>Leviticus 11:16; <051415>Deuteronomy 14:15, among birds of prey not clearly identified, but declared to be unclean. None of the various ancient or modern versions of this word give a bird possessing any affinity with the other species enumerated; and although the cuckoo is a winter and spring bird, distinctly heard, it appears, by Mr. Buckingham, early in April, while crossing the mountains between Damascus and Sidon, at that time covered with snow, it could scarcely deserve to be included in the prohibited list, for the species is everywhere scarce. The identifications proposed by late writers on the subject all equally lack a sufficient foundation. Bochart (*Hieroz*. vol. 2, c. 18) thinks the sea-gull is meant. Upon the whole, while so much obscurity still remains on the subject, the interpretation of “cuckoo” may as well remain undisturbed. (See *Penny Cyclopoedia*, s.v.) The word *shachaph* was a good imitation of the dissyllabic voice of this bird, as our word *cuckoo*, variously repeated in all European languages, and *yakoob*, which the bird is supposed by the Arabs to utter. The latter, indeed, call it *tir el-Yakub*, or “Jacob’s bird,” on this account (Kitto, *Phys. Hist. of Palest*. p. 403). The common cuckoo (*Cuculus canorus*) is a bird of considerable size, unfit for

food, because habitually feeding on reptiles and large insects. It is spread over the whole of Asia and Africa as well as Europe, migrating northward in spring, and probably not breeding in Palestine, although passing the winter there. The American cuckoo (*Erythiophris Americanus*), often called “cow-bird,” is a different species of the family of the *Cuculinoe*, all the members of which are distinguished by laying their eggs in the pests of other birds, and rearing no young themselves.

Cucullus

SEE COWL.

Cucumber

Picture for Cucumber

is the translation of aVqæ *kishshu’* (so called probably from its *difficulty of digestion*; Sept. σίκυος), in our Auth. Vers., and the correctness of this rendering has been almost universally admitted. It occurs in <041105>Numbers 11:5, where the Israelites, when in the desert, express their longings for the melons and the *cucumbers* of Egypt. The Hebrews is so similar to the Arabic *kissa* that there can be very little doubt of their both meaning the same thing. Celsus (*Hierobot* . 2:247) gives *keta*, *kati*, and *kusaia* as different pronunciations of the same word in different Oriental languages. It does not follow that these names always indicate exactly the same species, since in the different countries they would probably be applied to the kinds of cucumber most common, or perhaps to those which were most esteemed in particular localities. Thus, in Egypt (see Prosp. Alpin, *Plantt. AEg*. c. 38, p. 54), the name kati appears to be applied to the species which is called *Cucumis* chate by botanists, and “queen of cucumbers” by Hasselquist, who describes it as the most highly esteemed of all those cultivated in Egypt (*Trav*. p. 258). See MELON. In India the name *kissa* is applied by the Mohammedans to the *Cucumus utilissimus*, or the common *kukree* of the natives, while in Persia and Syria the same name would probably be applied only to the common cucumber, or Cucumis sativus, as the two preceding species are not likely to be much known in either country. The Talmudists (*Maaser*. 1:4; *Terumoth*, 2:6; 6:6; *Baba Mez*. 7:5) have t/Vqæ and the Phoenicians had the word Κουσίμεζαρ (Diosc. 4:152), which is probably. Xrp açq rxm, “cucumber of Egypt”=σίκυς ἄγριος. The same name for cucumber exists in all cognate languages. (For

an account of the cucumbers of Syria and Egypt; see Forskal, *Flora AEgypt*. p. 169; Celsii *Hierobot*. 2, 249.) *SEE BOTANY*.

All travelers in the East notice the extensive cultivation and consumption of cucumbers and other vegetables of the same tribe, especially where there is any moisture of soil, or the possibility of irrigation (see Burckhardt, *Arabic Proverbs*, No. 660). Thus, even in the driest parts, the neighborhood of a well is often occupied by a field of cucurbitaceous plants, generally with a man or boy set to guard it from plunder, perched up on a temporary scaffolding, with a slight protection from the sun, where he may himself be safe from the attacks of the more powerful wild animals. That such plants appear to have been similarly cultivated among the Hebrews is evident from <23108>Isaiah 1:8, "The daughter of Zion is left like a cottage in a vineyard, like a lodge in a *garden of cucumbers*" (hvpjmæ *mikshah'*, Sept. σικυήρατον), as well as from Baruch 6:70, "as a scarecrow in a *garden of cucumbers* (σικυήρατον) keepeth nothing, so are their gods of wood." *SEE GARDEN*; *SEE COTTAGE*.

Cud

(hrgæ *gerah'*, *rumination*), the pellet of halfchewed food brought up from the first stomach of ruminant animals to be thoroughly masticated (<03108>Leviticus 11:3-7, 26; <05146>Deuteronomy 14:6-8). *SEE CLEAN (ANIMALS)*.

Cudworth, Ralph

an eminent English divine and philosopher, was born at Aller, Somersetshire, in 1617, and entered Emmanuel College, Cambridge, in 1630, became M.A. 1639, rector of N. Cadbury 1641, and master of Clare Hall 1644. In 1645 he became professor of Hebrew; in 1654, master of Christ College; in 1662, vicar of Ashwell; and in 1678, prebendary of Gloucester. He died in 1688. Cudworth was a Platonist, of "great strength of genius and vast compass of learning." His reputation as a writer rests chiefly on his *True Intellectual System of the Universe*, which appeared in 1678 as the first part of a still greater work which he never completed. It is a defense of human liberty, and of belief in God, against fatalism and atheism. Cudworth describes three false systems or hypotheses of the universe in the preface: "Of the three fatalisms or false hypotheses of the universe mentioned in the beginning of this book, one is absolute atheism,

another immoral theism, or religion without any natural justice and morality (all just and unjust, according to this hypothesis, being mere thetical or factitious things, made by arbitrary will and command only); the third and last such a theism as acknowledges not only a God or omnipotent understanding Being, but also natural justice and morality, founded in him, and derived from him; nevertheless, no liberty from necessity anywhere, and therefore no distributive or retributive justice in the world.” Before erecting the true intellectual system of the universe (the epithet *intellectual* being used, as he tells us, “to distinguish it from the other, vulgarly so called, systems of the world, that is, the visible and corporeal world, the Ptolemaic, Tychonic, and Copernican”), it was his object to demolish these false systems. And the first of them, atheism, or the atheistic fate, is demolished in the first part of the “Intellectual System.” It is a work of great learning and acuteness. In attacking the atheistic faith, Dr. Cudworth describes the atomic physiology, which, as held by Democritus, and other ancient philosophers, involved atheism. For the better confutation of other forms of atheism, to which he gives the names Hylozoic and Cosmo-plastic, he makes the hypothesis of an “artificial, regular, and plastic nature,” working in complete subordination to the Deity. And to avert an argument brought against the oneness of the Deity, from its unnaturalness as shown by the general prevalence of polytheism among the pagan nations, he contends that “the pagan theologers all along acknowledged one sovereign and omnipotent Deity, from which all their other gods were generated or created,” and that their polytheism was but a polyonymy of one God. *The Treatise on Eternal and Immutable Morality* corresponds to the second part of the *Intellectual System*. It is directed against Hobbes and those who, with him, “affirm justice and injustice to be only by law, and not by nature.” Besides the *Intellectual System*, Cudworth published,

1. *A Discourse concerning the true Notion of the Lord’s Supper*, in which he maintains, as Warburton has since maintained, that the Lord’s Supper is a feast upon a sacrifice: —

2. *The Union of Christ and the Church Shadowed*: —

3. *A Sermon on* <430203>*John* 2:3, 4, preached in 1647 before the House of Commons: —

4. *A Sermon preached in 1664 at Lincoln’s Inn on* <461557>*1 Corinthians 15:57*: —

5. *Deus Justificatus against the Assertors of absolute and unconditional Reprobation.*

He left several works in MS., only one of which has yet been published, namely, the *Treatise concerning Eternal and Immutable Morality* (1731). The rest are,

1. *A Discourse of Moral Good and Evil*: —

2. *A Discourse of Liberty and Necessity, in which the Grounds of the Atheistical Philosophy are confuted*, and *Morality vindicated and explained*: —

3. *A Commentary on Daniel's Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks*: —

4. *Of the Verity of the Christian Religion against the Jews*: —

5. *A Discourse of the Creation of the World and Immortality of the Soul*: —

6. *A Treatise on Hebrew Learning*: —

7. *An Explanation of Hobbes's Notion of God, and of the Extension of Spirits.*

These MSS. are now in the British Museum. In 1733 a Latin translation of the *Intellectual System* was published by Mosheim (Lugd. Bat. 2 vols. 4to). The best ed. of the English work is Harrison's (London, 1845, 3 vols. 8vo, with index). A good and cheap edition is that of Andover (1837, 2 vols. 8vo), which includes all the published writings of Cudworth, but has no index. See Birch, *Life of Cudworth (*prefixed to most editions of his works); *Engl. Cyclopeadia*; Mackintosh, *Ethical Philosophy*, p. 73.

Cujacius

(properly *De Cajas*), JACQUES, a distinguished teacher of canon law, was born in 1522, at Toulouse. He became in 1554 a professor of law at Cahors, in 1555 at Bourges, in 1567 at Valence, and in 1575 again at Bourges. The civil war in France induced him shortly after to go to Paris, where he also received permission to give lectures on law. In 1577 he once more returned to Bourges, where he thenceforth remained, notwithstanding the most profitable offers from the University of Bologna. He died Oct. 4,1590. Cujacius was the most famous teacher of the Roman

law in the sixteenth century, and his reputation attracted large numbers of students from all countries of Europe. He corrected numerous passages of the Roman law-books from the more than 500 manuscripts which he had collected, and a great many obscure points were by him for the first time elucidated. He gained the love of the thousands of his pupils to a rare degree by the affectionate attention which he paid to the welfare of each. From the theological controversies of his time he cautiously abstained, though he was always a steadfast adherent of the cause of Henry IV. In his will he referred his wife and his daughter to the letter of the pure Bible, without note or comment, as the sole rule of their faith. He published himself a collection of his works (Paris, 1577), which, however, is not complete. The editions by Colombet (Paris, 1617 and 1634) does likewise not contain all the works of Cujacius. A complete edition was prepared by Fabroti (Paris, 1658, 10 vols.), which has several times been reprinted, with some additions (latest edition, Prato, 13 vols. 1836). A life of Cujacius was published in 1590 by Papyrius Masson, but the best account of Cujacius is by Saint Prix (appendix to his work *Histoire du droit Romain*, Paris, 1821; an extract from this, in German, by Spangenberg, *Cujacius u. seine Zeitgenossen*, Leipz. 1822). — Brockhaus, *Conversations-Lex*. s. V.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirch*. — *Lex*. 2:933.

Culbertson Matthew Simpson, D.D.,

a Presbyterian minister and missionary, was born at Chambersburgh, Pa., Jan. 18, 1819, and was educated at the Military Academy, West Point. While serving as lieutenant of artillery he made a religious profession, and went to the Theological Seminary at Princeton, where he graduated in 1844. In that year he was licensed and ordained as missionary to China; He labored, together with Bridgeman, for several years in preparing a revised translation of the Scriptures in Chinese; and wrote *Darkness in the Flowery Land*, or *Religious Notions and Popular Superstitions in North China* (N.Y. 1857, 12mo). He died of cholera, August, 1862. —Wilson, *Presb. Almanac*, 1863, p. 163.

Culdees

The name Culdee is variously derived and explained by several different authorities. Ebrard gives “Kile De” — man of God;” Dr. Braun, “Gille De” — “servant of God.” But the latest, and perhaps best authority, gives us *Cuildich* as the only name of the Culdees known among native Celts. This

word means “a secluded corner;” a Culdee, therefore, is “the man of the recess.” This accurately enough describes the Culdees’ mode of life; though not monks, they were in a certain sense recluses.

The Scottish Church, when it first meets the eye of civilization, is not Romish, nor even prelatical. When the monk Augustine, with his forty missionaries, in the time of the Saxon Heptarchy, came over to Britain under the auspices of Gregory, the bishop of Rome, to convert the barbarian Saxons, he found the northern part of the island already well-nigh filled with Christians and Christian institutions. These Christians were the Culdees, whose chief seat was the little island of Hi or Iona, on the western coast of Scotland. An Irish presbyter, Columba, feeling himself stirred with missionary zeal, and doubtless knowing the wretched condition of the savage Scots and Picts in the year 565, took with him twelve other missionaries, and passed over to Scotland. They fixed their settlement on the little island just named, and from that point became the missionaries of all Scotland, and even penetrated into England. Before the end of the 6th century they had filled the country with their institutions, and subjected it, at least nominally, to Christ. Invited to England by Oswald, king of Northumberland, to preach the Gospel to his people, they sent Corman, who failed because of too great austerity of behavior, and then Aidan, who, without knowing the people’s language, succeeded, and proved himself one of the noblest of missionaries. The people in the south of England converted by Augustine and his assistants, and those in the north who had been won by Culdee labor, soon met, as Christian conquest advanced from both sides; and when they came together, it was soon seen that Roman and Culdee Christianity very decidedly differed in a great many respects. The Culdees, for the most part, had a simple and primitive form of Christianity, while Rome presented a vast accumulation of superstitions, and was arrayed in her well-known pomp. The result was, that in England the Culdee soon gave place to the Roman, and retired to his Northern home. Columba no doubt chose the little island of Iona as a place of safety from barbarian attack, as also because it was near to Ireland, whence he had brought his divine message. Besides, the loneliness of a small island in the sea was favorable to meditation, and accorded with the ascetic tendencies which at least *touched* the best men of those ages. The institution set up by Columba has been called a monastery, but, in truth, it had no claim to that name. True, the members of the community lived in cells, to which they retired for devotion and study, but this no more made them monks than a

similar life makes monks of theological students of our own day. The Culdee recluses were not pledged to celibacy; many of them were married; many of them were succeeded in office by their own sons ; they were not dedicated for life to their calling, but were free at any time to change it for another. Their families did not live within the sacred enclosure, but the husbands, their work within being done, passed out to spend the rest of their time with their families. Nor, indeed, was the aim of the institution at all kindred to that of monachism. The monk generally retires for his own improvement solely; he is weary of the world, and will have no more contact with it. He renounces it. The Culdee went to Iona that in quiet, with meditation, study, and prayer, he might fit himself for going out into the world as a missionary. Indeed, Iona was a great mission institute, where preachers were trained who evangelized the rude tribes of Scotland in a very short time. To have done such a work as this in less than half a century implies apostolic activity, purity, and success. With the exception of the principal men, they must have been much more out of their cells than in them. Traces of the schools and churches they established are found all over Scotland. The reason of this freedom from Romish asceticism may be found, at least in part, in the doctrines of these men. They had no dogma of purgatory, no saint worship, no works of supererogation, no auricular confession, or penance, or absolution; no mass, no transubstantiation, no "chrism" in baptism, no priesthood, and no third order (bishops). They knew nothing of any authoritative rule except the Holy Scriptures. "These were held to be the one standard of truth, and were made by the missionaries a subject of close and constant study. Columba's own home work and that of his disciples was transcribing the Scriptures. These early missionaries were thoroughly Biblical. Columba's life by Adamnan represents him in almost every page as familiar with the Word of God, and ready to quote it on all occasions as of supreme authority." . . . "The great subject of their teaching was the simple truth of the Gospel of salvation. It was *'verbum Dei,'* the Word of God. Adamnan says of Columba that from his boyhood he was instructed in the love of Christ." "The spirit of the Culdean Church may suitably and rightfully be described as an evangelical spirit, because it was free and independent of Rome; and when it and the papal Church came into contact, it always and obstinately repudiated its authority, under appeal to the single and supreme authority of holy Scripture; but, above all, because in its inner life it was penetrated throughout by the main principles of the evangelical Church. The Culdees read and understood the Scriptures in their original texts. Wherever they

came they translated them orally and in writing into the language of the country, explaining them to the inhabitants, exhorting them to diligent and regular Bible reading. But the Scriptures were more to them than a codex of authoritative doctrines of faith. They were the living word of Christ. In the most earnest manner they preached the natural, inborn inability of man for good; the atoning death of Christ; justification without all merit of works; the worthlessness, especially, of all mere outward works; and the necessity of the new birth" (Ebrard). These views of life and doctrine reveal sufficiently the reason why the Culdees were missionaries rather than monks. The truths of the Gospel, pure and simple, just as they warmed the hearts of the apostles, had possession of them, and all their work was to make men feel and accept them. Their theory of Church government was very simple. The institution at Iona was under the presidency of a presbyter called a presbyter abbot, who had associated with him twelve other presbyters. In case of a vacancy in the headship, these brethren elected their abbot. That he was a presbyter simply there can be no doubt. Bede, who belonged to the Romish Church, himself mentions it as a very strange thing "that a man who is merely a presbyter should govern a diocese, and have even bishops under him." The truth is, that the missionaries sent out from these Culdee seminaries were appointed and ordained pastors of the churches they founded, and the pastor of the church was the overseer of it, i.e. the bishop. The presbyter abbot, therefore, had ordained an elder, but, by appointment to a parish, had made him a bishop. They evidently knew nothing of the distinction between the order of presbyter and that of bishop. After the success of Augustine and his monks in England, the Culdees had shut themselves up within the limits of Scotland, and had resisted for centuries all the efforts of Rome to win them over. At last, however, they were overthrown by their own rulers. Margaret, the daughter of William the Conqueror, the queen of Malcolm Canmore, devoted to the cause of Rome, notable for piety, of powerful mind and skillful in the management of others, set her heart upon exchanging the Culdee for the Romish Church in Scotland. She got the Culdee presbyters together, and for three days discussed the matter with them in person. She succeeded by persuasion and artifice. This was in the latter part of the 11th century. It was not, however, till the 13th century that Culdeeism was completely overturned and Romanism established. Nay, it is more than probable that Culdeeism, with its simple and powerful Gospel influence, continued to live in the hearts of the people long after its forms and public ministrations had been buried beneath the finery of

triumphant Romanism. There was a readiness among the Scotch to embrace the Reformation when it came, which, together with their sturdy evangelical character, reminds the historical reader of Culdeeism.

Literature. —McLauchlan, The *Early Scottish Church* from the 1st to the 12th centuries (Edinb. 1865, 8vo); Alexander, *Iona* (Edinb. 1866); Ebrard, *Kirchen-und Dogmengeschichte* (4 vols., vol. 2); *Zeitschr. f. d. hist. Theol.* 1862, 1863; King, *The Culdees and their Remains*, 1864; *Meth. Quart. Rev.* Oct. 1861; *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* Jan. 1866; *Princeton Rev.* Jan. 1867; *The Church of Iona*, by the Bishop of Argyll, 1866. See IONA.

Culon

(Κουλόν v. r. Κουλόμ, Jerome *Caulon*), the fifth named of the group of eleven cities added by the Septuagint to those in the mountains of Judah (between ver. 59 and 60 of Joshua 15); thought to be the modern *Kulonieh*, a trace of which appears in the notice of the Crusades (Wilken, *Gesch. der Kreuz.* 4:509), a village with ruins about 1 1/2 h.W. of Jerusalem towards Jaffa (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 305); but, as this lay beyond the border of Judah (Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 118), the authenticity of the names in the Sept. being, moreover, dubious (Wilson, *Bible Lands*, 2:266 n.), the place perhaps only represents some station or *Colonia* of the Romans (Robinson, *Later Res.* p. 158).

Cultus

SEE WORSHIP.

Culverwell Nathaniel, M.A.

a pious and learned writer. He was fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambride, and died about 1650. We have of him an *Elegant and learned Discourse on the Light of Nature* (on Proverbs 20:27), with several other treatises (Lond. 1661, 4to). The *Light of Nature* abounds in striking thoughts, and has passages of rare eloquence.

Cumanus Ventidius,

procurator of Judaea immediately next to Alexander (a short time after Fadus), and partly in conjunction with Felix (q.v.), B.C. 4953; under his administration the commotions broke out that led eventually to the final

war with the Romans (Josephus, *Ant.* 20:5, 2 and 3; 6, 1-3; *War*, 2:12, 1-7).

Cumberland Presbyterian Church

SEE PRESBYTERIAN (CUMBERLAND) CHURCH.

Cumberland Presbyterians

SEE PRESBYTERIANS.

Cumberland Richard, D.D.,

bishop of Peterborough, a learned divine and archaeologist, was born in London in 1632, and was educated at St. Paul's School, and Magdalen College, Cambridge. He was made rector of Brampton, and in 1667 vicar of All Hallows, Stamford. In 1691 he was raised to the see of Peterborough without any solicitation on his part. He was previously known by his treatise *De Legibus Naturae* (Lond. 1672, 4to), in answer to Hobbes, and by his *Essay on Jewish Weights and Measures* (London, 1686, 8vo). He was indefatigable in performing his episcopal duties. Being advised, on account of his age and infirm state, to relax a little, he replied, "It is better to wear out than rust out." After his death appeared his *Origines Gentiuin* (Lond. 1724, 8vo), and his translation of Sanchoniatho's *Phoenician History* (London, 1720, 8vo). At the age of eighty-three, Dr. Cumberland, having been presented by Dr. Wilkins with a copy of his *Coptic Testament*, then just published, commenced, like another Cato, the study of Coptic. "At this age," says Mr. Payne, "he mastered the language, and went through great part of this version, and would often give me excellent hints and remarks as he proceeded in reading of it." He died Oct. 9, 1718. Cumberland's theory of morals is set forth in his treatise *De Legibus Naturae*. Tendency to effect the general good is made the standard of morality. To endeavor to effect the greatest amount of general good is the one great duty, or the one great "law of nature;" and we know, according to Cumberland, that it is a duty or law of nature, or law of God, because we know that an individual derives the greatest happiness from the exercise of benevolence, and that God desires the greatest possible happiness of all his creatures. Carrying out the fundamental principle that the greatest general good is to be sought, he deduces the several particular duties or particular "laws of nature." He founds government upon, and tests it by the same principle. An abridged

translation of the work was published by Tyrrel in 1701. Maxwell, an Irish clergyman, published a translation in 1727. Barbeyrac published a French version in 1744. A third English translation, by the Rev. John Towers, D.D., appeared in 1750. On Cumberland as a moralist, see Mackintosh, *Hist. of Ethical Philosophy*, p. 70; Whewell, *Hist. of Moral Philosophy*, p. 52.

Cu'mi

(κοῦμι), a mode of Graecizing the Hebrews imperative ymiWq (*ku'mi*), signifying *rise*, as it is immediately explained (Mark 5:41).

Cumin

Picture for Cumin

(ˆMKi *kammon'*, lit, a *condiment*, from its use; Greek κύμινον; and names of similar sound in all the Oriental dialects) is an umbelliferous plant, mentioned both in the Old and New Testaments, and, like the dill and the coriander, continues to be cultivated in modern as it was in ancient times in Eastern countries (Pliny, 19:47). These are similar to and used for many of the same purposes as the anise and caraway, which supply their place, and are more common in Europe. All these plants produce fruits, commonly called seeds, which abound in essential oil of a more or less grateful flavor, and warm, stimulating nature; hence they were employed in ancient as in modern times both as condiments (Pliny, 19:8; Apicius, 1:32; 3. 18; Polyaen. 4:3, 32) and as medicines (Mishna, *Shabb.* 19:2). A native of Upper Egypt and Ethiopia, it is still extensively cultivated in Sicily and Malta. It would appear to have been a favorite herb among the Hebrews, and as late as the last century it retained a place of some importance in pharmacy (see Ehrmann, *De cumino*, Argent. 1733), Cumin is first mentioned in Isaiah 28:25; "When he (the ploughman) hath made plain the face thereof, doth he not cast abroad the fitches, and scatter the cumin?" showing that it was extensively cultivated, as it is in the present day, in Eastern countries, as far even as India. In the south of Europe it is also cultivated to some extent. In the above chapter of Isaiah (ver. 27) cumin is again mentioned: "For the fitches are not threshed with a threshing instrument, neither is a cart-wheel turned about upon the cumin; but the fitches are beaten out with a staff, and the cumin with a rod." This is most applicable to the fruit of the common cumin, which, when ripe, may

be separated from the stalk with the slightest stroke, and would be completely destroyed by the turning round of a wheel, which, bruising the seed, would press out the oil on which its virtues depend (see Dioscor, 3. 68). In the New Testament, cumin is mentioned in Matthew 23:23, where our Savior denounces the Scribes and Pharisees, who paid their "tithe of mint, and anise, and *cumin*," but neglected the weightier matters of the law. In the Talmudical tract *Demai* (ii. 1) cumin is mentioned as one of the things regularly tithed. (See Celsii *Hierob.* 1:516; *Penny Cyclop.* s.v.) *SEE AROMATICS*.

Cumming Alexander,

a Congregational minister, native of Freehold, N. J., was born 1726. He entered the ministry 1747, and was made colleague pastor of the Presbyterian Church in New York, Oct. 1750. Owing to troubles in the Church, both pastors requested to be dismissed by a committee of the Synod in 1753, and Mr. Cumming was relieved Oct. 25, 1753. He was ordained collegiate pastor with Dr. Sewall, of the Old South Church, Boston, Feb. 25, 1761, where he remained until his death, Aug. 25, 1763. He published his ordination sermon at Boston (1761), and *Animadversions on Rev. Mr. Croswell's late Letter*, etc. (1763). —Sprague, *Annals*, 1:462.

Cuneiform

Picture for Cuneiform 1

Picture for Cuneiform 2

(*wedge -shaped*) or ARROW-HEADED INSCRIPTIONS, is the name now generally applied to those angular letters first found engraved on Persepolitan relics (see Ker Porter's *Travels*; Rich's *Memoir*), and lately in great abundance stamped on Babylonian bricks, *SEE BRICK*, and carved on the Assyrian monuments. *SEE ASSYRIA*. The most copious collections of these legends are contained in the great works on the Ninevite antiquities by Botta and Flandin (*Monuments de Nineve*, Par. 1847, sq.), and by Layard (*Assyrian Inscriptions*, Lond. 1851), and more lately those of Loftus (*Inscriptions from the Ruins of Susa*, Lond. 1852); a considerable collection is also given by Rich (*Memoir on Bab*. Lond. 1839). The character is the simplest and earliest known, and was in common use by the Medes, Persians, Assyrians, and Chaldaeans in the most ancient times. Like the Egyptian hieroglyphics, or rather *hieratic*, it

seems to have been chiefly employed in monumental inscriptions, there being doubtless another form (like the *demotic*) better adapted to common use. It appears to have fallen into disuse when, on the fall of Babylon under Alexander, these mighty empires ceased to have any great national annals to record. Within the past eighty years the first specimens found their way into Europe from the fragments of Persepolis, and at length engaged the attention of several German philologists, especially Tyschen; but Dr. Grotefend, of Hanover, was the first who obtained any clew to their decipherment (see Vaux's *Nineveh and Persepolis*, p. 391 sq.). According to him, this mode of writing is formed of two radical signs, the *wedge* and the *angle*, susceptible, however, of about thirty different combinations; and consists of three varieties, the Persian, the Median, and the Assyrian, distinguished from each other by a greater or less complication of the characters, the last being the most elaborate: others make still further subdivisions, e.g. the Achaemanian, Babylonian, Medo-Assyrian, Elymaean, Scythian, Arian, etc. The whole of each alphabet, however, is obviously reducible to a single element, the wedge, which is found either singly or in groups of two, three, or more, and placed vertically, horizontally, or obliquely, in the several characters. It is evidently of Asiatic origin, is written from right to left, and is alphabetic, (See an elucidation of the process of deciphering these letters by Layard, *Nineveh.* 2:134 sq.) The other great laborer in this field of discovery is Colossians Rawlinson, of England, who has so completely succeeded in confirming and extending the results arrived at by others, that the meaning of these inscriptions, with the exception of the exact rendering of some of the proper names, may now be said to be established beyond dispute. (See his *Commentary on the Cuneiform Inscriptions*, read before the Roy. As. Soc., and published in a separate form, Lond. 1850.) Dr. Hincks has also successfully prosecuted these inquiries. (See his papers in the *Transactions* of the Roy. Irish Acad. vol. 22.) The inscriptions are usually trilingual as well as triliteral, the alphabets and entire structure differing in each version. *SEE BEHISTUN*. The language is Shemitic, but corresponds with neither the Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, nor Arabic, as they have come down to us. The inscriptions of various periods and at different places differ considerably in their form and diction.

The following specimens of identification of names mentioned in the Old Test. with those occurring in the Assyrian inscriptions are given by Layard (*Nin. and Bab*. p. 534-6). Other instances will be noted under the several

kings and deities in their proper places, e.g. Artaxerxes, Asshur, Cyrus, Darius, Xerxes. See Paravey, *Ninive et Babylon expliques* (Paris, 1845 6); Stern, *Die dritte Gattung d. Achiimenidischen Keilschr*. (Gott. 1850); Anon. *Lecture lit. des hieroglyphes et des cuneiformes* (Par. 1853); Grotefend, in the *Fundgruden des Orients*, 1814; and in Heeren's *Ideen*, I, i (1t15); *Neue Beitrage zur Erliuterung der Persepolit. Keilschr'*. (Hann. 1837); *N. Erlaut. der Babylon. K.* (ib. 1840); Bemerkungen *ub. d. Inschr. e. Thongesstses m. Babylon. Keilschr*. (Gott. 1848); Erlaut. d. *k. — en bab. Backsteine* (Hann. 1850); *Der Trib. der Obelisken aus Nimrud* (Gott. 1852); Burnouf, *Mem. surc deux inscriptions cuneiformes* (Paris, 1836); Holzmann, *Beitrdge zur Erkl. der Pers. Keilinschr*. (1845); Hincks, *On the three Kinds of Persepolitan Writing, etc*. (Lond. 1846); *On the third Persepol. Writing* (1847); *Report to the Trustees of the Brit. Mus*., etc. (1854); *Polyphony of the Cun. Writing* (Lond. 1863); Suzatto, *Sulla inscrizione cunifornme de Behistun* (Mail. 1848) ; *Le Sanscritisme de la langue Assyrienne* (Pad. 1844); *Etudes sur les inscriptions de Persepolis, etc*. (ib. 1850); *Botta, emm. sur l'ecriture cuneiforme* (Par. 1848); De Saulcy, *Recherches sur l'ecri- utre cun*. (ib. 1848); *Rech. analytiques, etc*. (ib. 1849 sq.); *Traduction de l'inscrip. de Behistun* (ib. 1854); Layard, *inscript. in the Cun. Character* (Lond. 1851); Norris, *Memoir on the Scythic Version 'of the Beh. Inscr*. (ib. 1853); Lassen, *Altpersische Keil-Inschriftcn vonz Persepolis* (Bonn, 1836); Lichtenstein, *Palceographia Assyro-persica* (Helmst. 1803); Col. Rawlinson, *Cunei. Insc. at Behistun* (Assyrian and English, with a vocabulary, 3 pts. 8vo, Lond. 1846, and later being vol. 10, sq. of the *Jour. of the Roy. As. Soc*.); *Commentary on the Cuneiform Inscriptions* (London, 1850); Memoir on the Babyl. and Assyr. Inscriptions (ib. 1851); Menant, *Inscriptions Assyriennes* (Par. 1859); *Notice sur les Inscriptions cuneiformes* (Paris, 1859); also, *Les ecritures Cuneiformes* (Paris, 1860, 1864); Oppert, *Das Lautsystem des A ltpersischen* (Berl. 1847); *Miem. sur les inscr. des Achemenides* (Paris, 1851); *Nnnemm mmresusus Roi de Babylone* (Par. 1859); *Elements de la grammaire Assyrienne* (Paris, 1860); and *Grande inscription de Khorsabad* (Par. 1866); Brandis, *Assyr. Inscr*. (tr. in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April, 1857); G. H. Rawlinson, *Four Monarchies, i*; De Gobineau, *Lecture des texts Cuneiformes* (Par. 1858); also, *Traite des ecritures Cuneiformes* (Par. 1864); Olshausen, *Privfung der Assyrischen Keilschrift* (Herm. 1864); *Presb. Quart. Review*, April, 1861; *Br. and For. Evang. Review*, July, 1861; *Jour. Sac. Lit*. April, 1861, *Ocit*. 1864; Morris, *Assyrian Dictionary* (Lond. 1868 sq. 8vo).

Cunigunda

wife of Henry of Bavaria, who afterwards became emperor. She was crowned with her husband by pope Benedict VIII, A.D. 1014. According to the Roman Acts of the Saints, she had made a vow of virginity, and her husband suspecting her fidelity, she "walked over red-hot ploughshares without being hurt," and thus vindicated her innocence! She died March 3,1040, and was canonized in 1200 by Innocent III. The Romish legends tell of many miracles wrought at her tomb. — Butler, *Lives of Saints*, March 3.

Cunningham William, D.D.,

an eminent minister of the Free Church of Scotland, was born in October, 1805, and was fully identified with all the movements and controversies which led to the disruption of the Church of Scotland. He received at the hands of the Free Church all the honors in their gift, and was moderator of the Assembly in 1859. At the time of his death he was principal of the college of the Free Church of Scotland. After the disruption he visited America, where his eloquence and intellectual power enabled him to enlist the sympathies of a large portion of the churches, and to secure an amount of material aid at that time greatly needed by the Free Church. He died at his house in Edinburgh, Scotland, December 14,1861. His principal writings were collected after his death by his literary executors, as follows, viz., *The Reformers, and the Theology of the Reformation* (Edinb. 1862, 8vo); *Discussions of Church Principles* (Edinb. 1863, 8vo); *Historical Theology* (Edinb. 1864, 2 vols. 8vo). The first two works consist chiefly of Dr. Cunningham's Review articles; the last, of his lectures in the Free Church College. They manifest large learning, great grasp of theological science, both historical and doctrinal, and a thoroughly evangelical spirit. In regard to Church government, Dr. Cunningham was a Presbyterian, "believing that Christ has committed the government of his Church, not to congregations, nor to prelatic bishops, but to presbyters or elders, otherwise called bishops. But, above all, he was a Calvinist, maintaining that man is by nature helplessly lost, and is and can be saved only by the free and sovereign love of God, giving salvation to whom he will, in what manner he will, because he wills it. He will be recognized in history, not as a Free Churchman, nor as a Presbyterian, but as a great Calvinist, occupying a place in his generation such as Calvin and Turretine occupied in theirs. The Calvinistic system Dr. Cunningham holds not provisionally,

as a half-way house to some more comprehensive system in posse, ‘looming in the future,’ but definitely, as what has been ascertained to be the system revealed in God’s Word, the only possible exhibition of all the Scripture facts regarding God and man, the only scriptural description of what God actually is, and has done, and is doing, in his relation to rational creatures, and specially in order to man’s salvation. He therefore immovably rests in the conviction that no new discovery can be made in theology; that any pretended novelty is either Calvinism under a new form, or some of the old errors in disguise which have been advanced against Calvinism, and which, as opposed to Calvinism, are, *ipso facto*, shown to involve a lie.” — *Brit. and For. Evangelical Review*, Jan. 1863, p. 193 sq ; Wilson, Presbyt. *Almanac*, 1863, p. 163; *Lond. Quarterly Review*, April, 1863, p. 258; *N. British Review*, Feb. 1863.

Cup

Picture for Cup 1

Picture for Cup 2

Picture for Cup 3

Picture for Cup 4

Picture for Cup 5

(usually כּוֹס, *kos*, prop. a *receptacle*; N.T. ποτήριον, a *drinking vessel*) denotes originally a wine-cup (Genesis 40:11-21), various forms of which, of different materials, are delineated on the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments. *SEE WINE*. The cups of the Jews, whether of metal or earthenware, were possibly borrowed, in point of shape and design, from Egypt and from the Phoenicians, who were celebrated in that branch of workmanship (*Il*. 23:743; *Od* 4:615, 618). Among the Egyptians the forms of cups and vases were very varied, the paintings upon the tombs representing many of most elegant design, though others are equally deficient in the properties of form and proportion. The forms used during the fourth and other early dynasties (1700 B.C.) continued to be common to a late date (Kenrick, *Egyptians of Time of Pharaohs*, Lond. 1857, p. 48). There are not any representations of cups like the head of an animal (Bonomi, *Nineveh and its Palaces*, 3d edit. p. 215, 216). Many of the Egyptian vases, cups, and bowls were of gold (Herod. 2:151) and silver

(<0144 02>Genesis 44:2; comp. <0407 34>Numbers 7:84), some being richly studded with precious stones, inlaid with vitrefied substances in brilliant colors, and even enameled. In Solomon's time all his drinking vessels were of gold, none of silver (<1110 21>1 Kings 10:21). Babylon is compared to a golden cup (<2451 07>Jeremiah 51:7). Assyrian cups from Khorsabad and Nimroud were of gold and bronze (Layard, *Nineveh.* 2:236; *Nin. and Bab.* p. 161; Bonomi, *Nineveh.* p. 187), as well as of glass and pottery. They were perhaps of Phoenician workmanship, from which source both Solomon and the Assyrian monarch possibly derived both their workmen and the works themselves. The cups and other vessels brought to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar may thus have been of Phoenician origin (<2701 02>Daniel 5:2). *SEE BANQUET*. On the bas-reliefs at Persepolis many figures are represented bearing cups or vases, which may fairly be taken as types of the vessels of that sort described in the book of Esther (<1701 07>Esther 1:7; Niebuhr, *Travels*, 2:106; Chardin, *Voyages.* 8:268, pl. 58). The great laver, or sea," was made with a rim like the edge of a cup (*cos*), "with flowers of lilies" (<1106 26>1 Kings 6:26), a form which the Persepolitan cups resemble (Jahn, *Arch.* § 144). Similar large vases have been found represented at Khorsabad (Botta, pl. 76). The use of gold and silver cups was introduced into Greece after the time of Alexander (Athen. 6:229, 230; 11:446, 465; Birch, *Anc. Pott*. 2:109). The cups of the N.T. (ποτήρια) were often, no doubt, formed on Greek and Roman models. (See Smith, *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. Patera.) They were sometimes of gold (<6617 04>Revelation 17:4). — Smith, s.v.; Fairbairn, s.v. The common Eastern drinking-cup is of brass, and frequently has devices and sometimes sentences from the Koran engraved on the inside (Lane, *Mod. Eg*. 1:222). As the Moslem law, however, forbids the drinking of wine to good Mohammedans, the common beverage in its place is coffee, which is invariably offered to visitors. The coffee (*kahweh*. i.e. the drink) is made very strong, and without sugar or milk. The coffee-cup (which is called *fingan*) is small, generally holding not quite an ounce and a half of liquid. It is of porcelain or Dutch-ware, and, being without a handle, is placed within another cup (called *zarf*) of silver or brass, according to the circumstances of the owner, and both in shape and size nearly like an egg-cup. In a full service there are ten fingans and zarfs of uniform kinds, and often another fingan and zarf of a superior kind for the master of the house or for a distinguished guest. In the accompanying sketch, the coffee-pot (*bekreg* or *bakrcag*) and the zarfs and tray are of silver, and are represented on a scale of one eighth of the real size. Below this-set are a similar zarf and fingan,

on a scale of one fourth, and a brass zarf, with the fingan placed in it. Some zarfs are of plain or gilt silver filigree, and a few opulent persons have them of gold. Many Moslems, however, religiously disallow all utensils of gold and of silver (Lane, *Mod. Eg*. 1:205). *SEE CUP-BEARER*.

Picture for Cup 6

Picture for Cup 7

Picture for Cup 8

The practice of divining by means of a cup ([ybG; *gabi'a*; <01442>Genesis 44:2-17; a *goblet*, distinguished from the preceding or smaller cups used in drinking: rendered "pot" in <24505>Jeremiah 35:5; spoken of the calix-form "bowls" of the golden candlestick, <02531>Exodus 25:31-34; 38:17-26) was a practice of great antiquity in the East. We read in early Persian authors of the mystical cup of Jemshid (Bonomi, *Nineveh.* 3d ed. p. 306), which was imagined to display all the occurrences on the face of the globe (Tieroff, *De Scypho Josephi*, Jen. 1657; Tittel, *id*. Tor. 1727). *SEE DIVINATION*. The bronze cup, with the sacred beetle engraved in the bottom, found by Layard among the ruins of Nimroud, may have been used for such a purpose (*Nineveh and Babylon*, p, 157). Κόνδυ, the word used in Genesis by the Sept., occurs in Hipparchus (up. Athen. p. 478, A), and is curiously, like the Indian kundi, a sacred Indian cup (Bohlen on Genesis 1). 403; Kalisch, *Comment.* p. 673). In <23224>Isaiah 22:24, the word translated "cup" is ^GAg (*aggan'*, literally a trough for washing garments), and signifies a laver or basin (as it is rendered in <02416>Exodus 24:6; "goblet," <22172>Song of Solomon 7:2). The "cup of trembling" (ãsi; *saph*, elsewhere "basin" or "bowl") signifies a broad convex dish, such as is easily made to rock or vibrate. The "cups" referred to in <13817>1 Chronicles 28:17, were the t/wcq] (*kesavoth'*), or broad bowls for libation (elsewhere improperly rendered "covers," <02529>Exodus 25:29; 38:16; <04907>Numbers 4:7). Such vessels appear in the hands of the Assyrian king on the monuments, apparently in festive or religious drinking after public exploits (Bonomi, *Nineveh.* p. 252). In the Apocrypha we find the sacred vessels of Jehovah called σπονδελα, goblets (1 Esdras 2:13. "In their *cups*" l. Esdras 3:22, is a rendering for ὅταν πίνωσι, *when they drink*). *SEE BASIN*; *SEE BOWL*; *SEE DISH*; *SEE VASE*; *SEE VIAL*, etc.

"The word 'cup' is used in both Testaments in some curious metaphorical phrases. Such are *the cup of salvation* (<19B613>Psalm 116:13), which Grotius, after Kimchi, explains as '*poculum gratiarum actionis*,' a cup of wine lifted in thanksgiving to God (comp. <401627>Matthew 26:27). That it alludes to a paschal libation cannot be proved; and that it was understood by the Jews to be expressive of gratitude we may see from 3 Maccabees 6:27, where the Jews offer 'cups of salvation' in token of deliverance. In <241607>Jeremiah 16:7 we have the term 'cup of consolation,' which is a reference to the wine drunk at the περίδειπνα, or funeral feasts of the Jews (<101939>2 Samuel 3:95; <211806>Proverbs 31:6; Joseph. *War*, 2:1). In <461016>1 Corinthians 10:16, we find the well-known expression 'cup of blessing' (ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας), contrasted (ver. 21) with the 'cup of devils.' The sacramental cup is called the cup of blessing because of the blessing pronounced over it (<401627>Matthew 26:27; <422217>Luke 22:17; see Lightfoot *Hor. Hebr.* in loc.). No doubt Paul uses the expression with a reference to the Jewish 'cup of blessing' (hk;rB]lv,sK), the third of the four cups drunk by the Jews at their Paschal feast (Schottgen, *Hor. Hebr.* in 1 Corinthians; Jahn, *Bibl. Arch.* § 353), but it is scarcely necessary to add that to this Jewish custom our Lord, in his solemn institution of the Lord's Supper, gave an infinitely nobler and diviner significance (Buxtorf, *De Sacra Cana*, § 46, p. 310). Indeed, of itself, the Jewish custom was liable to abuse, and similar abuses arose even in Christian times (Augustine, *Serm.* 132, *de tempore*; Carpzov, *App. Critic*, p. 380 sq.). *SEE PASSOVER*. In <19B105>Psalm 11:5; 16:5, 'the portion of the cup' is a general expression for the condition of life, either prosperous or miserable (<19B235>Psalm 23:5). A cup is also in Scripture the natural type of sensual allurement (<245107>Jeremiah 51:7; <211231>Proverbs 23:31; <660704>Revelation 17:4; 18:6). *SEE BANQUET*.

"But in by far the majority of passages, the cup is a 'cup of astonishment,' a 'cup of trembling,' the full red flaming wine-cup of God's wrath and retributive indignation (<19B508>Psalm 75:8; <235117>Isaiah 51:17; <244515>Jeremiah 25:15; <250421>Lamentations 4:21; <262332>Ezekiel 23:32; <381212>Zechariah 12:2; <661619>Revelation 16:19, etc.). There is, in fact, in the prophets no more frequent or terrific image; and it is repeated with pathetic force in the language of our Lord's agony (<401639>Matthew 26:39, 42; <431811>John 18:11; <411038>Mark 10:38). God is here represented as the master of a banquet, dealing the madness and stupor of vengeance to guilty guests (Vitringa in <235117>Isaiah 51:17; Wichmannshausen, *De irce et tremoris Calice, in Thes. Nov. Theol. Philol.* 1:906 sq.). The cup thus became an obvious symbol of death (ποτήριον . .

. σημαίνει καὶ τὸν θάνατον, Etym. M.); and hence the Oriental phrase, to 'taste of death,' so common in the N.T. (<40162>Matthew 16:28; <41901>Mark 9:1; <43052>John 8:52; <58209>Hebrews 2:9), in the Rabbis (Schottgen, *Hor. Hebr.* in Matthew 16), in the Arabian poem *Antar*, and among the Persians (Schleusner, *Lex.* N.T., s.v. ποτήριον; Jahn, *Bibl. Arch.* § 203). The custom of giving a cup of wine and myrrh to condemned criminals (Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* s.v. Mors) is alluded to in <40274>Matthew 27:34; <41523>Mark 15:22." See Wemyss, *Clavis Symbol*. s.v.; Stier, *Words of Jesus*, 1:378 sq. *SEE CRUCIFIXION*.

Cup

SEE LORDS SUPPER.

Cup Given To The Laity

SEE LORDS SUPPER.

Cup-bearer

Picture for Cup-bearer

(hqvm; *mashkeh'*, one who gives to drink; so Gr. οἰνοχόος, wine-pourer; Vulg. *pincerna*), an officer of high rank with Egyptian, Persian, Assyrian, as well as Jewish monarchs. The chief cup-bearer, or butler, to the king of Egypt was the means of raising Joseph to his high position (<01402>Genesis 40:121; 41:9). Rabshakeh, who was sent by Sennacherib to Hezekiah, appears from his name to have filled a like office in the Assyrian court (<12817>2 Kings 18:17; *Gesen. Thesaur.* p. 1225), and it seems probable, from his association with Rab-saris (*chief of the eunuchs*), and from Eastern custom in general, that he was, like him, a eunuch (Gesen. p. 973). *SEE RABSHAKEH*. Herod the Great had an establishment of eunuchs, of whom one was a cup-bearer (Josephus, *Ant.* 16:8, 1). Nehemiah was cupbearer to Artaxerxes Longimanus, king of Persia (<16011>Nehemiah 1:11; 2:1). Cup-bearers are mentioned amonn the attendants of Solomon (<11005>1 Kings 10:5; <14904>2 Chronicles 9:4; so Achiacharus, Tobit, 1:22). They are frequently represented on the Assyrian monuments (Bonomi, *Nin.* p. 250), always as eunuchs (Lavard. *Nin.* 2:253).

Cupboard

(κυλικεῖον), a place of deposit for vases, dishes, etc. (so Athen. *Deipn.* xi, c. 2, p. 48; Zonaras, *Lex.* col. 1268), e.g. for the royal plate (1 Maccabees 15:32).

Curate

literally one who has the cure (Lat. cura, care) of souls, in which sense it is used in the Church of England Prayer-book, "all bishops and curates." In the Church of Rome it was originally appropriated to assistants and vicars appointed by the bishops. It is now generally used to denote the humblest degriee of ministers in the Church of England. A curate, in this sense, is a minister employed by the incumbent of a church (rector or vicar), either as assistant to him in the same church, or else in a chapel of ease within the parish belonging to the mother church. He must be licensed and admitted by the bishop of the diocese, or by an ordinary having episcopal jurisdiction, who also usually appoints his salary. Any curate that has no fixed estate in his curacy, not being instituted and inducted, may be removed at pleasure by the bishop or incumbent. But there are *perpetual* curates as well as temporary, who are appointed where tithes are impropriate and no vicarage was ever endowed: these are not removable, and the impropriators are obliged to maintain them. In general, the salaries of curates, certainly the hardest-worked and not the least devoted of the English clergy, are shamefully small, and reform in this matter is urgently required. "This large class of men are absolutely at the disposal of the bishops; they have no security whatever, no rights, no powers; public opinion may protect them to a certain extent, but any bishop who chooses to set public opinion at defiance is absolute over the whole class." — *Church of England Quarterly Review,* April, 1855, p. 25; Chambers, *Encyclop.* s.v.; Hook, *Church Dictionary,* s.v.

Curcellaeus Stephanus

(*Etienne de Courcelles*), an eminent aind le irned divine, was born at Geneva in 1586. He studied under Beza at Geneva, and afterwards at Heidelberg. In 1614 he was appointed pastor at Fontainebleau; in 1621, at Amiens; but, on his refusal to subscribe to the canons of Dort (q.v.), he was compelled to resign his pastoral charge. But, yielding to the importunity of friends, he afterwards gave a modified assent to the decrees of Dort, and became pastor at Verrez, in Piedmont, where he remained

until 1634. Becoming satisfied that he could not, with a good conscience, serve in a Church which held the doctrine of absolute predestination, he removed to Amsterdam, where he acquired a great reputation among the followers of Arminius. He read lectures in divinity, and succeeded Episcopius (1634) in the professorship of theology in the Remonstrants' College. He had great skill in Greek, as appears by his translation of Comenius's book, *Janua linguarum*, into that language. He applied himself particularly to a critical examination of the Greek of the New Testament, of which he gave a new edition, with many various readings drawn from different MSS. He prefixed a large dissertation to this edition, in which he treats of various readings in general (Amst. 1658 and 1675, 12mo). His large culture and tolerant spirit commended him to his great contemporaries in Holland, Grotius and Uitembogaert, with both of whom he was intimately connected. In the discussion between Amyraut and Du Moulin he intervened, as a sort of arbiter, by his *Advis d'unpersonnage desinteresse relativement 'a la dispute sur la predestination* (Amst. 1638, 8vo). Later he published *Vindicice Arminii ado. III. Amyraldum* (1645, 8vo); *Defensio D. Blondelli adv. Maresii Criminationes* (Amst. 1657); *Dissertationes* (Amst. 1659, 8vo). These, and other of his writings (translated into Latin), are given, together with his *Institutio Religionis Christiana* (an incomplete system of Theology), *in Curcellei Opera Theologica* (Amstelod. 1675, fol.), with preface by Limborch, and eulogy on Curcellaeus by Arnold Poelemburg. Curcellaeus died at Amsterdam in 1659. Poelemburg thus characterizes him: "He first of all directed his mind to a search after divine TRUTH; for he thought that this treasure, descending from heaven, should be preferred to all other acquirements. Next, he had all the thoughts of his mind directed to INTEGRITY, because he believed that not even truth could be of benefit to us, unless it brought some strikingly advantageous aid to our piety. Finally, this especially he wished, and for this peculiarly he labored, to unite the Christian body, torn into many and terrible schisms to compose and conciliate the separate, distracted feelings of various minds; and to teach that not all the doctrines which were alleged as a pretext for causing or cherishing a schism were vital for salvation, and at the same time to show that those things which had not the weight of necessity by no means sufficed for dividing the Church of Christ. To this all things were to be referred which he meditated, uttered, or performed; for this he refused to subscribe to the famous canons of the synod, because we, whose opinions ought not to be, were condemned; for this he abandoned his loved country, France, and endured

many hardships for the sake of mutual toleration; and for this he determined to contest, as if for some divine palladium. He conceded to others as much as he thought should be equally granted to him; demanded that nothing should be conceded to himself from others except what justice, and right reason, and the sacred writings require should be admitted. What is more holy than this proposition, what more salutary, what more necessary for the times? For many contend concerning the truth, and so contend that they never obtain truth, but lose charity. Hence the many disputes in Christendom on slight causes. But what is more disgraceful to us as members of Christ, what more ignominious to Christ as our Head and Leader, than that his seamless coat, and his body, which ought to be united by the closest ties of love, should be torn into a thousand fragments? This, indeed, is the distinction of Remonstrantism; this our crown of glory, because we neither caused this schism, nor consented to any other, nor cherished nor approved any; but we invite and exhort all who love Christ and adhere to his Gospel alone to enter this communion of peace" (see translation of Poelemburg's eulogy in the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, January and April, 1863). The theology of Curcelleeus was a modified Arminianism. He held the Grotian view of the atonement, but, *SEE ATONEMENT*, set special emphasis upon the sacrificial character of the death of Christ in its reference to God as well as to man, asserting that Christ made satisfaction for sin, but not by enduring the whole punishment due to sinners (*Instit.* lib. v, chap. xviii, xix). As to the Trinity, he held that Christ and the Holy Spirit are divine, but that both Son and Spirit are subordinate to the Father, from whom they receive both existence and divinity (*Instit. Relig. Christ*. lib. ii, cap. xix). — Curcellaeus, *Opera* (as cited above); Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, ii, § 235, 268; Dorner, *Doctrine of the Person of Christ* (Edinb. transl.), div. ii, vol. 2:350 sq.; Bull, *Defence of the Nicene Creed* (Lib. of Angl. Cath. Theology), 1:81 sq.

Cure

aPer]mi, *marpe'* (<243606>Jeremiah 36:6); ἴασις (<421332>Luke 13:32). From the same Hebrews root, ap;r; rapha', to "heal" or *cure*, is derived tWap]ri *riphuath'*, the art of healing, curing (<200308>Proverbs 3:8); and t/apur], *rephuoth'*, *remedies*, medicines (<244611>Jeremiah 46:11; <263021>Ezekiel 30:21). The Scriptures make no mention of physicians before the time of Joseph, and then it is Egyptian, not Hebrew physicians that are spoken of. Indeed,

it does not appear that physicians were ever much resorted to among the Hebrews, especially for internal maladies. For wounds, bruises, and external injuries, they had physicians or surgeons who understood dressing and binding them, with the application of medicaments (<24822>Jeremiah 8:22; 46:11; <26021>Ezekiel 30:21); and the Levites, it seems from <03134>Leviticus 13:14; <05012>Deuteronomy 20:2, had peculiar duties assigned them, which rendered it necessary they should know something of the art of medicine. The probable reason of king Asa's not seeking help from God, but from the physicians, was, that they had not recourse to the simple medicines which nature offered, but to certain superstitious rites and incantations; and this, no doubt, was the ground of the reflection cast upon him (<14162>2 Chronicles 16:12). The balsam, or balm of Gilead, was particularly celebrated as a medicine (<01375>Genesis 37:25; 43:11; <24822>Jeremiah 8:22; 46:11; 51:8). That mineral baths were deemed worthy of notice, and perhaps from ancient times, we know from Josephus. *SEE CALLIRRHOE*. Although there can be no doubt that there were physicians in the country when our Savior appeared in Palestine, it is evident that the people placed but little confidence in them (<41056>Mark 5:26; <42843>Luke 8:43). The Egyptian physicians, on the other hand, were highly esteemed. We first read of them as being commanded by Joseph to embalm the body of his father Jacob (Genesis 1, 2). Pliny states that, during the process of embalming, certain examinations took place, which enabled them to study the disease of which the deceased had died. Wilkinson observes (*Anc. Egypt.*, 2d ser., 2:460 sq.), "These examinations appear to have been made in compliance with an order from the government, as, according to Pliny (xix. 5), the kings of Egypt had the bodies opened after death to ascertain the nature of their diseases, by which means alone the remedy for phthisical complaints was discovered. Indeed, it is reasonable to suppose that a people so far advanced as were the Egyptians in knowledge of all kinds, and whose medical art was so systematically arranged that they had regulated it by some of the very same laws followed by the most enlightened and skillful nations of the present day, would not have omitted so useful an inquiry, or have failed to avail themselves of the means which the process adopted for embalming the body placed at their disposal. And nothing can more clearly prove their advancement in the study of human diseases than the fact of their assigning to each his own peculiar branch, under the different heads of oculists, dentists, those who cured diseases in the head, those who confined themselves to intestinal complaints, and those who attended to secret and internal maladies. Their knowledge of drugs, and of their effects,

is sufficiently shown by the preservation of the mummies, and the manner in which the intestines and other parts have been removed from the interior. And such is the skill evinced in the embalming process, that every medical man of the present day, who witnesses the evidence derived from such an examination of the mummies, willingly acquiesces in the praise due to the ability and experience of the Egyptian embalmers." *SEE EMBALMING*. There is reason to believe that the ancient Egyptians encouraged, or at least profited by, the growth of many wild plants of the desert, which were useful for medicinal purposes. Many of them are still known to the Arabs, as the *Salvadora Persica, Heliotropium inebrians, Lycium Europceum, Scilla maritima Cassia Senna, Ochradenus baccatus, Ocimum Zatarhendi, Linaria ,Egyptiaca, Spartium monospermum, Headysarum Alhagi, Santolina fragrantissima, Artemisia Judaica (monosperma and inculta), Inula undulata* and *crispa, Cucumis Colocynthis, etc*.; and many others have probably fallen into disuse from the ignorance of the modern inhabitants of the country, who only know them from the Arabs, by whom the traditions concerning their properties are preserved. From what Homer tells us of "the infinity of drugs produced in Egypt" (Odys. 2:229), the use of "many medicines," mentioned by Jeremiah, ch. 46:11, and the frequent allusion by Pliny to the medicinal plants of that country, we may conclude that the productions of the desert (where those herbs mostly grew) were particularly prized. *SEE MEDICINE*. The art of medicine was very ancient in Egypt, and some writers have supposed that Moses, having been instructed in all the learning of the Egyptians, must have known the chief secrets of medicine, a fact which they also infer from his accurate diagnosis, or indications concerning diseases. Though the Arabian physicians were in the Middle Ages the most skillful of their class, medical art in the East has long sunk into mere empiricism and merited contempt. It is, indeed, in the estimation of the common people, of far less utility than the employment of charms for the recovery of health, and is never resorted to till this means has failed. Roberts informs us, "Physicians in England would be perfectly astonished at the numerous kinds of medicine which are administered to a patient in India. The people themselves are unwilling to take one kind for long together, and I have known a sick woman swallow ten different sorts in one day. Should a patient, when about to take his medicine, scatter or spill the least quantity, nothing will induce him to take the rest; it is a bad omen; he must have the nostrum changed. The people of the East give a decided preference to external applications; hence, when they are directed to 'eat'

or ‘drink’ medicine, they ask, Can they not have something to apply outside? For almost every complaint a man will smear his body with bruised leaves or saffron, or ashes of certain woods or oils, and he professes to derive more benefit from them than from those medicines which are taken internally; at all events, he knows they cannot do him so much harm. It ought to be observed that they do not attach any miraculous effects to the being ‘anointed with oil.’“ *SEE DISEASES*; *SEE PHYSICIAN*.

Cureton William, D.D.,

an eminent English divine and Orientalist, was born in 1808, and educated at Christ Church, Oxford. He was ordained priest in 1834, and was for a time sub-librarian of the Bodleian. In 1837 he became assistant keeper of the MSS. in the British Museum, which post he retained till 1849, when he was appointed to a canonry of Westminster and to the attached rectorship of the parish of St. Margaret’s. Two years before that date he had been appointed chaplain in ordinary to the queen. He was also a Fellow of the Royal Society, an honorary D.D. of Halle, corresponding member of the Institute of France, and member of the Asiatic Society of Paris, the Oriental Society of Germany, and many other Continental societies. These honors he owed to his great reputation as an Orientalist, and especially as a Syriac scholar. This reputation was formed by his publications while an official in the British Museum. His *Corpus Ignatianum*, an edition of an ancient Syriac version of the Epistles of St. Ignatius, with commentaries thereon, was published in 1845, and gave rise to an interesting controversy. Among his subsequent works were an edition of a palimpsest of parts of Homer found in an Eastern convent, and his *Spicilegium Syriacum*, published in 1855. He was understood to be engaged on some work connected with St. Matthew’s Gospel at the time of his death, June 17, 1864.

Curia Romana

in the narrower sense, a collective appellation of all the authorities in Rome which exercise the rights and privileges enjoyed by the pope as supreme bishop of the Roman Catholic Church; in a wider sense, the collective appellation of all officers and authorities which assist the pope both in his secular and spiritual rule, or belong in any way to his retinue. In the

following article we speak only of those authorities which assist the pope as supreme bishop, and in the papal court.

I. *Judicial Authorities.* —They are the following:

1. The *Rota Romana* (Italian, *Ruota Ronana*), the supreme Court of the Roman Catholic Church, and in particular the highest court of appeal. *SEE ROTA ROMANA.*

2. The *Signatura Justitice*. It decides on the admissibility of appeals to the Rota, and consists of a cardinal as president (*praefectus*), seven (formerly twelve) voting prelates, some referendaries who prep ire the reports on law cases, and have, with regard to them, a decisive vote. An *Auditor* of the Rota decides what matter may be brought before the Rota, and decides various preliminary questions; but appeal may be taken from his decisions to the full court of the *Signatura*. The decisions of the Signatura are signed by the pope with the word *Fiat*, or, in the presence and by order of the pope, by a cardinal, with the formula *Concessum in proesentia Domini nostri Papae*.

3. The *Signatura gratioc* decides on those cases on which a decision is expected from the personal grace of the pope, and which on that account must be expedited more promptly. The pope himself presides in this college, which consists of cardinals appointed by him. The cardinal penitentiary, the secretary of the briefs, and the prefect of the dataria, belong to it in virtue of their office. The reports are made by three referendaries. The members have only a consultative vote. The pope alone decides, and signs personally all decisions.

II. *Boards of Administration*. — These are as follows:

1. *Secretaria Apostolica*. To it belong the cardinal secretaryg of memorials, who has to receive and report on all memorials not belonging to any other board, and the cardinal secretary of briefs (*carditalis a secretis brevium*), who has to draw up certain papal briefs, which he signs and seals with the fisher’s ring. This office is now part of the bureau of the cardinal secretary of state for foreign affairs, the leading officer of the papal government, who conducts the negotiations on Church affairs with all the foreign governments. The nuncios and other diplomatic agents of the papal government are his subordinates, receive from him his instructions, and have to report to him on the condition of the Church in

those states to which they have been sent. His office employs a large number of clerks. In important questions he consults extraordinary "congregations," and even the regular congregation of ecclesiastical affairs. He reports to the pope on indulgences, on dispensations from the defectus cetatis, natalium, interstitiorun, and on holy days.

2. The *Dataria Apostolica* was formerly a board of expedition, but in the course of time has become an independent board of administration. Its president is called *datarius*, and if he is — as is usually the case — a cardinal, *prodatarius*. It has its name from the common subscription, *Datum apud Sanctum Petrum*. Within the jurisdiction of the Dataria belong the granting of certain privileges, of dispensations from certain cases of consanguinity, etc. Among the officers of the Dataria is the *officialis ad obitum*, to whom belongs the management of those ecclesiastical benefices which become vacant in consequence of the deaths of their occupants. The Datarius, after obtaining the consent of the pope, signs *Annuit Sanctissminus*.

3. The *Cancellaria Apostolica* (Apostolical Chancellory) issues bulls or briefs on all important subjects which have been transacted in the Consistory or in the Dataria. Its chief is a cardinal *vice-chancellor*, the name vice-chancellor having originated in the fact that formerly (until the thirteenth century) the honorary dignity of chancellor was conferred upon some foreign prelate, and having been retained since, although from that time the presidency of the Chancellory has always been vested in a cardinal.

4. The *Camera Apostolica* (the Apostolical Chamber) has the administration of the papal revenues. Its president is a cardinal chamberlain (*camerarius* or *camerlengo*). The ecclesiastical revenues having been greatly reduced in the course of time, the chief business of the Apostolical Chamber is the administration of the finances of the papal territory.

5. The *Panitentiaria Romana* (Penitentiary) acts in all cases of absolutions and dispensations which are reserved to the pope; as regards dispensations, however, only in secret cases, or *inforo interno*. The president of the board is a cardinal, who has the title *Paenitentiarius Major.*

III. *The Papal Court*, or the so-called "Papal Family" (*Famiglia Pontifica*). —It comprises the officers on service who live in the papal

palace (*palatini*),besides a large number of honorary members. Among them are:

1. The *cardinales palatini*; namely, the cardinal secretary of state, the cardinal secretary of briefs, and the cardinal prodatarius.

2. The *praelatini palatini*, embracing a court marshal, a master of ceremonies; a master of the sacred palace (always a Dominican monk, who is also censor of the books published in Rome), the *sacristan of the palace* (always an Augustinian monk, who assists the pope in his private chapels), an *auditor sanctissimi* (a lawyer who is consulted by the pope), a large number of privy chamberlains and of honorary domestic prelates (*prelati domestics*), and bishops assistant of the throne (*vescovi assistenti al soglio*). These latter titles are conferred on a large number of bishops and priests in all parts of the world. Among the earlier writings on the *papal curia*, the best is that by the chevalier Lunadoro, *Relazione della Corte di Roma* (Padua, 1641; many edit. since; latest edition, with all the necessary additions, Rome, 1830, 2 vols.). See also Dr. O. Mejer, *Die heutige romische Curie*, in Jacobson's *Zeitschrift fuir das Recht der Kirche* (Leips. 1847); Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex*. 2:944.

Curio

(or CURION), COELIUS SECUNDUS, one of the Italian Reformers of the 16th century, was born at Chirico, near Turin, in 1503. He took an active part in the reformatory efforts made in Italy, and, in consequence of his teaching, was persecuted by the Roman Catholic priesthood at Milan, Pavia, and Lucca. He finally fled to Lausanne, where he became rector. Subsequently he was appointed professor of elocution at the University of Basel, in which city he died in 1569. He wrote, among others, the following works: — *Pusquilli ecstatici* (first edit. without year; again Geneva, 1544); *Pasquillorum tomi duo* (Basel, 1544); *Christianae religionis institutio* (Basel, 1549); *De perfecto grammatico* (Basel, 1555); *Forum Romanum* (Basel, 1561, 3 vols. fol.); *Logicis Elementa* (Basel, 1569); *De bello Melitensi* (Basel, 1567). He also published editions of several Roman classics. —Pierer, *Univ*. — *Lex*. 4:590.

Curious Arts

(τὰ περίεργα, literally *the sedulous things*, hence the term is applied to an over-officious person, e.g. a "busy-body," 1 Timothy 5:13), prop.

overwrought, hence magic (see Iren. *adv. Haeres*. 1:20; Isidor. iii. 139; comp. *curiosus*, Horace, *Epod.* 17:77); spoken of the black art as practiced by the Ephesian conjurors (<44919>Acts 19:19; see Kuinol, in loc.). The appropriateness of the term is shown by Deyling (*Observatt. Sacr*. iii. 277 sq.). The allusion is doubtless to the famous *Ephesian spells* (Ἐφέσια γράμματα), i.e. charms or scraps of parchment (originating or most used at Ephesus) whereon were written certain marks and formulae, which, like amulets, were worn upon the person as a safeguard against diseases, demons, and other evils (see Wagenseil, *Tela Ignea*, preface, p. 33; Ursinus, *Analect*. 2:46; Dietric, *Antt. Biblic*. in loc.; Cellarins, *Disputt.* A cadem. p. 441; Wolburg, *Observatt. Sacr*. p. 470; Laur. Rannires, in *Penteconcarch*. p. 214). *SEE DIVINATION*. They are frequently referred to in ancient writings (see Wetstein, Kype, etc. in loc.), e.g. Eustathius (*ad* Hom. *Odyss.* i, p. 994, 35), "Ephesian letters: some say these were incantations which were of very great assistance to Croesus when used by him at the stake; in the Olympic games, however, it is said that a certain Milesian failed to outstrip an Ephesian till the charm worn by the latter was discovered and removed" (comp. Erasmus, *Adagg. Center*. 2:578). The phrase appears to have been applied to any talismanic inscription (Kister, *ad* Suidam, 1:919; Gale, *ad* Jamblichum, p. 290). Ortlob, however, in his *Diss. de Ephesiorum libris conbustis* (Lips. 1708), § 9, contends that the arts in question were rather methods of promoting the worship of the patron goddess of the city (see Wolf, *Curae*, in loc.). The other and usual view is maintained by Siber (*Disputatio de* περιεργίᾳ *Ephesiorum*, Vitemb. 1685; also in *Thesaur. Dissertationum super N.T.* 1:484 sq.), and Schurzfleisch (*Dissertat o de libris Ephesiis*, Vitemb. 1698). *SEE EPHESUS*.

Curse

(the rendering of various Hebrews and Greek words). God denounced his curse against the serpent which had seduced Eve (<01314>Genesis 3:14), and against Cain, who had imbued his hands in his brother Abel's blood (iv. 11). He also promised to bless those who should bless Abraham, and to curse those who should curse him. The divine maledictions are not merely imprecations, nor are they impotent wishes; but they carry their effects with them, and are attended with all the miseries they denounce or foretell. (See Zachary, *Threats of Scripture*, Oxford, 1653.) Holy men sometimes prophetically cursed particular persons (<01025>Genesis 9:25; 49:7; <05715>Deuteronomy 27:15; <06026>Joshua 6:26), and history informs us that these

imprecations had their fulfillment, as had those of our Savior against the barren fig-tree (<41112>Mark 11:21). But such curses are not consequences of passion, impatience, or revenge; they are predictions, and therefore not such as God condemns. *SEE IMPRECATION*. No one shall presume to curse his father or his mother, *SEE CORBAN*, on pain of death (<02217>Exodus 21:17); nor the prince of his people (22:28); nor one that is deaf (<03914>Leviticus 19:14); whether a man really deaf be meant here, or one who is absent, and therefore cannot hear what is said against him. Blasphemy, or cursing of God, is punished with death (<03240>Leviticus 24:10, 11). Our Lord pronounces blessed those disciples who are (falsely) loaded with curses, and requires his followers to bless those who curse them; to render blessing for cursing, etc. (<40511>Matthew 5:11). The Rabbins say that Barak cursed and excommunicated Meroz, who dwelt near the brook Kishon, but who came not to assist Israel against Jabin. Wherefore Barak excommunicated him by the sound of four hundred trumpets, according to <07023>Judges 5:23. But Meroz is more probably the name of a place. — Calmet. The Jews were cursed by the Almighty for rejecting the Messiah (<39406>Malachi 4:6; see on this the dissertation of Iken, *De Anathemate*, etc., Brem. 1749). *SEE ANATHEMA*; *SEE OATH*.

On the passage in Job (<18209>Job 2:9)," Curse God and die," Mr. Roberts makes the following remarks: "Some suppose this ought to be, 'Bless God and die' (the Hebrews is Ë r B); but Job would not have reproved his wife for such advice, except she meant it ironically. It is a fact, that when the heathen have to pass through much suffering, they often ask, 'Shall we make an offering to the gods for this?' that is, 'Shall we offer our devotions, our gratitude for afflictions?' Job was a servant of the true God, but his wife might have been a heathen; and thus the advice, in its most literal acceptation, might have been in character. Nothing is more common than for the heathen, under certain circumstances, to curse their gods. Hear the man who has made expensive offerings to his deity, in hope of gaining some great blessing, and who has been disappointed, and he will pour out all his imprecations on the god whose good offices have, as he believes, been prevented by some superior deity. A man in reduced circumstances says, 'Yes, yes, my god has lost his eyes; they are put out; he cannot look after my affairs.' 'What!' said an extremely rich devotee of the supreme god Siva, after he had lost his property, 'shall I serve him any more? What! make offerings to him? No, no; he is the lowest of all gods.' With these

facts before us, it is not difficult to believe that Job's wife actually meant what she said." *SEE JOB*.

Curtain

Picture for Curtain

the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of three Hebrew terms.

1. h[yrij] *yeriah'* (from its tremulous motion, invariably thus translated), the ten "curtains" of fine linen, etc., each twenty-eight cubits long and four wide, and also the eleven of goats' hair, which covered the tabernacle of Moses (<02601>Exodus 26:1-13; 36:8-17). The charge of these curtains and of the other textile fabrics of the tabernacle was laid on the Gershonites (<04025>Numbers 4:25). Having this definite meaning, the word came to be used as a synonym for the tabernacle — its transitoriness and slightness — and is so employed in the sublime speech of David, <10702>2 Samuel 7:2 (where "curtains" should be "the curtain"), and <131701>1 Chronicles 17:1. In a few later instances the word bears the more geneial meaning of the sides of a tent, as in the beautiful figure of <235402>Isaiah 54:2 (where "habitations" should be "tabernacles," t/nK]v]mi poetic word for "tents"); <240420>Jeremiah 4:20; 10:20 (here "tabernacle" and "tent" are both one word, lh,ao, tent); <19A402>Psalm 104:2 (where "stretch," ^fn; is the word usually employed for extending a tent). Also specially of nomadic people, <244929>Jeremiah 49:29; <350307>Habakkuk 3:7 (of the black hair-cloth of which the tents of the real Bedouin are still composed); but <220105>Song of Solomon 1:5 rather refers to the hangings of the palace. *SEE TENT*.

2. Ësm; *masak*, the "hanging" for the doorway of the tabernacle (<02636>Exodus 26:36, 37; 35:15; 36:37; 39:38; xl, 5; <04025>Numbers 3:25; 4:25); and also for the gate of the court round the tabernacle (<02716>Exodus 27:16; 35:17; 38:18; 39:40; xl, 33; <04026>Numbers 3:26; 4:26). Among these the rendering "curtain" occurs but once (<04026>Numbers 3:26), while "hanging" is shared equally between *masak* and a very different word -y[ilq], *kelai'*. *SEE HANGING*. Besides "curtain" and "hanging," masak is rendered "covering" in <03512>Exodus 35:12; 39:34; 40:21; <04005>Numbers 4:5; <101719>2 Samuel 17:19: <19A539>Psalm 105:39; <232208>Isaiah 22:8. The idea in the root of masak seems to be of shielding or protecting (Ësm; Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 951). If this be so, the object denoted may have been not a curtain or

veil, but an awning to shade the entrances — a thing natural and common in the fierce sun of the East (see Fergusson's *Nineveh and Persepolis*, p. 184). s.v. *SEE TABERNACLE*. The sacred curtain separating the holy of holies from the sanctuary is designated by an entirely different term, tk,rEP] *pero'keth* (Exodus 26:31 sq.; Leviticus 16:2; Numbers 18:7, etc.). *SEE VAIL*.

3. qDoD *dok* (prop. *fineness*), fine cloth for a garment, specially a curtain, apparently a tent-covering of superior fineness (Isaiah 40:22), such as the rich Orientals spread for a screen over their courts in summer (Henderson, in loc.). *SEE COURT*.

Curtius Valentin,

a prominent Lutheran minister of the sixteenth century, was born at Lebus Jan. 6, 1493. He studied at the University of Rostock, and early entered the order of Franciscans. He was one of the earliest adherents of the Reformation of Luther, and became its leader, first in the city of Rostock, and subsequently in that of Lubeck. In 1554 he was appointed superintendent of all the churches of Lubeck, and in this position exercised a most beneficent influence upon the religious life of the city. He also took a prominent part in many of the theological conferences of the Lutheran Church. Thus he was present at the "convent of Brunswick" in 1557, which was to settle the adiaphoristie controversies, and in 1561 at the "convent of Luneburg," when the "'Luneburg Articles" were drawn up, which were incorporated with the symbolical books of Brunswick. Curtius is also the author of the so-called "Lubeck Formula" (*Formula consensus*, etc.), which he drew up in concert with the secular authorities and the entire clergy of the city. By it the ministers pledge themselves to abide by the doctrine of the prophets and the apostles, the Apostolic Creed, the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, and the Articles of Schmalkald. It was signed by Curtius and all the other ministers of Lubeck in 1560, aid afterwards. by all ministers appointed in Lubeck until 1683, when the signing of it was no longer required. Curtius also drew up, in the name of the clergy, a "'*Protestatio contra Synodumn Tridentinam*." He died Nov. 28, 1573. —Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 19:373; Starke, *Liub Kirch-Hist.* (Hamburg, 1724, 2 vols., where both the "*Formula Consensus*" and the *Protestatio* are printed).

Cusa Nicholas De,

or CUSANUS, a cardinal of great learning. His name was properly NICHOLAS KHRYPFFS (KREBS), but he was named *Cusanus* or *De Cusa* from Cues on the Mosel, where he was born in 1401. He was the son of a poor fisher, who wished him to learn the same trade. Rather than comply with this request, Nicholas left the paternal home, and found employment with the count of Manderscheid, who, having discovered the eminent talent of his servant, sent him to the school of the Brothers of Common Life at Deventer, and subsequently to the University of Padua. At the age of 23 Nicholas became doctor of law, but when he lost his first lawsuit he left the profession of law for the study of theology. Possessing a thorough knowledge of the Greek, Latin, and Hebrew languages, and a rare degree of eloquence, he soon attracted attention. After holding several ecclesiastical benefices at St. Wendel and Coblentz, he was present as archdeacon of the cathedral church of Liege at the Council of Basel, where he presented to the assembled bishops the celebrated work *De Concordantia Catholica*. This is one of the ablest works published, during the Middle Ages in favor of the opinion that the pope is subordinate to an oecumenical council; it attacks the pretended donation of Constantine, and the authority of the false decretals, and insists on the reformation of the Church and the Germanic empire. Cusa was opposed to the dissolution of the council which was attempted by Eugene IV, and showed himself favorable to the reforms which the council decreed. But soon after he left the reformatory party and became an adherent of the pope, who added him to the legation which was sent over to Constantinople to dissuade the Greeks from going to Basel, and to induce them to go to Ferrara. After the rupture between the pope and the council, Cusa accompanied the papal legate, Thomas de Sarzana, on his missions to Germany and France. When the latter became pope, under the name of Nicholas V, Cusa was made a cardinal (1449), and bishop of Brixen, in the Tyrol, in 1459. He was also sent on important missions to Germany, England, and Prussia. Being charged with the re-establishment of ecclesiastical discipline in Holland, he acquitted himself of this task with great firmness. His reform measures in his own diocese involved him in a quarrel with the archduke Sigismond of Austria. Cusa excommunicated the archduke, who, in his turn, imprisoned the cardinal, and compelled him to agree to a compromise. The matter was not fully settled when the cardinal died at Lodi in 1464.

The transition of Cusa from the reform party to the adherents of the court of Rome has by some writers been charged to ignoble motives; but, in view of the purity of his life, and the honesty of his purposes exhibited in all his public acts, most of the writers consider it as an honest change of opinion. It is thought that Cusa himself discovered the inconsistency of some of his views on the unity of the Church, the papal prerogatives, and the authority of the councils, as laid down in the work *De Concordantia Catholica*, and that, finding it necessary to discard the one or the other, he laid greater stress on the monarchical government of the Church than on the representative councils. This agrees with the strong attachment which Cusa shows to the monarchical principle in general. See Brockhaus, *Nicolai Cusani de concilii universalis potestate sententia explicatur* (Lpzg. 1867).

As a philosopher, Cusa was among the first to abandon the scholastic creed. “He arranged and republished the Pythagorean ideas, to which he was much inclined, in a very original manner, by the aid of his mathematical knowledge. He considered God as the unconditional Maximum, which at the same time, as *Absolute Unity*, is also the unconditional Minimum, and begets of himself and out of himself equality and the combination of equality with unity (Son and Holy Ghost). According to him, it is impossible to know directly and immediately this absolute unity (the Divinity), because we can make approaches to the knowledge of him only by the means of number or plurality. Consequently he allows us only the possession of very imperfect notions of God, and those by mathematical symbols. It must be admitted that the cardinal did not pursue this thought very consequently, and that his view of the universe, which he connected with it, and which represented the universe as the maximum condensed, and thus become finite, was very obscure. Nor was he more successful in his view of the oneness of the Creator and of creation, or in his attempt to explain the mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation by means of this pantheistic theism. Nevertheless, numerous profound though undeveloped observations on the faculty of cognition are found in his writings, interspersed with his prevailing mysticism. For instance, he observes that the principles of knowledge possible to us are contained in our ideas of number (*ratio explicatea*) and their several relations; that absolute knowledge is unattainable to us (*precisio veritatis inattingibilis*, which he styled *docta ignorantia*), and that all which is attainable to us is a probable knowledge (*conjectura*). With such opinions he expressed a sovereign contempt for the dogmatism of the schools.” The

works of Cusa were published in 1514 at Paris (3 vols. fol.),' and again in 1565 at Basel (3 vols. fol.). The latter edition is the more complete. See Tennemann, *Manual Hist. Phil*. § 286; Scharpff, *Der Cardinal und Bishop Nic. von Cusa* (vol. 1, Mainz, 1843; the 2d vol, has not appeared); Dix, *Der deutsche Cardinal Nic. von Cusa* (Ratisbon, 1847, 2 vols.); Clemens, *G. Bruno und N. von Cusn* (Bonn, 1847); Zimmermann, *Cusa als Vorlidvfer Leibnitzens* (Vienna, 1852).

Cush

(Heb. *Kush*, vWK, deriv. uncertain; A. V. "Cush," <01006>Genesis 10:6, 7, 8; <13008>1 Chronicles 1:8, 9, 10; Psalm vii, title; <23111>Isaiah 11:11; "Ethiopia," <01023>Genesis 2:13; <12909>2 Kings 19:9; <17001>Esther 1:1; 8:9; <18819>Job 28:19; <19731>Psalm 78:31; 87:4; <23801>Isaiah 18:1; 20:3, 5; 37:9; 43:3; 45:14; <26910>Ezekiel 29:10; 30:4, 5; 38:5; <34009>Nahum 3:9; <36310>Zephaniah 3:10; "Ethiopians," <23104>Isaiah 20:4; <24609>Jeremiah 46:9; <26109>Ezekiel 30:9), the name of two men, and of the territory or territories occupied by the descendants of one of them.

1. (Sept. Χούς, Vulg. *Chus*.) A son (apparently the eldest) of Ham. B.C. cir. 2510. In the genealogy of Noah's children Cush seems to be an individual, for it is said "Cush begat Nimrod" (<01008>Genesis 10:8; <13010>1 Chronicles 1:10). If the name be older than his time, he may have been called after a country allotted to him. The following descendants of Cush are enumerated: his sons, Seba, Havilah, Sabtah or Sabta, Raamah, and Sabtechah or Sabtecha; his grandsons, the sons of Raamah, Sheba and Dedan; and Nimrod, who, as mentioned after the rest, seems to have been a remoter descendant than they, the text not necessarily proving him to have been a son. *SEE HAM*. The only direct geographical information given in this passage is with reference to Nimrod, the beginning of whose kingdom was in Babylonia, and who afterwards went, according to the reading which we prefer, into Assyria, and founded Nineveh and other cities. The reasons for our preference are:

(1) that if we read "Out of that land went forth Asshur," instead of "he went forth [into] Asshur," i.e. Assyria, there is no account given but of the "beginning" of Nimrod's kingdom; and

(2) that Asshur the patriarch would seem here to be quite out of place in the genealogy. *SEE NIMROD*.

LAND OF CUSH. — From the eldest son of Ham (<010006>Genesis 10:6; <130108>1 Chronicles 1:8) seems to have been derived the name of the land of Cush, which is commonly rendered by the Sept. Αἰθιοπία, and by the Vulgate *AEthiopia*; in which they have been followed by almost all other versions, ancient and modern. The German translation of Luther has *Mohrenland*, which is equivalent to Negroland, or the Country of the Blacks. A native was called *Cushi'* (yvWK, Αἰθίοψ, *AEthiops*, <242323>Jeremiah 13:23), the feminine of which was *Cushith'* (tyvWK, Αἰθιόπισσα, *AEthiopissa*, <041201>Numbers 12:1), and the plural, *Cushiim'* (µyYæWK, Αἰθίοπες, *tiopes*, <300907>Amos 9:7). *SEE ETHIOPIAN*. "Of the four sons of Ham," says Josephus (*Ant.* 1:6, 2), "time has not at all hurt the name of Chus; for the Ethiopians over whom he reigned are even at this day, both by themselves and by all men in Asia, called *Chusites*." The Peshito Syriac version of <440827>Acts 8:27, styles both queen Candace and her treasurer *Cushaeans*. *SEE CANDACE*.

The locality of the land of Cush is a question upon which eminent authorities have been divided; for while Bochart (*Phaleg*, 4:2) maintained that it was exclusively in Arabia, Gesenius' (*Lex.* in voce) held, with no less pertinacity, that it is to be sought for nowhere but in Africa. In this opinion he is supported by Schulthess of Zurich, in his *Paradies* (p. 11, 101). Others again, such as Michaelis (*Spicileg. Geogr. Heb. 'Ext.* cap. 2, p. 237) and Rosenmüller (*Bibl. Geogr.* by Morren, 1:80; iii. 280), have supposed that the name Cush was applied to tracts of country both in Arabia and Africa — a circumstance which would easily he accounted for on the very probable supposition that the descendants of the primitive Cushite tribes who had settled in the former country emigrated across the Red Sea to the latter region of the earth, carrying with them the name of Cush, their remote progenitor. This idea had been developed by Eichhorn (*De Cuschaeis*, Ohrduf, 1774). The term Cush is generally applied in the Old Testament to the countries south of the Israelites. It was the southern limit of Egypt (<263910>Ezekiel 29:10), and apparently the most westerly of the provinces over which the rule of Ahasuerus extended, "from India even unto Ethiopia" (<170101>Esther 1:1; 8:9). Egypt and Cush are associated in the majority of instances in which the word occurs (<194803>Psalm 48:31; <231801>Isaiah 18:1; <244609>Jeremiah 46:9, etc.); but in two passages Cush stands in close juxtaposition with Elam (<231111>Isaiah 11:11) and Persia (<263805>Ezekiel 38:5). The Cushite king, Zerah, was utterly defeated by Asa at Mareshah, and pursued as far as Gerar, a town of the Philistines, on the southern border of

Palestine, which was apparently under his sway (<14149>2 Chronicles 14:9, etc.). In <14216>2 Chronicles 21:16, the Arabians are described as dwelling "beside the Cushites," and both are mentioned in connection with the Philistines. The wife of Moses, who, we learn from Exodus 2, was the daughter of a Midianite chieftain, is in <04120>Numbers 12:1, denominated a Cushite. Further, Cush and Seba (<234303>Isaiah 43:3), Cush and the Sabaeans (<234514>Isaiah 45:14), are associated in a manner consonant with the genealogy of the descendants of Ham (<011007>Genesis 10:7), in which Seba is the son of Cush. From all these circumstances it is evident that under the denomination Cush were included both Arabia and the country south of Egypt on the western coast of the Red Sea. It is possible also that the vast desert tracts west of Egypt were known to the Hebrews as the land of Cush, but of this we have no certain proof. The Targumist on <231111>Isaiah 11:11, sharing the prevailing error of his time, translates Cush by India, but that a better knowledge of the relative positions of these countries was anciently possessed is clear from <170101>Esther 1:1.

Some have sought for another Cush in more northerly regions of Asia, as in the Persian province of Chusistan or Susiana, in Cuthah, a district of Babylonia, etc.; and as Nimrod, the youngest son (or descendant) of Cush, spread his conquests in that direction, it is no doubt possible that his father's name might be preserved in the designation of some part of the territory or people. But here again the data are not very satisfactory; indeed, the chief thing which led to the supposition is the mention, in the description of the site of Paradise (<011213>Genesis 2:13), of a land of Cush, compassed by the river Gihon. Yet, even though the name of Gush were more variously applied in Scripture than it really is, it would not be more so than was the corresponding term Ethiopia among the Greeks and Romans, which comprised a great many nations far distant, as well as wholly distinct from each other, and having nothing in common but their swarthy, sun-burnt complexion — Αἰθίοψ q. d. αἰθὸς τὴν ὄψιν, i.e. "burnt-black in the face." Homer (*Odyss.* 1:22) speaks of them as "'a divided race — the last of men — some of them at the extreme west, and others at the extreme east." Strabo (i. 60) describes them as a "two-fold people, lying extended in a long tract from the rising to the setting sun." Herodotus (vii. 69, 70) distinguishes the eastern Ethiopians in Asia from the western Ethiopians in Africa by the straight hair of the former and the curly hair of the latter. The ancients, in short, with the usual looseness of their geographical definitions, understood by Ethiopia the extreme south in

all the earth’s longitude, and which, lying, as they thought, close upon the fiery zone, exposed the inhabitants to the sun’s scorching rays, which burned them black. It is the mistaken idea of the scriptural term “Cush” being used in the same vague and indeterminate manner that has led to so much confusion on this subject; and one writer (Buttmann, *Allt. Erdkc. d. Morgenl*. p. 40, note), in his desire to carry out the parallel between Ethiopia and Cush, derives the latter word from the root hwk (*kavh, kau, ku*), ‘to burn;” but that is opposed to all the rules of etymological analogy in the formation of Hebrew proper names (comp. Ritter’s *Erdkunde*, 1:222; Heeren’s *African Nations, Engl. transl*. 1:289). *SEE CUTH*.

1. The existence of an *African* Cush cannot reasonably be questioned, though the term is employed in Scripture with great latitude, sometimes denoting an extensive but undefined country (Ethiopia), and at other times one particular kingdom (Meroe). It is expressly described by Ezekiel as lying to the south of Egypt beyond Syene (29:10; comp. 30:4-6. Strabo, 17:817; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 6:35; Josephus, *War*, 4:10, 5). Its limits on the west and south were undefined; but it was probably regarded as extending eastward as far as the Red Sea, if not as including some of the islands in that sea, such as the famous Topaz Isle (<182819>Job 28:19; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 6:29; 37:8; Strabo, 16:4, 6; Diod. Sic. iii. 39). It thus corresponded, though only in a vague and general sense, to the countries known to us as Nubia and Abyssinia, so famous for the Nile and other great rivers. Hence the allusions in Scripture (<231801>Isaiah 18:1; <360311>Zephaniah 3:11) to the far-distant “rivers of Ethiopia,” a country which is also spoken of (<231802>Isaiah 18:2) in our version as the land “which the rivers have *spoiled*,” there being a supposed reference to the ravages committed by inundations (Bruce’s *Travels*, iii. 158, and Taylor’s *Calmet*, iii. 593-4); but recent translators prefer to render azB;by “divide,” q. d. “a land intersected by streams.” Isaiah likewise takes notice (in the above passage) of the “bulrush” — boats, or vessels of papyrus, which the Ethiopians employed upon the waters, a fact which is confirmed by Heliodorus in his *AEthiopica* (x. 460), and also by Bruce, who states that the only kind of boat in Abyssinia is that called tancoa, which is made of reeds, “a piece of the acacia-tree being put in the bottom to serve as a keel. to which the plants are joined, being first sewed together, then gathered up at stem and stern, and the ends of the plants tied fast there.” It is to the swiftness of these papyrus vessels that Job (9:26) compares the rapid speed of his days. From its proximity to Egypt we find Mizraim and Cush (i.e. Egypt and Ethiopia) so often classed

together by the prophets (e.g. <19403>Psalm 48:31; <23111>Isaiah 11:11; 20:4; 43:3; 45:14; <34039>Nahum 3:9). The inhabitants are elsewhere spoken of in connection with the Lubim and Sukkiim (<14212>2 Chronicles 12:3; 16:8; <24607>Jeremiah 46:7; <27143>Daniel 11:43), supposed to be the Libyans and Ethiopic Troglodytes, and certainly nations of Africa, for they belonged to the vast army with which Shishak, king of Egypt, "came out" of that country against Rehoboam, king of Judah. In these, and indeed in most other passages where "Cush" occurs, Arabia is not to be thought of; the Ethiopia of Africa is beyond all doubt exclusively intended. *SEE ETHIOPIA*.

In the ancient Egyptian inscriptions Ethiopia above Egypt is termed *Keesh* or *Kish*, and this territory probably corresponds perfectly to the African *Cush* of the Bible (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* 1:404, abridgment). The Cushites, however, had clearly a wider extension, like the Ethiopians of the Greeks, but apparently with a more definite ethnic relation. The settlements of the sons and descendants of Cush mentioned in Genesis 10, may be traced from Meroe to Babylon, and probably on to Nineveh. Thus the Cushites appear to have spread along tracts extending from the higher Nile to the Euphrates and Tigris. Philological and ethnological data lead to the same conclusion. There are strong reasons for deriving the nop-Shemitic primitive language of Babylonia, variously called by scholars Cushite and Scythic, from an ante-Shemitic dialect of Ethiopia, and for supposing two streams of migration from Africa into Asia in very remote periods; the one of Nigritians through the present Malayan region, the other and later one of Cushites, "from Ethiopia properly so called, through Arabia, Babylonia, and Persia, to Western India" (Poole, *Genesis of the Earth*, p. 214 sq.). Sir H. Rawlinson has brought forward remarkable evidence tending to trace the early Babylonians to Ethiopia, particularly the similarity of their mode of writing to the Egyptian, and the indication in the traditions of Babylonia and Assyria of "a connection in very early times between Ethiopia, Southern Arabia and the cities on the Lower Euphrates," the Cushite name of Nimrod himself as a deified hero being the same as that by which Meroa is called in the Assyrian inscriptions (Rawlinson's *Herod.* 1:353 n.). History affords many traces of this relation of Babylonia, Arabia, and Ethiopia. Zerah the Cushite (A. V. "Ethiopian"), who was defeated by Asa, was most probably a, king of Egypt, certainly the leader of an Egyptian army; the dynasty then ruling (the 22d) bears names that have caused it to be supposed to have had a Babylonian or Assyrian origin, as Sheshonk,

Shishak, Sheshak; Namuret, Nimrod; Tekrut, Teklut, Tiglath. The early spread of the Mizraites illustrates that of the Cushites, *SEE CAPHTOR*; it may be considered as a part of one great system of migrations. On these grounds we suppose that these Hamite races, very soon after their arrival in Africa, began to spread to the east, to the north, and to the west; the Cushites establishing settlements along the southern Arabian coast, on the Arabian shore of the Persian Gulf and in Babylonia, and thence onward to the Indus, and probably northward to Nineveh; and the Mizraites spreading along the south and east shores of the Mediterranean, on part of the north shore, and in the great islands. These must have been seafaring peoples, not wholly unlike the modern Malays, who have similarly spread on the shores of the Indian Ocean. They may be always traced where very massive architectural remains are seen, where the native language is partly Turanian and partly Shemitic, and where the native religion is partly cosmic or high-nature worship, and partly fetichism or low-nature worship. These indications do not fail in any settlement of Cushites or Mizraites with which we are well acquainted. *SEE ETHNOLOGY*.

But that part of this vast region of Cush which seems chiefly intended in these and most other passages of Scripture is the tract of country in Upper Nubia which became famous in antiquity as the *kingdom of Ethiopia*, or the state of Meroe. The Ethiopian nations generally ranked low in the scale of civilization; “nevertheless,” says Heeren, “there did exist a better cultivated, and, to a certain degree, a civilized Ethiopian people, who dwelt in cities; who erected temples and other edifices; who, though without letters, had hieroglyphics; who had government and laws; and the fame of whose progress in knowledge and the social arts spread in the earliest ages over a considerable part of the earth.” Meroe Proper lay between the river Astaboras (now the Atbara or Tacazze) on the east, and the Nile on the west. Though not completely enclosed with rivers, it was called an island, because, as Pliny observes, the various streams which flowed around it were all considered as branches of the Nile, so that to it the above description of a “country of rivers” was peculiarly appropriate. Its surface exceeded that of Sicily more than a half, and it corresponded pretty nearly to the present province of Atbara, between 13° and 18° N. lat. In modern times it formed a great part of the kingdom of Sennaar, and the southern portion belongs to Abyssinia. Upon the island of Meroe lay a city of the same name, the metropolis of the kingdom, the site of which has been discovered near a place called Assur, about twenty miles north of the town

of Shendy, under 17° N. lat. The splendid ruins of temples, pyramids, and other edifices found here and throughout the district have been described by Caillaud, Gau, Riippell, Belzoni, Waddington, Hoskins, and other travellers, and attest the high degree of civilization and art among the ancient Ethiopians. *SEE MEROE*.

Josephus, in his account of the expedition of Moses when commander of the Egyptian army against the Ethiopians, says that the latter "at length retired to Saba, a royal city of Ethiopia which Cambyses afterwards called Meroe, after the name of his own sister" (*Ant*. 2:10, 2). The same origin of the name is given both by Strabo and Diodorus Siculus, but see Mannert's *Geog*. of the Greeks and Romans, 10:199. There is still a place called Merawe considerably north of the island and near Mount Berkal, where Heeren thinks there may have been a settlement of the parent state called by the same name. The opinion of Josephus that Meroe was identical with Seba accords well with the statement in <01007>Genesis 10:7, that Seba was the eldest son of Cush, whose name (abs) is not to be confounded with either of the Shebas (abv), who are mentioned as descendants of Shem (<01028>Genesis 10:28; 25:3). Now this country of African Seba is classed with the Arabian Sheba as a rich but far-distant land (<19720>Psalm 72:10). In <23403>Isaiah 43:3, God says to Israel," I have given Egypt for thy ransom; Cush and Seba in thy stead;" and in <23514>Isaiah 45:14, "The wealth of Egypt, and the merchandise of Cush and of the Sebaim, men of stature, shall pass over to thee, and shall be thine." Charles Taylor, the ingenious but fanciful editor of Calmet, had the singular notion that by the expression "men of stature." in that passage is meant men of short measure, or dwarfs; and hence he identifies the Ethiopians with the pygmies of antiquity (Fragments to Calmet, 322). But the Hebrew phrase plainly denotes "tallness of stature" (comp. <13123>1 Chronicles 11:23), and the Ethiopians are described by Herodotus as of gigantic stature (ἄνδρες μέγιστοι, iii. 114; μέγιστοι ἀνθρώπων, 3, 20); and Solinus affirms that they were twelve feet in height (*Polyhist*. cap. 30). In common with the other Cushite tribes of Africa the skin was black, to which there is an obvious allusion in <24123>Jeremiah 13:23: "Can the Cushite change his skin?" Bruce finds Seba in Azab, a sea-port on the east coast of Africa, near the entrance to the Red Sea, and in this he is followed by Heeren, while others think of a place called Subah, about lat. 15° N., where are some of the most remarkable ruins of Nubian grandeur; but both opinions are merely conjectural. *SEE SEBA*.

Among other tribes of Africa said to have been in alliance with Egypt, the prophet Ezekiel (Ezekiel 30:5) mentions along with Ethiopia the name of *Chub*, which Michaelis connects with *Kobe*, a trading town described by Ptolemy as on the west coast of the Red Sea. But in the Arabic translation made from the Septuagint, instead of Chub we find "the people of Nubia," a name easily interchanged for the other, and in some Hebrews MSS. actually read there. There are still two districts adjoining Meroe on the south-west, called *Cuba* and *Nuba*, which are said to abound in gold. The Sukkiim, who, along with the Cushites and Lubim or Libyans, formed part of the host of Shishak (2 Chronicles 12:3), are in the Sept. designated as Troglodytes, i.e. cave-dwellers, and were no doubt the people known to the Greeks by the same name as inhabiting the mountain caverns on the west coast of the Red Sea (Diod. Sic. 3, 32; Strabo, 17, p. 785). They ,were noted for swiftness of foot and expertness in the use of the sling, and hence were employed, as Heliodorus informs us (*AEthiopica*, 8:16), as light troops. Pliny makes mention of a town of *Suche* in that region (*Hist. Nat.* 6:29, 34), and there is still on the same coast a place called *Suakim*, described by Burekhardt in his *Travels in Nubia*. If, however, the term *Sukkiim* be of Hebrew derivation, it would specially denote those who lived in booths, i.e. tabernacles made of the *boughs of trees*; and it deserves remark that the Shangallas who inhabit that country still dwell during the good season in arbors fitted up for tents, repairing in winter to their rocky caves. *SEE CHUB*.

In the age of Herodotus, the countries known to us as Nubia and Sennaar were occupied by two different races, one of whom he includes under the general appellation of Ethiopians, the other an immigratory Arabian race leading, for the most part, a nomadic life. This distinction has continued down to the present day. Among the original inhabitants the first place is due to the Nubians, who are well-formed, strong, and muscular, and with nothing whatever of the negro physiognomy. They go armed with spear, sword, and a shield of the skin of the hippopotamus. South of Dongola is the country of the Scheygias, whose warriors are horsemen, also armed with a double-pointed spear, a sword, and a large shield (comp. Jeremiah 46:9, the "Cushites who handle the shield"). They were completely independent till subdued by Mehemet Ali, pacha of Egypt. It is in their country that the pyramidal monuments which adorned the ancient Meroe are first met with, and even its name has been preserved in that of their chief place, Merawe, though the original Meroe must be sought

farther south. Next comes the territory of the Berbers, strictly so called, who, though speaking Arabic, evidently belong to the Nubian race. Above these regions, beyond the Tacazze, and along the Nile, the great mass of the inhabitants, though sometimes with a mixture of other blood, may be regarded as of Arab origin. But between the valley of the Nile and the Red Sea there is still, as of old, a variety of scattered aboriginal tribes, among whom the Arabic is much less common; they are, doubtless, partly the descendants of the abovementioned Sukkiim, or Troglodytes, and of the Ichthyophagi, or fish-eaters. Some of them spread themselves over the plains of the Astaboras, or Tacazze, being compelled to remove their encampments, sometimes by the inundations of the river, at other times by the attacks of the dreaded *zimb*, or gad-fly, described by Bruce, and which he supposes to be the "fly which is in the utmost part of the rivers of Egypt" (<scripRef passage="Isaiah 7:18" />Isaiah 7:18). Another remarkable Ethiopic race in ancient times was the Macrobians, so called from their supposed longevity. They were represented by the ambassadors of Cambyses as a very tall race, who elected the highest in stature as king: gold was so abundant that they bound their prisoners with golden fetters — circumstances which again remind us of Isaiah's description of Ethiopia and Seba in ch. 45:14. (See Ludolf, *Hist, AEthiopica,* F. *ad* M. 1681; with his *Commentaries* thereon, ib. 1691; and his *Hodlern. Habess. status,* ib. 1693). *SEE AFRICA*.

2. That some of the posterity of Cush settled in the south of Arabia may readily be granted; but that he gave a permanent name to any portion either of the country or people is by no means so evident: it is, at least, more a matter of inferential conjecture than of historical certainty, Almost all the passages usually cited in support of the averment are susceptible of a different interpretation.

(1.) For example, in <scripRef passage="Numbers 12:1" />Numbers 1:21, Miriam and Aaron are said to have taken offense at Moses for having married "a Cushitess;" and upon the presumption that this was the same person as Zipporah, daughter of the priest of Midian (<scripRef passage="Exodus 2:16" />Exodus 2:16, 21), it is inferred that Midian was in Cush. But, to say nothing of Zipporah's high rank, or of the services of her family to Israel, there would have been something so grossly incongruous and absurd in Moses's brother and sister complaining for the first time of his selection of a wife, after the marriage had subsisted for more than forty years, that it is evident Zipporah was now dead, and this second wife, though doubtless a proselyte to Judaism, was (whether born in Asia or Africa) a descendant of Cush, and therefore a Hamite, and not one of the

Midianites, who were of Shemitic origin, being the children of Abraham by Keturah. But, admitting that it is a second marriage which is thus referred to, the case is not materially altered, for still Cush must be sought near the place of Israel's encampment, as it cannot be supposed that Moses would go to Ethiopia to fetch a wife. *SEE ZIPPORAH*.

(2.) Others discover a connection between Cush and Midian, because in <3507>Habakkuk 3:7, the clause, "I saw the tents of Cushan in affliction," finds a parallelism in "the curtains of the land of Midian did tremble" — Cushan being held to be the poetical and high-sounding form of Cush. But this idea is met by another identification; for while it is acknowledged that part of the sublime description in that chapter refers to the Exodus and the transactions at Sinai, other portions (such as the passage of the Jordan, verse 8, and the standing still of the sun, verse 11) have plainly a reference to incidents in the books of Joshua and Judges. Now in the latter book (3, 10; 8:12) we find a record of signal victories successively obtained by Othniel over Cushan Rishathaim, king of Mesopotamia, and by Gideon over the princes of Midian. *SEE CUSHAN*.

(3.) But perhaps a stronger argument is the mention of Arabians as contiguous to the Cushites. Thus, in <142116>2 Chronicles 21:16, among those who were stirred up hgainst the Hebrews are mentioned the Philistines, and "Arabs that were near the Cushites," and the expression "near" (dy; l [i) in this connection can scarcely apply to any but dwellers in the Arabian peninsula. Other arguments adduced by Michaelis (Spicileg. *Geograph. Hebr*. 1:149) in favor of the Arabian Cush are not decisive, and the passages on which he relies apply with greater probability to the African Cush. Thus the retreat of Sennacherib from Judaea in order to meet Tirhakah (<121909>2 Kings 19:9; <233709>Isaiah 37:9) does not necessarily imply that the latter passed through Palestine, since the Egyptians had reached Carchemish on the Euphrates without doing so (<143520>2 Chronicles 35:20), and Tirhakah was undoubtedly an African prince. *SEE TIRHAKAH*. Again, it has been rashly concluded that Zerah the Cushite, who attacked Asa, king of Judah, with so immense a host (<141409>2 Chronicles 14:9), could not have been an Ethiopian of Africa, and yet the fact of his army having included Libyans (<141608>2 Chronicles 16:8) as well as Ethiopians, seems decisive of the fact that the latter were of African origin. Their ancestors may have belonged to the "people without number"' whom Shishak had led forth against Asa's grandfather, Rehoboam (<141203>2 Chronicles 12:3), and these their descendants may have retained possession of the north of

Arabia Petraea, between Palestine and Egypt (see Bruce's *Travels*, 1:30). *SEE ZERAH*.

Yet, though there is a great lack of evidence to show that the name of Cush was ever applied to any part of Arabia, there seems no reason to doubt that a portion of the Cushite race did early settle there. According to the ethnographic table in the 10th chapter of Genesis, Cush was the father of Seba, Havilah, Sabta, Raamah (whose sons were Sheba and Dedan), Sabtechah, and also of Nimrod (<01007>Genesis 10:7, 8; <13109>1 Chronicles 1:9, 10). The last mentioned appears to have moved northward, first into Babylonia and then into Assyria, but the others seem to have migrated to the south, though it is impossible accurately to trace out their settlements. Yet, even if we give Seba to Africa, and pass over as doubtful the names of Havilah, Sheba, and Dedan (for these were also the names of Shemitic tribes, <01028>Genesis 10:28, 29; 25:3), still, in <26722>Ezekiel 27:22, Raamah is plainly classed with the tribes of Arabia, and nowhere are any traces of Sabtah and Sabtechah to be found but in the same country. By referring, however, to the relative geographical positions of the south-west coast of Arabia and the east coast of Africa, it will be seen that nothing separates them but the Red Sea, and it is not unlikely that while a part of the Cushite population immigrated to Africa, others remained behind, and were occasionally called by the same name. In the fifth century of our era, the Himaryites, in the south of Arabia, were styled by Syrian writers Cushaeans and Ethiopians (Assemanni, *Bibl. Orient*. 1:360; 3, 568). The Chaldee paraphrast Jonathan, at Genesis 6, and another paraphrast at <13008>1 Chronicles 1:8, explain "Cush" by Arabia. Niebuhr (Beschr. p. 289) found in Yemen a tribe called *Beni Chusi*. <18819>Job 28:19 speaks of the topaz of Cush, and there was a Topaz Island in the Red Sea (Diod. Sic. 3, 39; Pliny, *Hist. Nat*. 37:8; Strabo, 16:4, 6). Yet most of these are circumstances:upon which we can lay but little stress; and the passage in <14216>2 Chronicles 21:16, is the only direct evidence we possess of the name "Cush" being applied in Scripture to any part of Arabia, and even that does not amount to absolute demonstration. *SEE ARABIA*.

3. Cush, as a country, therefore appears to be African or Arabian in all passages except <01023>Genesis 2:13. We may thus distinguish a primeval and a post-diluvian Cush. The former was encompassed by Gihon, the second river of Paradise: it would seem, therefore, to have been somewhere to the northward of Assyria. See GIHON. From etymological considerations, Huet was induced to place Cush in Chusistan (called Cutha, <12724>2 Kings 17:24),

Leclerc in Cassiotis in Syria, and Reland in the "regio Cossaeorum." Bochart identified it with Susiana, Link with the country about the Caucasus, and Hartmann with Bactria or Balkh, the site of Paradise being, in this case, in the celebrated vale of Kashmir. It is possible that Cush is in this case a name of a period later than that to which the history relates, but it seems more probable that it was of the earliest age, and that the African Cush was named from this older country. Most ancient nations thus connected their own lands with Paradise, or with primeval seats. In this manner the future Paradise of the Egyptians was a sacred Egypt watered by a sacred Nile; the Arabs have told of the terrestrial paradise of Sheddad the son of Ad (q.v.) as sometimes seen in their deserts; the Greeks located the all-destroying floods of Ogyges and Deucalion in Greece; and the Mexicans seem to have placed a similar deluge in America — all carrying with them their traditions, and fixing them in the territories where they established themselves. We are told that, in the Hindoo mythology, the gardens and metropolis of India are placed around the mountain Meru, the celestial north pole; that, among the Babylonians and Medo-Persians, the gods' mountain, Alborj, "the mount of the congregation," was believed to be "in the sides of the north". (<2314 13>Isaiah 14:13); that the oldest Greek traditions point northwards to the birthplace of gods and men; and that, for all these reasons, the Paradise of the Hebrews must be sought for in some far-distant hyperborean region. Guided by such unerring indications, Hasse (*Entdeczkunen*, p. 49, 50, n.) scrupled not to gratify his national feeling by placing the Garden of Eden on the coast of the Baltic; Rudbeck, a Swede, found it in Scandinavia; and the inhospitable Siberia has not been without its advocates (Morren, Rosenmüller's *Geog.* 1:96). But, with all this predilection in favor of the north, the Greeks placed the gardens of the Hesperides in the extreme west, and there are strong indications in the Puranas "of a terrestrial paradise, different from that of the general Hindu system, in the southern parts of Africa" (*As. Res*. 3, 300). Even Meru was no further north than the Himalayan range, which the Aryan race crossed in their migrations. *SEE EDEN*.

2. (Sept. Χουσί, Vulg. *Chusi*.) A Benjamite, apparently at the court of Saul, by the name of Cush is mentioned in the title of <1907 01>Psalm 7, respecting whom nothing more is known than that the psalm is there said to have been composed "concerning his words" (or affairs). B.C. 1061. "There is every reason to believe this title to be of great antiquity (Ewald, *Psalmen*, p. 9). Cush was probably a follower of Saul, the head of his tribe,

and had sought the friendship of David for the purpose of 'rewarding evil to him who was at peace with him' — an act in which no Oriental of ancient or modern times would see any shame, but, if successful, the reverse. Happily, however, we may gather from ver. 15 that he had not succeeded." By some (see Poole's *Synopsis*, in loc.) he is believed to have been Saul himself (see Hengstenberg, in loc.); by others he is identified with Shimei (see Pfeiffer, *Vict. Vexata*, in *Opp.* 1:297), who treated David so scurrilously on his retreat from Absalom (2 Samuel 16:5-8). A recent view (Kitto's *Daily Illustrations*, in loc.) is that this was the name of some treacherous informer in David's corps, through fear of whose intrigues he fled the second time to Achish (1 Samuel 27:1); or (see Calmet's *Comment.* in loc.), most probably, some of Saul's malicious courtiers, as no good reason can be given for calling so well-known characters as either Saul or Shimei by so fanciful a title as Cush. *SEE DAVID*.

Cu'shan

(Heb. *Kushan'*, ˆv#K). — ; Sept. Αἰθίοπες; Vulg. *AEthiopia*), usually regarded as a prolonged or poetic form (Habakkuk 3:7) of the name of the land of CUSH *SEE CUSH* (q.v.), but perhaps rather the same as *Cushanrishtthain*, (A.V. "Chushan-"), king of Mesopotamia (Judges 3:8, 10). The order of events alluded to by the prophet seems to favor this supposition. First he appears to refer to former acts of divine favor (ver. 2); he then speaks of the wonders at the giving of the Law, "God came from Teman, and the Holy One from Mount Paran;" and he adds, "I saw the tents of Cushan in affliction: [and] the tent-curtains of the land of Midian did tremble," as thou, h referring to the fear of the enemies of Israel at the manifestations of God's favor for his people. Chushan-rishathaim, the first recorded oppressor of the days of the Judges, may have been already reigning at the time of the entrance into Palestine. The Midianites, certainly allied with the Moabites at that time, feared the Israelites, and plotted against them (Numbers 22-25); and it is noticeable that Balaam was sent for from Aram (Numbers 23:7), perhaps the Aram-naharaim of the oppressor. Habakkuk afterwards alludes to the crossing of Jordan or the Red Sea, or both (ver. 8-10, 15), to the standing still of the sun and moon (11), and apparently to the destruction of the Canaanites (12, 13, 14). — Smith, s.v. There is, however, good reason for the supposition that Cushan here stands for an Asiatic Cush (see *Meth. Quar. Rev.* Jan. 1861, p. 81), as it is named in connection with Midian (q.v.). Delitzsch (*Der Prophet*

Habakuk, Leips. 1843, p. 159), who admits only the African Cush, holds that its mention along with Midian is intended to show how places so far removed from each other were equally affected by the theophany; but this is exceedingly strained, and at variance with the parallelism of the passage. *SEE CHUSHAN-RISHATHAIM*.

Cu'shi

(Heb. *Kushi'*, yvWK q. d. Cushite or Ethiopiasn; Sept. Χουσί; Vulg. *Chusi*), a name of three men in the Old Test. *SEE CUSH*.

1. (With the article, yvWKhi; i.e. "the Cushite," "the Ethiopian;" Sept. ὁ Χουσί; Vulg. *Chusi*.) The messenger sent by Joab to announce to David the success of the battle against Absalom and the death of the young prince (<101821>2 Samuel 18:21, 22, 23, 31, 32). B.C. 1023. He was apparently attached to Joab's person, but unknown and unaccustomed to the king, as may be inferred from his not being recognized by the watchman, and also from the abrupt manner in which he breaks his evil tidings to David — unlike Ahimaaz, who was well aware of the effect they were sure to produce. *SEE DAVID*. That Cushi was a foreigner — as we should infer from his name-is also slightly corroborated by his ignorance of the ground in the Jordan valley — "the way of the 'Ciccar"' (q.v.) — by knowing which Ahimaaz was enabled to outrun him. Ewald, however, conjectures that a mode of running is here referred to peculiar to Ahimaaz, and by which he was recognized a long distance off by the watchman.

2. The father of Shelemiah, and great grandfather of Jehudi, which last was sent by the Jewish magnates to invite Baruch to read his roll to them (<243614>Jeremiah 36:14). B.C. long ante 605.

3. The son of Gedaliah, and father of the prophet Zephaniah (<360101>Zephaniah 1:1). B.C. ante 635.

Cushion

SEE BED; *SEE PILLOW*.

Cushman, Elisha

a Baptist minister, was born at Kingston, Mass., May 2, 1788. He was ordained pastor of the First Baptist Church of Hartford, June 10, 181:3. In 1824 he was made M.A. (honorary) by Yale College. In 1825 he resigned

his charge in Hartford, and became pastor of the New Market Street Baptist Church of Philadelphia. In September, 1829, he returned to Connecticut, and, after preaching some time at Stratfield, was, in April, 1831, called to the pastoral charge of the Baptist church in New Haven. In 1835 he removed to Plymouth, Mass., but returned to Hartford in 1838, and resumed the editorship of *The Christian Secretary*, a religious paper of which he had been the original editor in 1822. He died October 26, 1838. Mr. Cushman's preaching was simple, instructive, and often eloquent. He published a number of occasional sermons and addresses. —Sprague *Annals*, 6:562.

Cuspius

SEE FADUS.

Custom

(Chald. Ël ḫ} *halak'*, a way-tax. i.e. *toll*, <150413>Ezra 4:13, 20; 7:24; Gr. τέλος, a tax. 1 Maccabees 11:35; <401725>Matthew 17:25; <451307>Romans 13:7; φόρος, *tribute*, 2 Maccabees 4:28; τηεή, *price*; 1 Maccabees 10:29), RECEIPT OF (τελώνιον, *collector's office*, i.e. *toll-house*, <400909>Matthew 9:9; <410214>Mark 2:14; <420527>Luke 5:27). *SEE TOLL*. Under the Persian and Syrian supremacy, imposts of various kinds were collected by local agents. Under the Romans, the management of the provincial revenues was generally committed to the Roman knights, who were thence denominated *chief publicans*, or chief collectors of the taxes; the tax-gatherers or exactors whom they employed were termed *publicans*. It was different in Judaea, for there the management of the revenues was committed to the Jews themselves, and those who held this office eventually obtained an equal rank with the knights of Rome (<421902>Luke 19:2; Josephus, *War*, 2:14, 9). The subordinate agents, or *publicans*, in collecting the revenues, took their position at the gates of cities and in the public ways, and, at the place appointed for that purpose, called the "*receipt of custom*," examined the goods that passed, and received the moneys that were to be paid (<400902>Matthew 9:2; <410214>Mark 2:14; <420527>Luke 5:27, 29). These tax-gatherers, if we may believe Cicero (*Pro Flacc*. 28), were more inclined to exact too much than to forget the promise which they had made to their masters; and were, accordingly, in consequence of their extortions, everywhere, more particularly in Judaea, objects of hatred, and were placed in the same class with notorious sinners (<410215>Mark 2:15, 16; <420312>Luke 3:12, 13). The

Pharisees held no communication with them; and one ground of their reproaches against the Savior was, that he did not refuse to sit at meat with persons of such a character (<40546>Matthew 5:46, 47; 9:10, 11; 11:19; 18:17; 21:31, 32). The half-shekel tax was a tax or tribute to be paid annually by every adult Jew at the Temple. It was introduced after the captivity in consequence of a wrong interpretation of certain expressions in the Pentateuch, and differed from the revenue which accrued to the kings, tetrarchs, and ethnarchs, and from the general tax that was assessed for the Roman Caesars. It was required that this tax should be paid in Jewish coin (<40217>Matthew 22:17-19; <41214>Mark 12:14,15). The prominent object of the temple money-changers (q.v.) was their own personal emolument; but the acquisition of property in this way was contrary to the spirit of the law in <052320>Deuteronomy 23:20, 21. It was for this reason that Jesus drove them from the temple (<40212>Matthew 21:22; <41115>Mark 11:15; <43015>John 2:15). Messengers were sent into other cities for the purpose of collecting this tax (<40725>Matthew 17:25). The Jews who collected this tax from their countrymen dwelling in foreign nations transmitted the sums collected every year to Jerusalem. This accounts for the immense amount of the treasures which flowed into the Temple (Josephus, *Ant.* 14:7, 2). *SEE TAX*.

Cut the Flesh

Cut off from the People.

SEE CUTTING, etc.; *SEE EXCOMMUNICATION*.

Cuth

(Hebrew, *Kuth*, tWK, signif. unknown; Sept. Χούθ, <122730>2 Kings 17:30) or Cu'thah (Heb. *Kuthah'*, , hTWK, fem. of same; Sept. Χουθά, ver 24), one of the districts in Asia whence Shalmaneser transplanted certain colonists into the land of Israel, which he had desolated. *SEE SAMARIA*. From the intermixture of these colonists with the remaining natives sprung the Samaritans (q.v.), who are called *Cuthites* (µyTWK) in the Chaldee and the Talmud (see Buxtorf, *Lexo Tahn*. col. 1027), and for the same reason a number of non-Shemitic words which occur in the Samaritan dialect are called Cuthian (compare Χουθαῖοι, Josephus, *Ant.* 9:14, 3; comp. 13:9,1). Josephus places Cuthah in central Persia (comp. Zonar. i, p. 77), and finds there a river of the same name (Χούθος, *Ant.* 9:14, 3; 10:9, 7).

Rosenmüller and others inclined to seek it in the Arabian Irak, where Abulfeda and other Arabic and Persian writers place a town of the name of Kutha, in the tract near the Nahr-Malka, or royal canal (the fourth in Xenophon, *Anab*. 1:7), which connected the Euphrates and Tigris to the south of the present Bagdad. The site has been identified with the ruins of Towibah, immediately adjacent to Babylon (Ainsworth's *Assyria*, p. 165; Knobel, *Volkertafel*, p. 252); the canal may be the river to which Josephus refers. Others prefer the conjecture of Stephen Morin (in *Ugolini Thes.* vii) and Le Clerc, which identifies the Cuthites with the Cosscei in Susiana (Arrian, *Indic*. xl; Plin. *Hist. Nat.* 6:31; Diod. Sic. 17:11; Mannert, 2:493), a warlike tribe who occupied the mountain ranges dividing those two countries, and whose lawless habits made them a terror even to the Persian emperors (Strab. 11:524; 16:744). They were never wholly subdued until Alexander's expedition, and it therefore appears doubtful whether Shalmaneser could have gained sufficient authority over them to effect the removal of any considerable number; their habits would have made such a step highly expedient, if practicable. Furst (*Heb. Handwort*. s.v.) identifies this district with the modern Khusistan of Susiana, the province Jutija of the cuneiform inscriptions of Behistun (Benfey, *Die Pers. Keilinzschr*. p. 18, 32). All these conjectures refer essentially to the same quarter, and any of them is preferable to the one suggested by Michaelis (*Spicil*. 1:104), that the Cuthites a were Phoenicians from the neighborhood of Sidon; founding it upon the connection between the Samaritans and the Sidonians, as stated in their letter to Alexander the Great (Joseph. *Ant.* 8, 6; 12:5, 5), and between the Sidonians and the Cuthaeans, as expressed in the version of the Chaldee Paraphrast Pseudo-Jonathan in Geno 10:19, who substitutes µyyntwk for ^wdx, and in the Targum, <130113>1 Chronicles 1:13, where a similar change is made; this is without doubt to be referred to the traditional belief that the original seat of the Phoenicians was on the shores of the Persian Gulf (Herod. 1:1). Rawlinson is confident that the ancient Cuth is identical with the modern ruined site *Ibrahim*, about twelve miles from Babylon (*Herod*. 1:243, 515; *Hist. Ev*. p. 340 sq.). *SEE NERGAL*. After all, it is possible that there is some historical and etymological connection (ç changed to t) between *Cuth* and the *Cush* of <010213>Genesis 2:13, which must have lain somewhere in the same quarter. *SEE CUSH*.

Cuthbert

ST., an eminent monk, born in the north of England in the beginning of the 7th century. His life, written by Bede, is full of marvelous stories; but it is clear that he was an earnest and faithful minister. He was educated by the Scottish monks at Icolmkill. After being for some time a monk in the monastery of Mailros, he became prior of the monastery of Lindisfarne. In 676 he withdrew to the island of Fame, where he lived a life of most rigorous asceticism as a hermit, and enjoyed the reputation of working many miracles. In 685 he yielded to the entreaties of king Egbert, and accepted the episcopal see of Hexham. When he felt the approach of death he returned to his hermitage on Frnme, and there died, March 20, 687. He is commemorated in the Roman Church March 20. The fame of St. Cuthbert had been great during his life; it became far greater after his death. Churches were dedicated to him throughout all the country between the Trent and Mersey on the south, and the Forth and Clyde on the north. When his tomb was opened at the end of eleven years, it was believed that his body was found incorrupt, and so for more than 800 years it was believed still to continue. It remained at Lindisfarne till 875, when the monks, bearing it on their shoulders, fled inland from the fury of the Danes. After many wanderings through the south of Scotland and the north of England, it found a resting-place at Chester-le-Street in 882. It was transferred to Ripon in 995, and in the same year it was removed to Durham. Here, enclosed in a costly shrine, and believed to work daily miracles, it remained till the Reformation, when it was buried under the pavement of the cathedral. The grave was opened in 1827, when a coffin, ascertained to have been made in 1541 when the body was committed to the earth was found to enclose another, which there was reason to suppose had been made in 1104; and this again enclosed a third, which answered the description of one made in 698, when the saint was raised from his first grave. This innermost case contained, not, indeed, the incorruptible body of St. Cuthbert, but his skeleton, still entire, wrapped in live robes of embroidered silk. Fragments of these, and of the episcopal vestments, together with a comb and other relics, found beside the bones, are to be seen in the cathedral library. The asceticism which distinguished St. Cuthbert in life long lingered round his tomb. Until the Reformation, no woman was suffered to approach his shrine; the cross of blue marble still remains in the cathedral floor which marked the limits beyond which female footsteps were forbidden to pass, under pain of instant and signal

punishment from the offended saint. His wrath, it was believed, was equally prompt to avenge every injury to the honor or possessions of his church. It was told that William the Conqueror, anxious to see the incorrupt body of the saint, ordered the shrine to be broken up; but scarcely had a stroke been struck, when such sickness and terror fell upon the king that he rushed from the cathedral, and, mounting his horse, never drew bridle till he had crossed the Tees! A cloth, said to have been used by St. Cuthbert in celebrating mass, was fashioned into a standard, which was believed to insure victory to the army in whose ranks it was carried. Flodden was only one of many fields in which the defeat of the Scots was ascribed to the banner of St. Cuthbert. It hung beside his shrine until the Reformation, when it is said to have been burnt by Calvin's sister, the wife of the first Protestant dean of the cathedral. The life of St. Cuthbert was twice written by the Venerable Bede — briefly in vigorous hexameters in his *Liber de Miraculis Sancti Cuthbercti Episcopi*; at greater length in prose, in his *Liber de Vita et Miraculis Sancti Cuthbercti Lindisfarnensis Episcopi*. In this latter work he made use of an earlier life by a monk of Lindisfarne, which is still preserved. Besides these lives — all of which have been printed more than once — and what is told of St. Cuthbert in Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Angloorum*, the chief ancient authorities are the *Historia Translationis S. Cuthberti*, published by the Bollandists in the *Acta Sanctorum*, mens. Martii, vol. 3; the *Libellus de Exordio Duunlelniensis Ecclesie*, by Symeon of Durham; the *Libellus de Nativitate S. Cuthberti de Historiis Hybernensium excerptus*, and the *Libellus de Admirandis B. Cuthberti Virtutibuss*; by Reginald of Durham, both published by the Surtees Society. There are two modern *Memoir*s of St. Cuthbert — the late Rev. James Raine's *St. Cuthbert* (Durham, 1828), and the Very Rev. Monsignor C. Eyre's *History of St. Cuthbert* (Lond. 1849)." — Chambers, *Encyclopedia*, s.v.; Butler, *Lives of Saints*, March 20; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 19:374.

Cuthites

SEE CUTH.

Cutler

Benjamin Clarke, D.D., a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Poxbury, Mass., Feb. 6, 1798, and died in Brooklyn, N.Y., Feb. 10, 1863. On his mother's side he was descended from the Huguenots. His

religious character developed early; it was marked by no epoch of sudden transition, but at the age of eighteen, two years after his confirmation, he became a decided Christian. He immediately began to study for the ministry, and graduated with high honor at Brown University in 1822. He discharged the functions of the ministry seven years in Quincy, Mass.; one year in Leesburg, Va.; two years in New York as a city missionary, and thirty years as rector of St. Ann's Church, Brooklyn. As a preacher he was pre-eminently evangelical, and as a pastor remarkably successful. He was one of the originators and most active promoters of the missionary work of the Protestant Episcopal Church. He was a Low-Churchman, and was deeply grieved by the rise of Puseyism, and its introduction into this country. He wrote of it as "the reigning heresy of incipient Romanism." In 1843 he visited England for the sake of his health. On his return the vessel struck a shoal in the harbor of New York, and for twelve hours it labored heavily in a storm. Always after he observed the anniversary of that day as an occasion of special thanksgiving. Dr. Cutler was a chronic invalid. Before he went to college he was thought to be in a decline, and his life was one long battle with disease. His final illness was protracted and very distressing. He would often say, "the under-currents are all peace." He left no published works except a few occasional discourses and a volume of sermons, which are good specimens of direct, fervent Gospel preaching.

Cutler

Manasseh, LL.D., a Congregational minister, was born in Killingly, Conn., May 28, 1742, graduated at Yale 1765, studied law, and was admitted to the bar, but in a short time devoted himself to the study of theology. He was installed pastor in Hamilton, Mass., Sept. 11, 1771. After the Revolution the Ohio Company chose him agent for the purchase of land in the West, and Washington offered him the honorable position of judge of the U. S. Court in the North-west Territory, but he declined. He was elected to Congress in 1800. Dr. Cutler devoted himself largely, to botany, and to the study and practice of medicine, but retained his pastoral relation until his death, July 28, 1823. He was made LL.D. by Yale in 1789. He published a number of articles on scientific subjects and a few occasional sermons. —Sprague, *Annals*, 2:15.

Cutler Timothy, D.D.,

minister of the English Church in America, was born at Charlestown, Mass., in the year 1683, and graduated at Harvard in 1701. He was educated and ordained for the Presbyterian ministry, and in 1710 was installed pastor of the Congregational church in Stratford, Conn. He became president of Yale College in 1719, at the request of the trustees; but on the day after Commencement in 1772, a paper was presented to the clergy and others assembled in the college library, signed by the rector and one of the tutors, together with several of the neighboring ministers, in which they say: “Some of us doubt of the validity, and the rest are fully persuaded of the invalidity, of Presbyterian ordination in opposition to Episcopal.” In October following a discussion took place in the college library, the principal speakers being the rector and Mr. Samuel Johnson (afterwards Dr. Johnson, of Hartford) on the one side, and governor Saltonstall on the other. The result was that the rector declared himself confirmed in his Episcopal proclivities, and in October following the trustees voted to excuse the Rev. Mr. Cutler from all further service as rector of Yale College.” He went to England in July, 1722, to procure Episcopal ordination, which he received the following year, with the degree of D.D. from both Oxford and Cambridge. In 1723, on his return, he was appointed missionary to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and became rector of Christ Church, Boston. In that station he died, Aug. 17, 1765. He published several occasional sermons. —Sprague, *Annals*, v. 50.

Cutting

Picture for Cutting

(IN THE FLESH), expressed technically by f r ,c, *se’ret* (<031928>Leviticus 19:28), or t f ,r ,c; sare’teth (<032105>Leviticus 21:5, where the cognate verb f r ic; *sarat’*, is used in the same connection), a *gash* or incision (Sept. ἐντομίς, Vulg. *incisura*) in the flesh (r c ;b B]); also by dWdG], *gedud’* (<244703>Jeremiah 47:37), a cut in the skin (e.g. the hand, as there; the verb ddG; *gadad’*, occurs in the same sense, with reference to the ceremonies of mourning, <241606>Jeremiah 16:6; 41:5; 47:5, or as a part of idol worship, <051401>Deuteronomy 14:1; <111828>1 Kings 18:28); and by [qi[}qi, *kaaka’*, a “mark” punctured on the person (<031928>Leviticus 19:28); compare the daemoniac in <410505>Mark 5:5, κατακόπτων ἑαυτόν, “cutting himself” with

stones. Among the prohibitory laws which God gave the Israelites there was one that expressly forbad the practice embraced in those words, viz. "Ye shall not make any cuttings in your flesh for the dead" (<03:1928>Leviticus 19:28). It is evident from this law that such a species of self-inflicted torture obtained among the nations of Canaan; and it was doubtless to guard his people against the adoption of so barbarous a habit, in its idolatrous form, as well as to restrain desperate grief (comp. <52:413>1 Thessalonians 4:13; see Macdonald, *Introd. to the Pentateuch*, Edinb. 1861, p. 113), that God led Moses to reiterate the prohibition: "They shall not make baldness upon their heads, neither shall they shave off the corner of their beards, nor make any cuttings in their flesh" (<66:2105>Revelation 21:5; <05:1401>Deuteronomy 14:1). (See J. G. Michaelis, *De incisura.propter mortuos*, *F. ad* O. 1733.) *SEE CORNER*.

1. The ancients were very violent in their expressions of sorrow. Virgil represents the sister of Dido as tearing her face with her nails, and beating her breasts with her fists (*AEn.* 4:672). Some of the learned think that that law of Solon's which was transferred by the Romans into the Twelve Tables (Cicero, *De Leg.*2:23), that women in mourning should not scratch their cheeks (*Corp. Jur. Civ.* v. 66, 67, ed. Godofredus, 1583), derived its origin from this law of Moses (<03:1928>Leviticus 19:28). But, however this opinion may be questioned, it would appear that the simple tearing of the flesh out of grief and anguish of spirit is taken in other parts of Scripture as a mark of affection: thus (<24:4837>Jeremiah 48:37), "Every head shall be bald, every beard clipped, and upon all cuttings." Again (<24:1606>Jeremiah 16:6): "Both the great and the small shall die in the land: they shall not be buried, neither shall men lament for them, nor cut themselves." So (<24:4105>Jeremiah 41:5): "There came from Samaria fourscore men having their heads shaven and their clothes rent, and having cut themselves, with offerings to the house of the Lord." A notion apparently existed that self-inflicted baldness or mutilation had a propitiatory efficacy with respect to the manes of the dead, perhaps as representing, in a modified degree, the solemnity of human or animal sacrifices. Herodotus (4. 71) describes the Scythian usage in the case of a deceased king, for whose obsequies not fewer than six human victims, besides offerings of animals and other effects, were considered necessary. An extreme case of funereal bloodshed is represented on the occasion of the burial of Patroclus, when four horses, two dogs, and twelve Trojan captives are offered up (II. 23:171, 176). Originally used with human or animal sacrifices at funerals, after these had

gone out of use, the minor propitiatory acts of self-laceration and depilation continued alone (11. 23:141; Od. 4:197; Virg. *AEn.* 3, 67, with Servius *ad* loc. 12:605; Eurip. *Ale*. p. 425; Seneca, *Hippol*. v. 1176, 1193; Ovid, *Eleg*. I, 3, 3; Tibullus, *Eleg*. I, 1:1). Plutarch says that some barbarians mutilate themselves (*De Consol. ad Apollon*. p. 113, vol. vi, Reiske). He also says that Solon, by the advice of Epimenides, curtailed the Athenian practice in this respect (*Solon*. 12-21, 1:184, 194). Such being the ancient heathen practice, it is not surprising that the law should forbid similar practices in every case in which they might be used or misconstrued in a propitiatory sense. "Ye shall not make cuttings for (propter) the dead, vpn,l ;(Leviticus 19:28; see Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 731; Spencer, *De Leg. Hebr*. II, 19:404,405). *SEE GRIEF*.

2. But the practice of self-mutilation as an act of worship belonged also to heathen religious ceremonies not funereal. The priests of Baal, a Syrian and also an Assyrian deity, cut themselves with knives to propitiate the god "after their manner" (1 Kings 18:28). Herodotus says that the Carians, who resided in Europe, cut their foreheads with knives at festivals of Isis; in this respect exceeding the Egyptians, who beat themselves on those occasions (Herod. 2:61). This shows that the practice was not then at least an Egyptian one. Lucian, speaking of the Syrian priestly attendants of this mock deity, says that, using violent gestures, they cut their arms and tongues with swords (Lucian, *Asinus*, c. 37, vol. 2:102, Amst.; *De Dea Syr*. 2:658, 681; comp. Ezekiel 8:14). Similar practices in the worship of Bellona are mentioned by Lucan (*Phars*. 1:560), and alluded to by AElius Lampridius (*Comm.* p. 209), by Tertullian (*Apol.* 9), and Lactantius (*Div. Instit*. i, c. 21, 29, Paris). Herodotus, speaking of means used for allaying a storm, uses the words ἔντομα ποιεῦντες, which may mean cutting the flesh, but more probably offering human sacrifices (Herod. 7:191; 2:119, with Schweighibuser's note; see also Virgo *AEn.* 2:116; Lucr. 1:85). Agreeably to the inference which all this furnishes, we find Tacitus declare (*Hist*. 1:4) that "the gods care, not for our safety, but *punishment*." In fact, it was a current opinion among the ancient heathen that the gods were jealous of human happiness; and in no part of the heathen world did this opinion more prevail, according to Sanchoniathon's account, than among the inhabitants of those very countries which surrounded that land where God designed to place his people Israel. The prohibition, therefore, is directed against practices prevailing, not among the Egyptians whom the Israelites were leaving, but among the Syrians, to

whom they were about to become neighbors (Selden, *De Diis Syris*, lib. ii, c. 1). The spirit of Islam is less favorable than that of heathenism to displays of this kind; yet examples of them are not of rare occurrence even in the Moslem countries of Western Asia, including Palestine itself. The annexed figure is copied from one which is represented in many of the books of travel in Egypt and Palestine that were printed in the seventeenth century. It is described by the missionary Eugene Roger (*La Terre Saincte*, etc., 1646, p. 252) as representing "one of those calenders or devotees whom the Arabs name Balhoaua," and whom the simple people honor as holy martyrs. He appears in public with a cimeter stuck through the fleshy part of his side, with three heavy iron spikes thrust through the muscles of his arm, and with a feather inserted into a cut in his forehead. He moves about with great composure, and endures all these sufferings, hoping for recompense in the Paradise of Mohammed. Add to this, the common accounts of the gashes which the Persian devotees inflict upon themselves, in the frenzy of their love and grief, during the annual mourning for Hassan and Hossein (see Mrs. Postans, in the *Jour. Sac. Lit.*, July, 1848, p. 107). The Mexicans and Peruvians offered human sacrifices both at funerals and festivals. The Gosayens of India, a class of Brahminical friars, endeavor in some cases to extort alms by gashing their limbs with knives. Among the native negro African tribes also the practice appears to prevail of offering human sacrifices at the death of chiefs. (See Chardin, *Voyages.* 6:482; 9:58, 490; Olearius, *Travels*, p. 237; Lane, *Mod. Eg*. 2:59; Prescott, *Mexico*, 1:53, 63; *Peru*, 1:86; Elphinstone, *Hist. of India*, 1:116; Strabo, 15:711 *et* sq.; Niebuhr, *Voyages.* 2:54; Livingstone, *Travels*, p. 318, 588; *Col. Ch. Chron*. No. 131. 179; Muratori, *Anecd*. 4:99, 100). *SEE SACRIFICE*.

3. But there is another usage contemplated more remotely by the prohibition, viz., that of printing marks (στίγματα), tattooing, to indicate allegiance to a deity, in the same manner as soldiers and slaves bore tattooed marks to indicate allegiance or adscription. (See Biedermann, *De Charact. corpori impressis*, Frib. 1755.) This is evidently alluded to in the Revelation of John (<43B316>John 13:16; 19:20; 17:5), though in a contrary direction, in <261904>Ezekiel 9:4, by Paul (<480617>Galatians 6:17), in the <661703>Revelation 7:3, and perhaps by <230405>Isaiah 45:5 and <381306>Zechariah 13:6. Lucian, speaking of the priests of the Syrian deity, says that they, and, in fact, the Assyrians generally, bear such marks on some part of their body (*De Dea Syr*. 2:684). A tradition, mentioned by Jerome, was current

among the Jews, that king Jehoiakim bore on his body marks of this kind which were discovered after his death (Spencer, *De Leg.Hebr*. II, 20:410). Philo, quoted by Spencer, describes the marks of tattooing impressed on those who submitted to the process in their besotted love for idol-worship, as being made by branding (σιδήρῳ πεπυρωμένῳ, Philo, *de Monarch*. 1:819; Spencer, p. 416). The Arabs, both men and women, are in the habit of tattooing their faces, and other parts of the body, and the members of Brahminical sects in India are distinguished by marks on the forehead, often erroneously supposed by Europeans to be marks of caste (Niebuhr, *Descr. de A r. p.* 58; *Voyages*. 1:242; Wellsted, *Arabia*, 2:206, 445; Olearius, *Travels*, p. 299; Elphinstone, *India*, 1:195). *SEE MARK (ON THE PERSON)*.

Cutting Off (From the People).

SEE EXCOMMUNICATION.

Cutty-stool

the stool or seat of repentance in the Scotch kirks, placed near the roof and painted black, on which offenders against chastity sit during service, professing repentance and receiving the minister's rebukes. It is somewhat remarkable that a breach of the seventh commandment should be the only sin subjecting the offender in the Scotch Church to this sort of discipline.

Cuyler Cornelius C., D.D.,

born at Albany, N. Y., Feb. 15, 1783; graduated at Union College 1806; studied theology under the Reverend Drs. Livingston and Bassett; licensed 1808 in the Reformed Dutch Church; settled in Poughkeepsie 1808-1833, and from that year until his decease, Aug. 31, 1850 was pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia. Dr. Cuyler is represented as "an excellent model of diligence, fidelity, and wisdom," a man of strong and well-furnished mind, an earnest and effective preacher, an adept in the management of ecclesiastical business. His ministry was characterized by several powerful revivals of religion, in which his wisdom, zeal, and success were very conspicuous. His printed works consist of a number of occasional sermons, tracts, pamphlets, article for periodicals and essays upon special topics, e.g. the subjects of Baptism, the Atonement, the Purity of the Ministry, Capital Punishment, etc. —Sprague, *Annals*, 4:432.

Cy’amon

(Κυαμών; Vulgate, *Chelmon*), a place named only in Judith 7:3, as lying in the plain (αὐλών, A. V. “valley”) over against (ἀπέναντι) Esdrelom. If by “Esdrelom” we may understand Jezreel, this description answers to the situation of the modern village Tell *Kaimon*, on the eastern slopes of Carmel, on a conspicuous position overlooking the Kishon and the great plain (Robinson, *Later Res*. p. 114; Van de Velde, *Narrative*, 1:330). The place was known to Eusebius (Καμμωνά) and Jerome (*Cimana*), and is mentioned by them in the *Onomasticon* (s.v. Camon, Καμών), where they identify it with CAMON, the burial-place of Jair the Gileadite (Judges 10:5). — Smith, s.v. Schultz assumes Cyamon to be identical with the modern Kumieh, south-east of Little Hermon (Zeitschr. *d. morg. Ges*. 3, 48); but Dr. Robinson (*ut sup*. p. 339) thinks this inconsistent with the true position (according to his location) of Bethulia (q.v.), and suggests that “Cyamon” may be only the Greek rendering (κύαμος) of the Hebrews name (פול, *pol*, a bean) corresponding to the present *Fuleh*, on the east side of the plain of Esdraelon, a trace of which appears in the notices of the Crusaders (Wilken, *Gesch. der Kreuzz*. 3, 2:231, 267). But *SEE JOKNEAM*.

Cyaxares

(Κυαξάρης, Grascised for the Old Pers. *Uvakshatara*, “beautiful-eyed.” Rawlinson, *Herod*. 3, 455), the name of two Median kings. *SEE MEDIA*.

1. CYAXARES I was, according to Herodotus, the third king of Media, being the son of Phraortes, and grandson of Dejoces. His father having been killed while besieging Ninus (Nineveh), he, immediately on his accession, B.C. 634, collected all the military resources of the empire to revenge his father’s death; but he was called away from the siege of Ninus by an attack of the Scythians, by whom he was defeated, and reduced to a tributary condition of great rigor for many years, B.C. 634-607 (Herod. 1:103). Herodotus else, where (i. 73 sq.) gives a different account of this war, as having originated in the treachery of Alyattes of Syria, who had sheltered some fugitive Scythians that had served up to Cyaxares as a banquet one of his own sons whom they had killed. The war, carried on for five years against the Lydians by the Median monarch, who evidently still retained his throne, was terminated by the mutual awe inspired by an eclipse, which has been variously calculated, but probably was that of Sept.

30, B.C. 610 (Baily, *Philos. Transact*. 1811; Oltmann, *Schrift. der Berl. Acad*. 1812-13; Hales, *Anal. of Chronology*, 1:74-78; Ideler, *Handbuch der Chronoloaqie*, 1:209 sq.; Fischer, *Grieh. Zeittaf*. s. a. 610). Cyaxares after this expelled the Scythians, B.C. 607, and in the following year, with the aid of the king of Babylon, he took and destroyed the Assyrian capital, at that time governed by Sardanapalus. This event is referred to in the Apocrypha (Tob. 14:15), where the Median king is styled "Ahasuerus" (q.v.), and his Babylonian ally is called Nabuchodonosor, doubtless referring to Nabopolassar, the father of Nebuchadnezzar. *SEE BABYLONIA*. The result of this campaign, according to Herodotus, was, that the Medes made the Assyrians their subjects, except the district of Babylon, probably meaning that the king of Babylon now obtained complete deliverance from the yoke of Assyria. The league between Cyaxares and the king of Babylon is said by Polyhistor and Abydenus (ap. Euseb. *Chron. Arm.* and *Syncell*. p. 210 b) to have been cemented by the betrothal of Anyhis or Anytis, the daughter of Cyaxares, to Nabuchadrossar or Nabuchadonosor (i.e. Nebuchadnezzar), the son of the Babylonian king. They have, however, by mistake, put the name of his son Asdapages (Astyages) for Cyaxares (Clinton, 1:271, 279). Cyaxares was a brave and energetic, but violent and cruel prince, and died B.C. 594, after a reign of 44 years, leaving the throne to Astyages, (Herod. 1:73, 74,103-106; 4:11, 12; 7:20). — Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog*. s.v.

2. CYAXARES II, the son of Astyages and grandson of the preceding, succeeded his father at the age of forty-nine years; but, being of a gentle disposition, he left the government principally in the hands of his nephew and son-in-law Cyrus. This account is given by Xenophon (in his *Cyclopaedia*), with which, however, the statements of Herodotus and Ctesias materially disagree. *SEE CYRUS*. This Cyaxares is believed to be the "Darius the Mede" (q.v.) referred to in the book of Daniel 9:1).

Cycle

a certain number of years in civil and ecclesiastical chronology. The *Lunar Cycle* (*cyclus lune*, or *decemnovalis*) embraces nineteen years, after the expiration of which the days of the new and full moon generally fall again upon the same day of the month. The Greek astronomer Meton is the inventor of this cycle. Anatolius, bishop of Laodicea, in Syria, toward the close of the third century, first used it for calculating Easter (q.v.). When the Council of Nice terminated the Easter controversy, and established

uniformity in the celebration of Easter, the bishops of Alexandria were commissioned to calculate annually the time of Easter, and to communicate it to the other metropolitans. At first the bishops of Alexandria used astronomical calculations, but subsequently they again adopted the lunar cycle, and by means of it calculated Easter for a number of cycles in advance. Thus the patriarch Theophilus of Alexandria prepared an Easter cycle for 480 years, or 22 lunar-cycles, beginning with the year 380. This cycle was, however; not well received in the Western churches, and patriarch Cyril consequently reduced it to 95 years, or five lunar cycles. This new Easter cycle extended from 437 to 531. When it approached its termination, Dionysius Exiguus (q.v.), in 525, proposed a new Easter cycle, which embraced 16 lunar cycles, or 304 (Julian) years. The defects of this cycle resulted from the inaccuracy of the Julian year, and were not remedied until the introduction of the Gregorian calendar. Nearly connected with the lunar cycle is the Golden Number (q.v.), which indicates what place a given year occupies in the lunar cycle. The Cycle of the Sun (or of the dominical letter) embraces 28 years, after the expiration of which the Sundays, and consequently also the days of the week, fall again upon the same days of the month. In Christian chronology it ‘became early customary to use the first seven letters of the alphabet for designating the seven days of the week. A was always used for the 1st of January, and the letter upon which fell the first Sunday of the year was called the Dominical Letter, which, in ordinary years, designated every Sunday of the year. But in every fourth year the 25th of February was intercalated, and as it had the same letter as the 24th of February, the intercalary year had two dominical letters, one applying from Jan. 1 to Feb. 24, and the second from Feb. 25 to the close of the year. As an ordinary year consists of 52 weeks and 1 day, the dominical letter of the new year is generally the one preceding the dominical letter of the year past; and if all years were ordinary years of 365 days, the same dominical letter would revert every seventh year. As there is, however, a change of one day every fourth year by the intercalation of one day, and the consequent advance of the dominical letter, it takes four times seven, or 28 years, before the cycle is completed, and the same series of dominical letters recommences. Another slight disturbance is, however, produced by the omission of the intercalary day three times in every 400 years (thus, in the years 1700, 1800, 1900).

To find the dominical letter of a particular year, it is first necessary to find the place of the year in the cycle of the sun. As, according to the

chronology of Dionysius, Christ is said to have been born in the ninth year of the cycle of the sun, the place of a particular year in the cycle of the sun is found by adding 9 to the given year, and dividing the whole by 28; the remainder indicating the place of the year in the cycle. For instance, to find the dominical letter for the year 1868, we add 9 and divide by 28; [thus, (1868+9)/28 = 1877/28] which leaves a remainder of 1. The year 1868, therefore, is the first of the cycle of the sun for the present century (the omission of the intercalary day in the year 1800, as stated above, interrupting the regular order of the cycle). The cycle of the dominical letter is as follows:

Year	Dom. L.
1st	ED
2ND	C
3RD	B
4TH	A
5TH	GF
6TH	D
7TH	E
8TH	C
9TH	BA
10TH	G
11TH	F
12TH	E
13TH	DC
14TH	B
15TH	A
16TH	G
17TH	FE
18TH	D
19TH	E
20TH	B
21ST	AG
22ND	F
23RD	E
24TH	D
25TH	CB
26TH	A

27	G
28TH	F

The intercalary year 1868, as the first of a new cycle, has therefore the two dominical letters e d, e from Jan. 1 to Feb. 24, and d from Feb. 25 to Dec. 31. After thus ascertaining the dominical letter of the year, it is easy to find what days of every month are Sundays. For that purpose the initial letters of the several words in the following two hexameters are used:

> **A**stra **D**abit **D**ominus **G**ratisque **B**eabit **E**genos **G**ratia **C**hristicolae
> **F**eret **A**urea **D**ona **F**ideli.

The initial letters of the words of these two verses are the letters designating the first days of every month. A being the 1st of January, and E being the dominical letter of the year 1868 from Jan. 1 to Feb. 24, the Sundays of 1868 are the 5th, 12th, 19th, and 26th of January. The initial D of the second word shows that the first dominical letter (E) of February falls on the 2d of February. For March and the following months, the dominical letter of the year: 1868 is D; consequently, the first Sundays of the following months are, March 1, April 5, May 3, June 7, July 5, August 2, September 6, October 4, November 1, and December 6.,

Finally, in order to ascertain upon which day of the month and the week full and new moons occur, the Epacts are used. —Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex*. 2:960. *SEE EPACTS*; *SEE CHRONOLOGY, CHRISTIAN*.

Cymbal

Picture for Cymbal 1

Picture for Cymbal 2

Picture for Cymbal 3

(לְצִלְצַל *tselatsal'*, in the plur. <1065>2 Samuel 6:5; <1905>Psalm 150:5; or מְצִלְתַּיִם *metse'leth*, in the dual, <1308>1 Chronicles 13:8; 15:16, 19, 28; 16:5, 42; 25:1, 6; <1452>2 Chronicles 5:12, 13; 29:25; <1380>Ezra 3:10; <1227>Nehemiah 12:27; both from לָצַל *tsalal'*, to tinkle; κύμβαλον, in the plur. 1 Esdras 4:9; Judith 16:2; 1 Maccabees 4:54; <4601>1 Corinthians 13:1), a musical instrument consisting of two convex pieces of brass, which are struck together to make the rythm or time, and produce a loud clanging sound. They are generally employed in connection with the drum in out-door

orchestras. Josephus (*Ant*. 7:12, 3) describes in like manner the cymbals (κύμβαλα) used in the Temple services as “large plates of brass.” They were used from the most ancient times in the East as a part of a martial band in public religious occasions (<131308>1 Chronicles 13:8), and also by females in connection with dancing (Lucian, *Saltat*. c. 68; comp. Chrysost. *in Gen*. XXIV, hom. 48; Clem. Al. *Paedag*. 2:4); also along with the drum (Pliny, v, i). Niebuhr (*Reis*. 1:181, pl. 27) learned that in Arabia two kinds of *castanets* were employed in a similar manner; one of small metal clappers held between the thumb and fingers, especially by females, as with the dancing girls of Egypt (Lane, *Mod. Eg*. 2:106); the other consisting of larger pieces of metal, like our cymbals. Pfeiffer (*Musik der Hebr*. p. 55) thinks this distinction is intended between the two kinds of cymbals mentioned in <19F005>Psalm 150:5, [mv;ylx]l]xi, “loud cymbals,” and h[WrT ylx]l]xi, “high-sounding cymbals.” “The former probably consisted of four small plates of brass or of some other hard metal; two plates were attached to each hand of the performer, and were smitten together to produce a loud noise. The latter consisted of two larger plates, one held in each hand, and struck together as an accompaniment to other instruments. Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun, the renowned conductors of the music of the sanctuary, employed the ‘loud cymbals’ possibly to beat time, and to give the signal to the choir when it was to take part in the sacred chant.” The ancient Egyptians likewise had cymbals and cylindrical maces (*crotala*, or clappers), two of which were struck together, and probably emitted a sharp metallic sound. The cymbals were of mixed metal, apparently brass, or a compound of brass and silver, and of a form exactly resembling those of modern times, though smaller, being only seven, or five inches and a half in diameter. The handle was also of brass, bound with leather, string, or any similar substance, and being inserted in a small hole at the summit, was secured by bending back the two ends. The same kind of instrument is used by the modern inhabitants of the country, and from them have been borrowed the very small cymbals played with the finger and thumb, which supply the place of castanets in the almeh dance. These were the origin of the Spanish castanet, having been introduced into that country by the Moors, and afterwards altered in form, and made of chestnut (*castana*) and other wood instead of metal. The cymbals of modern Egypt (see *Descr. de l’Egypte*, 13:496 sq.) are chiefly used by the attendants of sheiks’ tombs, who travel through the country at certain periods of the year to exact charitable donations from the credulous or the devout among the Moslems by the promise of some blessing from the indulgent saint. Drums and some

other noisy instruments, which are used at marriages and some other occasions, accompany the cymbals, but these last are more peculiarly appropriated to the service of the sheiks, and the external ceremonies of religion, as among the ancient Egyptians; and a female, whose coffin contained a pair of cymbals, was described in the hieroglyphics of the exterior as the minstrel of a. deity. The cylindrical *maces*, or clappers, were also admitted among the instruments used on solemn occasions, and they frequently formed part of the military band, or regulated the dance. They varied slightly in form, and some were of wood or of shells; others of brass, or some sonorous metal having a straight handle, surmounted by a head or other ornamental device. Sometimes the handle was slightly curved, and double, with two heads at the upper extremity; but in all cases the performer held one in each hand; and the sound depended on their size, and the material of which they were made. When of wood they corresponded to the crotala of the Greeks, a supposed invention of the Sicilians, and reported to have been used for frightening away the fabulous birds of Stymphalus; and the paintings of the Etruscans show that they were adopted by them, as by the Egyptians, in the dance (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt*. 1:99 sq.). Among the Greeks and Romans cymbals of a similar description were anciently used in the worship of Cybele, Bacchus, Juno, and other earlier deities. They were probably derived from the East. At Rome they are first mentioned in Livy's account (39. 9) of the Bacchic orgies introduced from Etruria (Smith, *Dict. of Class. Antiq.*, s.v. Cymbalum). See Mendelssohn's *Preface to Book of Psalms*; Kimchi; Lewis, *Origines Hebraece* (Lond. 1724,176-7); Forkel, *Gesch. der Musik*; Jahn, *Archceology, Am. ed*., cap. v, § 96, 2; Munk, *Palestine*, p. 456; Esendier, *Dict. of Music*, 1:112. Lampe has an excellent dissertation, *De Cymbalis veterum* (Traj. *ad* Rh. 1703; also in Ugolini *Thes.* xxxii). Monographs on the subject have also been written in Latin by Ellis (*Fortuita Sacra*, Rotterd. 1727, p. 257-378), *Magius* (Amst. 1664), Zorn (*Opusc*. 1:111-163). See MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS.

Cypress

Picture for Cypress 1

(hz;r]T;, *tirzah'*, from its *hardness*; Sept. ἀγριοβάλανος, but most copies omit; Vulg. *ilex*) is mentioned only in ²³4414 Isaiah 44:14: "He (i.e. the carpenter, ver. 13) heweth him down cedars, and taketh the *cypress*," for the purpose of making an idol. There is no doubt that the wood must have

been of a texture fit to be worked, as well as to retain the shape given to it. Though translated “cypress,” we have no proof that this tree was intended, but it is well suited for the purpose indicated. See FIR. The Greek translators, Aquila and Theodotion, have employed a word which denotes the wild or forest oak (ἀγριοβάλανος). The oldest Latin version renders the Heb. word by *ilex*, “the evergreen oak” (Rosenmüller, p. 317). As the wood of this species is well fitted for being worked into images, and was so employed by the ancients, it is possible that it may be that intended, though we have no satisfactory proof of its being so. Celsius (*Hierob.* 2:269, 70) defends the rendering of the Vulg. in Isaiah 44:14, but the etymology of the word from זרה; to be *hard* (as in Latin we get *robur*, an oak), equally well suits the cypress, and there is great probability that the tree mentioned by Isaiah with the cedar and the oak is identical with the “cypress” (κυπάρισσος) of the Apocrypha. In Ecclesiasticus 24:13, it is described as growing upon the mountains of Hermon; and it has been observed by Kitto (*Phys. Hist. of Palest.* p. 224) that if this be understood of the great Hermon, it is illustrated by Pococke, who tells us that it is the only tree which grows towards the summit of Lebanon. In Ecclesiasticus 1, 10, the high-priest is compared to a “cypress towering to the cloud,” on account of his tall and noble figure. It is usually supposed that the words translated “fir,” “gopher-wood,” and “thyine-wood,” in our version of the Bible indicate varieties of the juniper or cypress. (See each in its alphabetical order.)

Picture for Cypress 2

Cypress, the κυπάρισσος of the Greeks and the *suroo* of the Arabs, called also by them *shujrut-alhyat*, or tree of life, is the *Cupressus sempervirens*, or the evergreen cypress of botanists. This tree is well known as being tapering in form, in consequence of its branches growing upright and close to the stem, and also that in its general appearance it resembles the Lombardy poplar, so that the one is often mistaken for the other when seen in Oriental drawings. In southern latitudes it usually grows to a height of fifty or sixty feet. Its branches are closely covered with very small imbricated leaves, which remain on the trees five or six years. Du Hamel states that he has observed on the bark of young cypresses small particles of a substance resembling gum tragacanth, and that he has seen bees taking great pains to detach these particles, probably to supply some of the matter required for forming their combs. This cypress is a native of the Grecian

Archipelago, particularly of Candia (the ancient Crete) and Cyprus, and also of Asia Minor, Syria, and Persia. It may be seen on the coast of Palestine, as well as in the interior, as the Mohammedans plant it in their cemeteries. That it is found on the mountains of Syria is evident from the quotations by Celsius (*Hierobot* . 1:133), from Cyril of Alexandria (in *Esaiam*, p. 848), Jerome (*Comment.* in Hosea 14:6), and others. *SEE CEDAR*. The wood of the cypress is hard, fragrant, and of a remarkably fine close grain, very durable, and of a beautiful reddish hue, which Pliny says it never loses (*Hist. Nat.* 16:33). As to the opinion respecting the durability of the cypress-wood entertained by the ancients, it may be sufficient to adduce the authority of Pliny, who says that “the statue of Jupiter, in the Capitol, which was formed of cypress, had existed above 600 years without showing the slightest symptom of decay, and that the doors of the temple of Diana at Ephesus, which were also of cypress, and were 400 years old, had the appearance of being quite new.” This wood was used for a variety of purposes, as for wine-presses, poles, rafters, and joists, and was an especial favorite for funereal grounds. Horace says (*Carm*. ii. 14, 23) that whatever was thought worthy of being handed down to remote posterity was preserved in cypress or cedar wood; and Virgil refers to it in similar terms (*Georg*. 2:442; *AEn*. v. 64). (See *Penny Cycloepedia*, s.v. Cupressus.) *SEE BOTANY*.

Cyp’rian

(Κύπριος), a Cypriot or inhabitant (2 Maccabees 4:29) of the island of Cyprus (q.v.).

Cyprian Manuscript

Picture for Cyprian Manuscript

(CODEX CYPRIUS, so called from its place of discovery), usually designated as K of the Gospels, one of the important uncial MSS. of the N.T., containing the four Gospels complete, was brought into the Colbert collection from Cyprus in 1673. and is now in the Royal or National Library at Paris, where it is No. 63. It is an oblong quarto, written in a single column of about twenty-one lines on each page, in large upright and compressed characters, somewhat irregular. A single point of interpunction often standing where the sense does not require it, seems to indicate that it was copied from a text arranged in στίχοι. The subscriptions, τίτλοι, Ammonian sections, and indices of the κεφάλαια of the last three

Gospels, are believed to be the work of a later hand; the Eusebian canons are absent. The breathings and accents are by the first hand, but often incorrectly placed. The writing, etc., may be taken as proof that the MS. is not older than the middle of the ninth century. Wetstein used readings from it for his N.T., and Scholz also collated it, but not accurately. This has been done more thoroughly by Tischendorf and Tregelles. The MS. yields many valuable readings. —Scrivener, *Introduc*. p. 101 sq.; Tregelles, in Horne's *Introduc*. 4:201 sq. *SEE MANUSCRIPTS, BIBLICAL*.

Cyprian Thascius Caecilius,

a bishop and martyr, was born in North Africa, probably in Carthage, about the beginning of the third century. His father was wealthy, and one of the principal senators of Carthage. His noble parentage insured him a good education, by which his natural endowments, which were of a high order, were duly developed, both intellectually and. morally, according to the heathen type of training. The representation he gives, after his conversion to Christianity, of his earlier immoral life, is generally regarded as an exaggeration springing from humility, and the legend to the effect that he:had given himself to the practice of sorcery is not accredited. His life, while he still stood in heathenism, is very much buried in obscurity, even as to the precise time and place of his birth. His biographer, the deacon Pontius, regarded all this as unworthy of mention "in view of that spiritual greatness" which characterized his subsequent life. It seems, however, that he was an earnest student, and that, having enjoyed all the advantages furnished in his time, he excelled in the study of oratory and eloquence, and devoted himself to the teaching of law and rhetoric in his native city, where he was greatly admired, became wealthy, and lived in affluence and grandeur. His life seems to have received new impetus, concentrated purpose, and true meaning from the time of his conversion and baptism, which occurred A.D. 246, when he was not far short of fifty years old. He had been won to Christianity by a presbyter, Caecilius, who also instructed and prepared him for baptism, at which time Cyprian added to his name that of Caecilius, out of gratitude to his Christian teacher. Before his conversion he was exercised by a deep sense of the vanity of heathenism. In his tract *De Gratia Dei*, addressed to his friend Donatus soon after his conversion, speaking of his spiritual state while yet in heathenism, he says: 'I lay in darkness, and floated on the world's boisterous sea, with no resting-place for my feet, ignorant of my proper life, and estranged from truth and light." God's mercy in his baptism he ever praises as being a

marked epoch in his life. He felt himself to be a new man, having received "by means of the regenerating wave" the "second birth, by the Spirit derived from on high." As a new man, he now devoted himself fully to the study of the holy Scriptures, and also to a life of celibacy and voluntary poverty. He studied the holy Scriptures earnestly, and also the best ecclesiastical writers known, among whom Tertullian was his favorite, with whom he communed in mind every day, calling for him, as Jerome relates, with the simple word, "Hand me the Master." He sold his estate, and gave the proceeds, together with almost all else that he possessed, for the support of the poor. This he did with the double end in view of renouncing and despising all secular influences, and at the same time fulfilling the law of charity, which he believed God prefers to all sacrifices. Besides the above-mentioned letter, *ad Donatum*, he about this time wrote several works, in which he unfolded his new principles and convictions, as, for instance, *De idolorum vanitate* and his *Libri III testimoniorum adv. Judceos*. So wonderfully grew his Christian reputation that, on the death of Donatus, the bishop of Carthage, there was a pressing cry from both clergy and laity that Cyprian might be ordained as his successor. He modestly declined the nomination, but the people would not be put off. They so besieged him with their importunities. that he fled into retirement to avoid the popular pressure; but the place of his concealment was discovered, and the people surrounded his house, closed every avenue of escape, and refused to withdraw until he should yield to their wishes. He at length humbly bowed to what. seemed to him now a necessity imposed on him by the providence of God. Thus, in perhaps not more than two years after his baptism, with the unanimous approbation of the bishops of the province, he was consecrated bishop of Carthage A.D. 248. His elevation to this place of dignity and power, though effected under such wide favor, was for him the beginning of long and severe conflicts. Opposition to him arose among some presbyters. Some of the more aged, among whom were Fortunatus and Donatus, who had themselves aspired to the vacant office, with some of their friends among the laity, opposed his elevation as being still only a novice in the Church. *SEE DONATISTS*. These gave him much trouble. He treated them with kindness, but at the same time maintained the authority and dignity of his office with decision. In the time of peace which had preceded his official term, luxurious extravagance and immorality had gotten the upper hand in society. Cyprian pushed earnestly for reform and discipline. This became the occasion of increased opposition, his strictness having been attributed to a spirit of hierarchical assumption of power,

though he did nothing, especially in the beginning of his episcopate, without first gathering in the views of the presbyters, whom he calls his *compresbyteri* (comp. Ep. 14). Still worse troubles came with the persecution under Decius, which broke out not much more than a year after he had been raised to the episcopal office, in which the heathen populace with violence demanded his death, crying *Cyprianurn ad leonem*! The cruel edict came to Carthage about the beginning of A.D. 250. The heathen hailed it as letting loose their rage upon one who, having but a few years before stood so prominent in heathenism, now occupied the front rank in the Christian Church. He accordingly was their first mark. He, however, saved himself by flight, which was made the occasion for fresh reproaches from those in the Church who still bore the old grudge against him. Some saw cowardice in this self-exile, but many praised it from considerations of prudence, and as a course which would still preserve his great worth and influence to the Church after peace should be restored. He kept himself in constant correspondence with the Church, and in the deepest sympathy with the trials of the confessors and martyrs. He longed to be with them, and looked upon himself as deprived of all this by a necessity painful to his heart. He himself seems to have possessed the' consciousness of having been in the path of duty, and he gave abundant evidence in his after life, in times of pestilence and in the persecution of Valerian, that he possessed the firmest Christian courage, and knew no fear of death in the path of duty. The strict and severe manner in which, after his return from flight, he dealt with those who had denied the faith under trial was not favorably regarded even by those who had faithfully endured the persecution, and was viewed as coming with less charity and grace from him who had himself withdrawn from the fire. The effects of the persecution had been terribly disastrous. Multitudes were driven from the faith like chaff before the wind. Cyprian looked upon it as a providential sifting of the Church made necessary by its previous worldly and immoral state, and hence was concerned that the lapsed should not be restored without the strictest care. Of the havoc and confusion thus produced in the Church, and the troubles of restoration, he gives a sad picture in his work De Lapsis. His strictness with the lapsed gave rise to new troubles. The faction of disaffected presbyters was headed now by Felicissimus, with whom were joined Novatian and four others who refused to acknowledge his authority in the form he exercised it in the case of the lapsed. They undertook to establish an independent church, into which the lapsed were to be allowed to enter without further delay. Many of the impatient among

the lapsed were charmed by this open door for speedy restoration. The result was a serious schism. Cyprian maintains his position firmly, and in a letter warns all against this snare of the devil (Epistle 43). An important series of controversies ensues relating to the unity of the Church, the nature of schism, the validity of baptism by heretics, and affiliated points, which became the occasion of one of the most important works of Cyprian on The Unity of the Church. This controversy also gradually involved the question of the independency of the episcopate, and the merits of the claims of Stephanus, the bishop of Rome, as over against the bishop of Carthage. (See Herzog's *Real-Encyklopadie*, 3, 219, 220; also four articles on Cyprian by Dr. Nevin in the *Mercersburg Review*, vol; 4:1852, particularly p. 527-536.) In this Novatian controversy Cyprian showed great bitterness as well as great firmness, and his statements as to his adversaries are to be taken with many grains of allowance. Hagenbach, in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopadie*, briefly sums up the closing scene of his life, and gives an estimate of his character, which we translate. "At length the time came when he should have opportunity to wipe out the stain which was supposed to rest on his name in consequence of his flight by the blood of his own martyrdom. It took place in the Valerian persecution. On the 30th of August, 257, it was demanded of him by the Roman consul, Aspasius Paternus, to offer to the gods. Having refused, he was banished to Caribis, a day's journey from Carthage. From this place he comforted the Church through letters. In a dream he saw foreshadowed the bloody fate which should in a year befall him. Having been called back from exile, he withdrew for a brief season to his country home. Under the consul Galerius Maximus, the successor of Aspasius Paternus, he received his final hearing. With serene composure and the words 'God be praised,' he welcomed the sentence, which was that he should be executed by the sword. Followed by a large crowd of spectators, he was led out beyond the city to a spot planted with trees. Here he laid off his over-clothes, kneeled down, prayed, and received the stroke of death, on the 14th of September, A.D. 258. To the executioner he gave twenty-five pieces of gold. The Christians buried him near the spot on which he suffered martyrdom. Over his grave, as well as over the place where he suffered death, churches were afterwards erected, which were, however, demolished at the invasion of the Vandals under Genseric. According to a legend, Charlemagne conveyed his bones to France, where they were preserved, first at Lyons and afterwards at Aries." Other churches also (Venice, Compiegne, and Rosnay in Flanders) claim to be in possession of his remains.

The character of Cyprian and his acts, in the various circumstances of his life, have been variously estimated. While some admire and praise his exalted views and shining virtues as a Church dignitary, others charge him with pride and despotism. The holy earnestness with which he honored his calling, the high degree of self-denial he manifested in life and in death, and as little be denied him as his extraordinary qualifications and activity as a leader in the Church. Herein we must seek his peculiar greatness. Speculative thinking was not his forte. In this respect he is excelled not only by the Alexandrians, but also by Tertullian, to whose theology he conformed his own. Prominent among his doctrinal presentations is that of tie Church, the unity of which he develops, not so much dialectically and theoretically as he apprehends it in actual life, and sets it forth in telling pictures in a concrete and energetic way. (Comp. his work, *De unitate ecclesiae*.) Cyprian may be regarded as the father of the Roman episcopal system. “In consequence of confounding the ideas of the visible and invisible Church, he referred all Christian life to communion with a definite external Body. In his view the Church was an outward organism founded by Christ, of which the bishops were the pillars; to them the Holy Spirit was communicated through the ordination of the apostles, and hence they were the indispensable links for connecting the Church with Christ. Only through them could the Holy Spirit be imparted, and out of the Church no one could be saved. *AExtra eeclesiam hanc visibilem nulla salus*. It is of no avail, says Cyprian, what any man teaches; it is enough that he teaches out of the Church. It can be only human outrageous wilfulness to substitute anything for a divine institution, to erect a human altar instead of the divine” (Neander). Nor can it be denied that Cyprian laid the foundations of the primacy of the see of Rome. He placed the unity of the Church in the episcopate, making the bishops representatives of the apostles; and further, he made the chair of St. Peter the center of episcopal unity, and the Church at Rome the root of all (*radix et matrix ecclesiae Catholicae*, Epist. 45). Practically, in his quarrel with pope Stephen (see above), he denied this primacy; but the doctrine lay in his own writings, and, after he had passed away, the legitimate inferences from his doctrines were drawn by his successors. But, while the writings of Cyprian afforded undoubtedly a basis, on the one hand, for Roman and prelatical claims, they have unquestionable merit, on the other, of setting forth Scripture as the sole ground of faith. During his controversy with pope Stephen, who was continually talking, of tradition, Cyprian uttered the sharp and pregnant aphorism, “Custom without truth is only ancient error.” As an interpreter

of Scripture, Cyprian occupies altogether a practical stand-point, and hence does not despise allegory wherever it forces itself upon his fancy. (See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 3,* 220-221.) His life has been written by the African presbyter Pontius, *De vita Cypriani* (in Ruinart, *Acta Martyrum*, ii, and in the editions of the works of Cyprian). With this, compare *Acta Proconsularia Martyrii Cypriani* (in Ruinart, 216 sq.); Lactant. *Div. Inst.* v.1; Eusebius, H. E. 7:3; also later works of Pearson, *Annales Cyprianici* (Oxf. 1682); P. Maran, *Vita Cypriani*; H. Dodwell, *Diss. Cyprianioc* (Oxon. 1684); Tillemont, *Memoir*es, 4:76 sq.; (Gervaise), *La vie de S. Cyprien* (Paris, 1717, 4 vols.); Freppel, *St. Cyprien, et l'eglise d'Afrique en in. le 'sicle* (Paris, 1865, 8vo); *Quart. Review*, London, July, 1853, art. iv; Cooper, *Free Church of ancient Christendom*, p. 297 sq. (Lond. 1844, 18mo); Cunningham, *Historical Theology*, ch. vi, § 6.

The best editions of Cyprian's works (*Opera Omnia*) are those of Oxf. 1682, fol., ed. Fell; Amst. 1700; Par., Benedictine ed., 1726, fol., and Ven. 1728, fol. Translation: *The genuine Works of St. Cyprian*, with his Life, by Pontius, by Nathaniel Marshall, LL.B. (London, 1717, fol.); also in French by Lombert (1682). Translations of separate tracts: *On Mortality*, with others, by Elyot (1534), by Brende (1553), by Story (1556), and by Lupset (1560); *on The Lord's Prayer*, by Paynel (1539); *on Virgins*, by Barksdale (1675); *on The Unity of the Church*, by bishop Fell (1681, 4to); and by Horsburgh (1815). *The Epistles translated*, Library of the Fathers, vol. xvii (Oxf. 1844); *the Treatises*, Lib. of Fathers, vol. 3 (Oxford, 1840). *The life and martyrdom of Cyprian*, by Pontius, his intimate friend, is still extant, and printed in several editions of the *Opera Omnia*, but the style is too rhetorical for simple truth. A compact edition of Cyprian for practical use is *Cypriani Opera Genuina*, ed. Goldhorn (Leips. 18389, 2 parts). A new *Life of Cyprian*, by Poole, was published in 1840 (Oxf. 8vo); another, by Rettberg, in 1831 (Gottingen, 8vo); another in *Saint Cyprien*, OEuvres completes, traduct. Guillon (Par. 1836, 2 vols. 8vo). New editions of several of the epistles were published by Krabinger (Tubing. 1853-1858, sq.).

Cypriarch

(Κυπριάρχης, "governor of Cyprus"), the title of Nicanor (q.v.) as Syrian viceroy of the island of Cyprus (2 Maccabees 12:2).

Cypros

(Κύπρος, i.e. *Cyprus*), the name of several females of the Herodian family. *SEE HEROD*.

1. An Idumeean (or Arabian) of noble family, wife of Antipater the elder, by whom he had four sons, Phasaelus, Herod (the Great), Joseph, and Pheroras, and a daughter, Salome (Joseph. *Ant.* 14:7, 3; *War*. 1:9,9).

2. The second of the two daughters of Herod (the Great) by Mariamne; she was married to her cousin Antipater, the son of Salome, Herod's sister (Joseph. *Ant.* 18:5, 4).

3. The second of the two daughters of Phasaelus (Herod the Great's brother) by his niece Salampsio; she was married to Agrippa I, the son of Aristobulus, by, whom she had two sons and three daughters (Joseph. *Ant.* 18:5, 4; *War,* 2:11, 6). She once diverted her husband from his purpose of suicide (*Ant.* 18:6, 2).

4. The daughter of the above (No. 2) wife of Antipater; she was married to Alexas Selcias (Joseph. *Ant.* 18:5, 4).

5. A daughter by the marriage preceding (*ib*.).

Cy'prus

Picture for Cy'prus 1

(Κύπρος), the modern *Kebris*, one of the largest islands in the Mediterranean, and next to Sicily in importance. It is about 140 miles in length, and varies in breadth from 50 to 5 miles. The interior of the island is mountainous, a ridge being drawn across the entire length, attaining its highest elevation near the central region anciently called Olympus. It had several names in early ages, mostly poetical. From its numerous headlands and promontories, it was called Κεραστίς, *Cerastis*, or the Horned; and from its exuberant fertility, Μακαρία, *Macaria,* or the Blessed (Horace, *Carm*. 3, 26, 9). Its proximity to Asia Minor, Phoenicia, and Egypt, and its numerous havens, made it a general rendezvous for merchants. "Corn, wine, and oil," which are so often mentioned in the Old Testament as the choicest productions of Palestine (<05D217>Deuteronomy 12:17; <130929>1 Chronicles 9:29; <160939>Nehemiah 10:39; <243112>Jeremiah 31:12), were found here in the highest perfection. The forests also furnished large supplies of timber for

shipbuilding, which rendered the conquest of the island a favorite project of the Egyptian kings. It was the boast of the Cyprians that they could build and complete their vessels without any aid from foreign countries (Ammian. Marcell. 14:8, § 14). Among the mineral products were diamonds, emeralds, and other precious stones, alum, and asbestos; besides iron, lead, zinc, with a portion of silver, and, above all, copper, the far-famed *oes Cyprium*. The principal mines were in the neighborhood of Tamassus (Strabo, 14:6; 3, 245, ed. Tauchn.). Pliny ascribes the invention of brass to this island (*Nat. Hist*. 34:2). Cyprus is a famous place in mythological history. The presiding divinity of the island was Venus, who had a celebrated temple at Paphos, and is hence often called the Paphian goddess. The inhabitants were luxurious and effeminate (Herod. 1:199; Athen. 12, p. 516; Clearch. *apud Athen*. 6, p. 255). Nevertheless, literature and the arts flourished here to a considerable extent, even at an early period, as the name of the *Cypria Carmina*, ascribed by some to Homer, sufficiently attests (Herod. 2:118; *Athen*. 15, p. 682). Situated in the extreme eastern corner of the Mediterranean, with the range of Lebanon on the east and that of Taurus on the north distinctly visible, it never became a thoroughly Greek island. Its religious rites were half Oriental, and its political history has almost always been associated with Asia and Africa. — Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v. *SEE PAPHOS*.

Picture for Cy'prus 2

Cyprus was originally peopled from Phoenicia (Gesenius, *Mon. Phoen*. p. 122). Amasis I, king of Egypt, subdued the whole island (Herod. 2:182). In the time of Herodotus the population consisted of Athenians, Arcadians, Phoenicians, and Ethiopians (vii. 90); and for a long time the whole island was divided into nine petty sovereignties (Xenoph. *Cyrop*. 8:6, 21; Pliny, v. 35; Diod. Sic. 16:42). It became a part of the Persian empire (Herod. 3, 19, 91), and furnished ships against Greece in the expedition of Xerxes (*ib*. 7:90). For a time it was subject to Greek influence, but again became tributary to Persia. After the battle of Issus it joined Alexander, and after his death fell to the share of Ptolemy. In a desperate sea-fight off Salamis (q.v.), at the east end of Cyprus (B.C. 306), the victory was won by Demetrius Poliorcetes; but the island was recovered by his rival, and afterwards it remained in the power of the Ptolemies, and was regarded as one of their most cherished possessions (Livy, 45:12; Josephus, *Ant.* 13:10, 4; Strabo, 14:684; Diod. Sic. 19:59, 79; 20:21, 47). It became a Roman province (B.C. 58) under circumstances discreditable to Rome (Strabo,

14:684; Flor. 3, 9; Veil. Pat. 2:38; Dion Cass. 38:31; 39:22). At first its administration was joined with that of Cilicia, but after the battle of Actium it was separately governed. In the first division it was made an imperial province (Dion Cass. 53:12). From this passage and from Strabo (xiv, p. 683) it has been supposed by some, as by Baronius, that Luke (<44307>Acts 13:7) used the word ἀνθύπατος (*proconsul*, "deputy"), because the island was still connected with Cilicia; by others, as by Grotius and Hammond, that the evangelist employs the word in a loose and general manner. But, in fact, Dion Cassius himself distinctly tells us (ib. and 54:4) that the emperor afterwards made this island a senatorial province, so that Luke's language is in the strictest sense correct. Further confirmation is supplied by coins and inscriptions, which mention other proconsuls of Cyprus not very remote from the time of Sergius (q.v.) Paulus. The governor appears to have resided at Paphos, on the west of the island. Under the Roman empire a road connected the two towns of Paphos and Salamis, as 'appears from' the *Peut. Table*. One of the most remarkable events in this part of the history of Cyprus was a terrible insurrection of the Jews in the reign of Trajan, which led to a massacre, first of the Greek inhabitants, and then of the insurgents themselves (Milman, *History of the Jews*, 3, 111, 112). When the empire was divided it fell to the share of the Byzantine emperors. Richard I of England conquered it in 1191, and gave it to Guy Lusignan, by whose family it was retained for nearly three centuries. In 1473 the republic of Venice obtained possession of it; but in 1571 it was taken by Selim II, and ever since has been under the dominion of the Turks. Cyprus was famed among the ancients for its beauty and fertility, and all modern travelers agree that in the hands of an industrious race it would be one of the most productive countries in the world, but Turkish tyranny and barbarism have reduced it to a deplorable condition. Through the neglect of drainage, the streams that descend from the mountain range form marshes, and render the island particularly unhealthy. Imperfectly as it is cultivated, however, it still abounds in every production of nature, and bears great quantities of corn, figs, olives, oranges, lemons, dates, and, indeed, of every fruit seen in these climates; it nourishes great numbers of goats, sheep, pigs, and oxen, of the latter of which it has at times exported supplies to Malta. The most valuable product at present is cotton. The majority of the population belong to the Greek Church; the archbishop resides at Leikosia. — *Penny Cyclopoedia*, s.v.; M'Culloch's *Gazetteer*, s.v.

"This island was in early times in close commercial connection with Phoenicia, and there is little doubt that it is referred to in such passages of the O.T. as <27006>Ezekiel 27:6. *SEE CHITTIM*. Josephus makes this identification in the most express terms (*Ant.* 1:6, 1; so Epiphan. *Haer.* 30:25). Possibly Jews may have settled in Cyprus before the time of Alexander. Soon after his time they were numerous in the island, as is distinctly implied in I Maccabees 15:23 (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 13:10, 4; Philo, *Opp.* 2:587). The name also occurs 2 Maccabees 10:13; 12:2. The copper mines were at one time farmed to Herod the Great (Josephus. *Ant.* 16:4, 5), and there is a Cyprian inscription (Bockh, No. 2628) which seems to refer to one of the Herods. The first notice of it in the N.T. is in <40406>Acts 4:36, where it is mentioned as the native place of Barnabas. In <41119>Acts 11:19, 20, it appears prominently in connection with the earliest spreading of Christianity, first as receiving an impulse among its Jewish population from the persecution which drove the disciples from Jerusalem at the death of Stephen, and then as furnishing disciples who preached the Gospel to Gentiles at Antioch. Thus, when Paul was sent with Barnabas from Antioch on his first missionary journey, Cyprus was the first scene of their labors (<41304>Acts 13:4-13). Again, when Paul and Barnabas separated and took different routes, the latter went to his native island, taking with him his relative Mark, who had also been there on the previous occasion (<41539>Acts 15:39). Another Christian of Cyprus, Mnason, called 'an old disciple,' and therefore probably an early convert, is mentioned <42116>Acts 21:16. The other notices of the island are purely geographical. On Paul's return from the third missionary journey, they 'sighted' Cyprus, and sailed to the southward of it on the voyage from Patara to Tyre (ib. 3). At the commencement of the voyage to Rome they sailed to the northward of it on leaving Sidon, in order to be under the lee of the land (<42704>Acts 27:4), and also in order to obtain the advantage of the current, which sets northerly along the coast of Phoenicia, and westerly with considerable force along Cilicia." *SEE SHIPWRECK (OF PAUL)*.

All the ancient notices of Cyprus are collected by Meursius (*Opera*, vol. 3, Flor. 1744). Comp. Cellarii *Notit.* 2:266 sq.; see also Engel's *Kypros* (Berlin, 1843) and Ross's *Reisen nach der Insel Cypern* (Halle, 1852). Further accounts may be found in Mannert, *Geographia*, VI, 2:422-454. Modern descriptions are given by Pococke, *East*, 2:210-235; Wilson, *Lands of Bible*, 2:174-197; Turner, *Levant*, 2:40, 528; Mariti, *Viag. in*

Cyper. (Flor. 1679); Unger and Kotschy, *Die Insel Cypern* (Wien, 1865); Cesnola, *Cyprus* (Lond. 1877).

Cyprus, Christianity in.

Bishops of Cyprus are for the first time mentioned in the 4th century. Soon Constantia became the seat of a metropolitan, who asserted and maintained his independence of all the patriarchs. At the beginning of the 5th century the patriarch John of Antioch made an effort to have Cyprus incorporated with his patriarchal district, but the OEcumenical Council of Ephesus (431), before which the newly-elected metropolitan Rheginus and two other Cyprian bishops pleaded their right, decided in favor of the independence of Cyprus. Ever since the churches of Cyprus have constituted an independent group of the orthodox Greek Church. —Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex*. 2:964 sq.

Cyran, St.

SEE DUVERGIER DE HAURANNE.

Cyre'ne

Picture for Cyre'ne 1

(Κυρήνη; *Ghrenna*, in modern Arabic), a city in Upper Libya, founded by a colony of Greeks from Thera (*Santorini*), a small island in the AEgean Sea (Thirlwall's *History of Greece*, vol. ii, ch. 12). Its name is generally supposed to be derived from a fountain (but according to Justin, *Hist*. xiii, a mountain), called Κυρή, *Cyre*, near its site. It was built on a table-land, 1800 feet above the level of the sea, in a region of extraordinary fertility and beauty. It was the capital of a district, called from it Cyrenaica (*Barca*), which extended from the Gulf of Plataea (*Bomba*) to the Great Syrtis (*Gulf of Sidra*). With its port Apollonia (*Musa Soosa*), about ten miles distant, and the cities Barca, Teuchira, and Hesperis, which at a later period were named Ptolemais, Arsinoe, and Berenice (Strabo, xvii; vol. 3, p. 496, ed. Tauchn.), it formed the Cyrenaic Pentapolis (*Mel*. 1:4, 8; Pliny, v. 5; Ptolem. 4:4, 11; Amm. *Marcell*. 22:16). It is observable that the expression used in 44010Acts 2:10, "the parts of Libya about (κατά) Cyrene," exactly corresponds with a phrase used by Dion Cassius (Λιβύη ἡ περὶ Κυρήνην, 53:12), and also with the language of Josephus (ἡ πρὸς Κυρήνην Λιβύη; *Ant.* 16:6, 1). See LIBYA. Its inhabitants were very

luxurious and refined, and it was, in a manner, a commercial rival of Carthage (Forbioer, *Handb. der alt. Geogr.* 2:380 sq.; Ritter, *Erdk.* 1:946 sq.). The Greek colonization of this part of Africa under Battus began as early as B.C. 631, and it became celebrated not only for its commerce, but for its physicians, philosophers, and poets (Herod. 4:155, 164). It would seem that the old Hellenic colonists cultivated friendly relations with the native Libyans, and to a much greater extent than usual became intermingled with them by marriage relationships (Herod. 4:186-189). For above 180 years the form of government was monarchical; it then became republican, and at last the country became tributary to Egypt, under Ptolemy Soter. It was bequeathed to the Romans by Apion, the natural son of Ptolemy Physcon, about B.C. 97 (Tacitus, *Ann.* 14:18; Cicero, *De leg. Agrar.* 2:19), and in B.C. 75 formed into a province (Strabo, 17:3). On the conquest of Crete (B.C. 67) the two were united in one province, and together frequently called Creta-Cyrene. See CRETE. An insurrection in the reign of Trajan led to great disasters, and to the beginning of its decay. In the 4th century it was destroyed by the natives of the Libyan desert, and its wealth and honors were transferred to the episcopal city of Ptolemais, in its neighborhood. The Saracens completed the work of destruction, and for centuries not only the city, but the once populous and fertile district of which it was the ornament, has been almost lost to civilization. During three parts of the year the place is tenanted by wild animals of the desert, and during the fourth part the wandering Bedouins pitch their tents on the low grounds in its neighborhood. — Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v.; *Penny Cyclopoedia*, s.v. Cyrenaica, Cyrene; Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, 3, 108 sq.

Picture for Cyre'ne 2

Picture for Cyre'ne 3

Strabo (quoted by Josephus, *Ant.* 14:7) says that in Cyrene there were four classes of persons, namely, citizens, husbandmen, foreigners, and Jews, and that the latter enjoyed their own customs and laws (comp. Dio Cass. 58:32). Ptolemy, the son of Lagus, introduced them, because he thought they would contribute to the security of the place (Joseph. c. *Apion.* 2:4). They became a prominent and influential class of the community (*Ant.* 14:7, 2), and they afterwards received much consideration from the Romans (xvi. 6, 5). See 1 Maccabees 15:23; comp. 2 Maccabees 2:23. We learn from Josephus (*Life*, 76) that soon after the Jewish war they rose

against the Roman power. The notices above given of the numbers and position of the Jews in Cyrene (confirmed by Philo, who speaks of the diffusion of the Jews southward to Ethiopia, adv. *Flacc*. p. 523) prepare us for the frequent mention of the place in the N.T. in connection with Christianity. Simon, who bore our Savior's cross (<4027 32>Matthew 27:32; <4115 21>Mark 15:21; <4232 6>Luke 23:26), was a native of Cyrene. Jewish dwellers in Cyrenaica were in Jerusalem at Pentecost (<4402 10>Acts 2:10). They even gave their name to one of the synagogues in Jerusalem (<4406 9>Acts 6:9). Christian converts from Cyrene were among those who contributed actively to the formation of the first Gentile church at Antioch (<4411 20>Acts 11:20), and among those "who are specially mentioned as laboring at Antioch, when Barnabas and Saul were sent on their missionary journey, is Lucius of Cyrene (<4413 1>Acts 13:1), traditionally said to have been the first bishop of his native district. Other traditions connect Mark with the first establishment of Christianity in this part of Africa. *SEE AFRICA*.

See Della Cella, *Viaggio da Tripoli*, etc. (Genoa, 1819); Pacho, *Voyage dans la Mt-armarique, la Cyrenaique* (Paris, 1827-29); Trige, *Res Cyrneenses* (Hafn. 1828); Beechey, *Expedition to Explore the north Coast of Africa* (London, 1828); Barth, *Wanderungen durch das Punische u. Kyrendische Kiustenland* (Berlin, 1849); Hamilton, *Wanderings in North Africa* (London, 1856), p. 78; Smith and Porcher, *Hist. of Discoveries at Cyrene* (Lond. 1865).

Cyre'nian

(Κυρηναῖος, *Cyrenoean*, "of Cyrene," <4027 32>Matthew 27:32; <4411 20>Acts 11:20; 13:1), a native of Cyrene (q.v.) or Cyrenaica, in Africa (<4115 21>Mark 15:21; <4232 6>Luke 23:26; <4406 9>Acts 6:9).

Cyre'nius

(Graecized Κυρήνιος, <4202 2>Luke 2:2; see Deyling, *Obss*. 2:431 sq.), for the Latin *Quirinus* (prob. not Quirinius; see Meyer, *Comment*. in loc.). His full name was PUBLIUS SULPICIUS QUIRINUS (see Sueton. *Tiber*. 49; Tacit. *Ann.* 2:30). He is the second of that name mentioned in Roman history (see Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v.), and was consul with M. Valerius Messala, B.C. 12. From the language of Tacitus (*Ann.* 3, 48), it would appear that he was of obscure origin, a supposition apparently favored by his surname, Quirinus, if rendered (as it might perhaps be) the Cyrenian, but opposed by it if referred to the old Sabine epithet of Romulus. He is

more likely to have been the son of the consul of the same name, B.C. 42. Tacitus, however, states (*ut sup*.) that he was a native of Lanuvium, near Rome, and was not a member of the ancient Sulpician family; and that it was owing to his military abilities and active services that he gained the consulship under Augustus. He was subsequently sent into Cilicia, where he was so successful in his campaign as to receive the honor of a triumph. In B.C. 1, or a year or two afterwards, Augustus appointed him to direct the counsels of his grandson C. Caesar, then in Armenia; and on his way thither he paid a visit to Tiberius, who was at that time living at Rhodes. Some years afterwards, but not before A.D. 5, he was appointed governor of Syria, and while in this office he took a census of the Jewish people. He was a favorite with Tiberius, and on his death, A.D. 21, he was buried with public honors by the senate at the request of the emperor. (Dion Cass. 54:28; Tacitus, *Ann.* 3, 22; Strab. xii, p. 569; Josephus, *Ant.* 14:1, 1.) — Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v.

The mention of the name of Quirinus in connection with the census which was in progress at the time of our Lord's birth presents very serious difficulties, of which, from the want of adequate data, historical and critical: inquiry has not yet attained an entirely satisfactory solution. The passage is as follows: αὕτη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τ ς Συρίας Κυρηνίου, translated in the Authorized Version thus: "Now this taxing was first made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria." Instead of "taxing" it is now agreed that the rendering should be "enrolment" or "registration" (of which use of the word ἀπογράφεσθαι many examples are adduced by Wetstein), as it is clear from Josephus that no taxing did take place till many years after this period. The whole passage, as it now stands, may be properly read, "This first enrolment took place while Cyrenius was governor of Syria." This appears very plain, and would suggest no difficulty were it not for the knowledge which we obtain from other quarters, which is to the effect, 1. That there is no historical notice of any enrolment at or near the time of our Lord's birth; and, 2d, That the enrolment which actually did take place under Cyrenius was not until ten years after that event. The difficulty begins somewhat before the text now cited; for it is said that "in those days there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus that the whole world should be taxed" (enrolled). But since no historian mentions any such general enrolment of the whole empire, and since, if it had taken place, it is not likely to have been mentioned in connection with the governor of Syria, it

is now usually admitted that Judaea only is meant by the phrase rendered "the whole earth" (but more properly "the whole land"), as in <42126>Luke 21:26; <44128>Acts 11:28; and perhaps in 21:20. The real difficulties are thus reduced to the two now stated. With regard to the enrolment, it may be said that it was probably not deemed of sufficient importance by the Roman historians to deserve mention, being confined to a remote and comparatively unimportant province. Nor was it perhaps of such a nature as would lead even Josephus to take notice of it, if it should appear, as usually supposed, that no trace of it can be found in his writings.

Quirinus held a census in Judaea after the banishment of Archelaus (Joseph. *Ant.* 18:1, 1), which took place B.C. 6. This is what is meant by the taxing (ἀπογραφή) in <44537>Acts 5:37. Hence it is evident that he cannot have held a census in Judaea in the year of Christ's birth, as is said in <42002>Luke 2:2, in the capacity of head of the province of Syria (the census, however, being a general one throughout the empire, according to the emperor's command, v. 1). At that time Q. Sentius Saturninus (Tert. *adv.* Marc. 4:19), or, if Jesus was born after B.C. 6, P. Quintilius Varus, must have been governor of Syria (Ideler, *Chronol*. 2:394 sq.). The interpreters have attempted various methods of reconciling the words of Luke, "This taxing was first made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria," <42002>Luke 2:2, with the chronology of Josephus. (See Wolf, *Cur*. 1:576 sq.; Zorn, *Histor. Fixi Jud*. p. 91 sq.; Thiess, *Krit. Comment.* 2:385 sq.; Kuinol, *Comment.* 2:101 sq., whose references, however, are not precise; K. Nahmmacher, *De Augusto ter censum agente*, Helmst. 1758, 2:4; Huschke, *Ueb. d. zur Zeit der Gebusrt J. Chr. gehalt. Cens*. Bresl. 1840; Wieseler, *Chron. Synopse*, p. 111 sq.). Apart from these, who cut the knot by pronouncing the passage an interpolation (as Beza in his first three eds., Pfaff, Venema, Kuinol, Olshausen, and others), we notice the following:

1. Some suppose that πρώτη, *first*, stands for προτέρα, *former* (comp. <43015>John 1:15, πρῶτός μου, *before me*), and that the genitive ἡγεμονεύοντος Κυρηνίου is governed by the comparative; rendering, *this census took place before Quirinus was governor of Syria*. (So J. G. Herwart, *Admir. Ethnic. Theol. Myster. propal.* Monach. 1626, p. 188; Petavius, Bynaus, Clericus, J. Perizonius, *De Augusto Orbis Terrar. Descrip*., in his *Disquis. de Praetor*. p. 908 sq.; Zeltner, Heumann, *De Censu Antequir*. 1732, and in his *Dissert. Sylloge*, 1:763 sq.; Norisius, *Cenotaph. Pisan*. 2:16; Storr, *Opusc. Acad*. 3, 126 sq.; Suiskind, *Term. Aufstze*, p. 63; Michaeler, *Ueber d. Geburts und Sterbejahr Christi*, 1:59

sq.; Tholuck, *Glaubwiuld.* p. 182 sq., and others). But this would be strange Greek, even if προτέρα stood in the passage (comp. Fritzsche on Romans 2:421 sq., where also the passage of the Sept. Jeremiah 29:2, compared by Tholuck, is settled); and the possibility of writing πρώτη for it is not established by the reference to John, and certainly such a use would be especially avoided where, as here, every reader must naturally understand the passage as the Auth. Vers. renders it. More recently, Huschke, *ut. sup*. p. 89; Wieseler, *ut sup*. 117 sq., and an anonymous writer in Rheinwald's *Repertot.* 36:105, have discovered that Luke purposely places the superlative before the genitive to express this meaning: this census as the first (i.e. of all Roman censuses) before Quirinus became governor; and that there is here an abbreviated expression, as is usual with the comparative degree, which they would fill out thus: πρὸ τῆς ἀπρογαφῆς γενομένης ἡγεμονεύοντος κ.τ.λ. Surely no one acquainted with Luke's style could suppose him to have written such jargon, and expressed this complicated idea with words which on their face mean something very different. This is the result of considering a language only in the light of one's study, not in that of living intercourse.

2. Several have tried conjectural emendation (comp. Bowyer, *Critical Conject. on the N.T.* 1:117 sq.). Hermann gives as another's suggestion Κρονίου, corresponding to the Latin Saturninus. Whiston, *Prim. N.T.* (Lond. 1745), reads αὕτη ἡ ἀπογρ. πρ. Σατυρνίνου, δευτέρα δὲ ἐγένετο ἡγεμ. τῆς Συρ. Κυρ., i.e. *This first census took place when Saturninus was governor of Syria, and a second under Quirinus*. But the last clause has no pertinence here. L. Cappellus and Huetius, *Demonstr. Evang*. p. 781, put Κυιντιλίου, Quintilius, or K. Οὐάρου, Q. Varus, instead of Quirinus. Q. Varus succeeded Saturninus B.C. 6 (see Josephus, *Ant.* 17:5, 2; Tacit. *Hist*. v. 9). Michaelis, *Einleit. ins N.T.* 1:71, would read πρὸ τῆς *after* πρώτη (i.e. before that under Quirinus, etc.), which might easily have dropped out (comp. R. Roullier, *Dissert. Sacr.* Amst. 1750, No. 4). H. Venema, *Selectee e Scholis Valck.* 1:70, thought αὕτη ἡ ἀπογρ. πρώτη. ἡ β (i.e. δευτέρα) ἐγένετο ἡγεμ., etc., i.e. This was the first census; but the second took place when Quirinus, etc. But again the second clause is out of place. Valesius (*ad* Euseb. *H. E.* 1:5) would at once write Saturninus for Quirinus. All such changes of the text, especially in the face of the unanimity of manuscripts and versions (see Griesbach in loc.), is uncritical and forced.

3. Rejecting all these methods of reconciliation, some here suppose a mistake or misrecollection on Luke's part (Ammon, *Bibl. Theolog.* 2:271; *Comm.* de Censu Quir. Erlangen, 1810; *Leben Jesu*, 1:201 sq.; Thiess, *Krit. Comm.* 2:385; Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, p. 262 sq.; Weisse, *Evangel. Geschichte*, 1:204 sq.), it being, at the time of writing, many years since the occurrence. So Winer, who still holds the census as a fact, and thinks Quirinus may have conducted it (Neander, *Leben Jesu*, p. 25; Meyer on Luke, 2:2), the only error being in naming him governor of Syria (comp. *Altes und Neues*, 1727, p. 120). Certainly it is not to be supposed that Luke here refers to the above-mentioned census of Quirinus (Acts 5:37), and misdates it thus, for the mention of it in Acts shows that he was well acquainted with it; and even in Acts 2:2, the word first seems to imply the other.

4. Another mode of getting over the difficulty is sanctioned by the names of Calvin, Valesius, Wetstein, Hales, and others. First, changing αὕτη into αὐτή, they obtain the sense: "In those days there went forth a decree from Augustus that the whole land should be enrolled; but the enrolment itself was first made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria." The supposition here is, that the census was commenced under Saturninus, but was not completed till two years after, under Quirinus. Dr. Robinson (*Addit. to Calmet*, in "Cyrenius") objects to this view the entire absence of any historical basis for it. But he must at the time have been unmindful of Hales, who, in his *Chronology* (in, 48-53), has worked out this explanation with more than his usual care and success. Hales reminds us that a little before the birth of Christ, Herod had marched an army into Arabia to redress certain wrongs which he had received; and this proceeding had been so misrepresented to Augustus that he wrote a very harsh letter to Herod, the substance of which was, that "having hitherto treated him as a friend, he would now treat him as a subject." And when Herod sent an embassy to clear himself, the emperor repeatedly refused to hear them, and so Herod was forced to submit to all the injuries (παρανομίας) offered to him (Joseph. *Ant.* 16:9). Now it may be collected that the chief of these injuries was the performance of his threat of treating him as a subject by the degradation of his kingdom to a Roman province. For soon after Josephus incidentally mentions that "the whole nation of the Jews took an oath of fidelity to Caesar and the king jointly, except 6000 of the Pharisees, who, through their hostility to the regal government, refused to take it." The date of this transaction is determined by its having been shortly before

the death of Pheroras, and coincides with the time of this decree of enrolment and of the birth of Christ. The oath which Josephus mentions would be administered at the same time, according to the usage of the Roman census, in which a return of persons, ages, and properties was required to be made upon oath, under penalty of confiscation of goods, as we learn from Ulplan. That Cyrenius, a Roman senator and procurator, was employed to make this enrolment, we learn not only from Luke, but by the joint testimony of Justin Martyr, Julian the Apostate, and Eusebius; and it was made while Saturninus was president of Syria (to whom it was attributed by Tertullian), in the thirty-third year of Herod's reign, corresponding to the date of Christ's birth. Cyrenius, who is described by Tacitus as "an active soldier and rigid commissioner," was well qualified for an employment so odious to Herod and his subjects, and probably came to execute the decree with an armed force. The enrolment of the inhabitants, "each in his own city," was in conformity with the wary policy of the Roman jurisprudence, to prevent insurrections and to expedite the business; and if this precaution was judged prudent even in Italy, much more must it have appeared necessary in turbulent provinces like Judaea and Galilee. At the present juncture, however, it appears that the census proceeded no farther than the first act, namely, the enrolment of persons in the Roman register. For Herod sent his trusty minister, Nicolas of Damascus, to Rome, who, by his address and presents, found means to mollify and undeceive the emperor, so that he proceeded no farther in the design which he had entertained. The census was consequently at this time suspended; but it was afterwards carried into effect upon the deposal and banishment of Archelaus, and the settlement of Judaea as a Roman province. On this occasion the trusty Cyrenius was sent again, as president of Syria, with an armed force, to confiscate the property of Archelaus, and to complete the census for the purposes of taxation. This taxation was a poll-tax of two drachmae a head upon males from fourteen, and females from twelve to sixty-five years of age-equal to about fifteen pence of our money. This was the "tribute money" mentioned in <40 17 24>Matthew 17:24-27. The payment of it became very obnoxious to the Jews, and the imposition of it occasioned the insurrection under Judas of Galilee, which Luke himself describes as having occurred "in the days of the taxing" (<44 05 37>Acts 5:37). By this statement, connected with the slight emendation of the text already indicated, Hales considers that "the Evangelist is critically reconciled with the varying accounts of Josephus, Justin Martyr, and Tertullian; and a historical difficulty satisfactorily solved, which has

hitherto set criticism at defiance." This is perhaps saying too much, but the explanation is undoubtedly one of the best that has yet been given (Lardner's *Credibility*, 1:248-329; Wetstein, Kuinol, and Campbell, on Luke 2:2, etc.).

5. The preceding explanations all render πρώτη), "*first*," as an adverb, but it is clearly not susceptible of such a construction, being an adjective regularly qualifying ἀπογραφή, evidently for the purpose of distinguishing the present "taxing" from a subsequent one under the same authority, namely, that mentioned in the Acts. The writer of an elaborate article in the *Journal of Sacred Literature* (October, 1851) indeed urges that Luke ought to have said ἀπογραφὴ ἡ πρώτη, and adduces many citations to show the adverbial force of προῶτος; but these are inappropriate, for they would rather require the rendering "this was the first taxing that took place," etc., a sense equally difficult; and Luke's design does not appear to be to contrast so strongly the two taxings, since they were in a measure one, this the beginning, the other the completion. We are disposed, therefore, to adopt a modification of this last preceding explanation, and find the distinction between these two dates in the verb ἐγένετο, rendering it "effected" or completed, the enrollment having only been begun in the present case. This will combine all the historical notices above cited, and obviate all the objections that have been raised to the explanations of this difficult text hitherto proposed. (See Strong's *Harmony and Exposition of the Gospels*, Append. i, p. 20.) There is the greater propriety in this solution, inasmuch as Luke himself not only elsewhere alludes to the later enforcement of the tax-roll in question, but in this very passage under discussion he clearly implies it by the use of πρώτη, *first*; the rendering of which as an adverb ("first occurred") makes the word itself either altogether nugatory or positively inapposite, since no later census of the kind is recorded than that referred to in the Acts. There can be no good philological reason assigned for adding this distinctive term, except to throw greater stress upon ἐγένετο, which otherwise would not naturally bear so strong a sense as the execution, under the direction of Quirinus, of what had already been inaugurated (πρώτη) under different auspices (see Alford, *Gr. Test.* in loc.). The parenthetical character of the clause is probably the cause of this somewhat blended antithesis in its phraseology. It is Luke who gives both incidents.

6. Many take ἡγεμών in the wider signification of *high executive officer* in general, including, for instance, the procurators. (So Casaubon, *Exercit.*

Antibaron. p. 126 sq.; Grotius, B. Ch. Richard, in Iken, *Nov. Thesaur.* 2:428 sq.; Magnani, *Probl. de Nativ. Christi*, p. 260 sq.; G.Wernsdorf, *De census quem Cces. Oct. August. fecit*, Viteb. 1693, 1720; Deyling, *Observat*. 1:233 sq.; *Weihnachtsprogr v. Helmstadt.* 1737; K. Nahmmacher, *ut. sup*.; Velborth, *De censu Quirini*, Getting. 1785; Birch, *De censu Quirini*, Havn. 1790; Sanclemente, *De Vulg. AEra Emend*. p. 413 sq.; Munter, *Stern d. Weisen*, p. 88 sq.; Neander, *Leben Jesu*, p. 25, and others.) These suppose that Quirinus held this census as an extraordinary magistrate, at the especial command of Augustus. (Comp. Usher, *Annal.* p. 530 sq.; Wedel, *De censu August.* Jena, 1703.) Munter, p. 99 sq., has shown, after others, that extraordinary legates, besides the chiefs of the provinces, were sometimes sent for such special duties, though perhaps not all the instances adduced by him are valid. If we are fully to believe Justin Martyr, *Apol.* 1:44, Quirinus must have held the census when he first became ἐπίτροπος, or procurator in Judaea. See Credner, *Beitrage z. Einleit. in N.T.* 1:230 sq. But there were no procurators in Judaea in Herod's time. We must then suppose, with Credner, that Quirinus was then sent to Palestine as procurator of Syria simply to take the census of the people, whose number Augustus wished to know. But this is simply multiplying hypotheses. Comp. also Huschke, p. 73 sq. This view appears the more probable, since Quirinus, who was a favorite with the emperor, was then in the East on his commission (Tacit. *Ann.* 3, 48; 2:42). There is also an inscription (Muratori, *Thesaur. Inscript*. i, p. 670) which states that Q. *A*Emil. Palicanus Secundus, by order of Quirinus, held a census in Apamea (in Syria), and, likewise by his order, conquered the Ituraeans in Lebanon. But, though the word ἡγεμών is not limited to a permanent governor of a province, yet Luke could hardly use such a phrase as this (ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας) of an extraordinary officer. In common language this could only mean "*being governor of Syria*" (see besides, Huschke, p. 65 sq.). Just as little does Bengel hit the mark (*Ordo Temp*. p. 203) when he makes Quirinus to have filled, as governor, an interim between Saturninus and Varus.

7. Assuming, on the authority of Luke, that an enrollment actually did take place at the time of our Lord's birth, a modification of the last foregoing hypothesis proceeds to make out a probability that Cyrenius was then joint governor of Syria along with Saturninus. It is known that a few years previous to this date Volumnius had been joined with Saturninus as the procurator of that province, and the two, Saturninus and Volumnius, are

repeatedly spoken of together by Josephus, who styles them equally governors of Syria (*Ant.* 16:9, 1; 9, 8). Josephus does not mention the recall of Volumnius; but there is certainly a possibility that this had taken place before the birth of Christ, and that Cyrenius, who had already distinguished himself, had been sent in his place. He would then have been under Saturninus, a ἡγεμών "governor," of Syria, just as Volumnius had been before, and as Pilate was afterwards, of Judaea. That he should here be mentioned as such by Luke rather than Saturninus is very naturally accounted for by the fact that he returned, ten years afterwards, as procurator or chief governor, and then held a second and more important census for the purpose of registration and taxation, when Archelaus was deposed, and Judaea annexed to the Roman province of Syria. The only real objection to this solution is the silence of all other history. But, although profane history does not affirm the fact of Cyrenius having formerly been procurator of Syria, yet it does not in any way deny it; and we may therefore safely rest upon the authority of the sacred writer for the truth of this fact, just as we do for the fact of the existence of the first enrolment itself. —Kitto, s.v. *SEE SYRIA*.

A. W. Zumpt, of Berlin, in his *Commentatio de Syria Romanorun provincia a Caesare Augusto ad T. Vespasianum*, has recently shown it to be probable that Quirinus was *twice* governor of Syria. This he supports by the following considerations: In B.C. 9 Sentius Saturninus succeeded M. Titius in the province of Syria, and governed it three years. He was succeeded by T. Quintilius Varus (Joseph. *Ant.* 17:5, 2), who, as it appears, remained governor up to the end of B. C. 4. Thenceforward we lose sight of him till he is appointed to the command in Germany, in which he, lost his life in A.D. 7. We also lose sight of the governors of Syria till the appointment of P. Sulpicius Quirinus in A.D. 6. Now, from the maxim acted on by Augustus (Dion. Cass. 52:23), that none should hold an imperial province for less than three or more than five years, Varus cannot have been governor of Syria during the twelve years from B.C. 6 to A.D. 6. Who, then, were the missing governors? One of them has been found — L. Volusius Saturninus, whose name occurs as "*legatus Syrise*" on a coin of Antioch, A.D. 4 or 5. But his proconsulate will not fill the whole time, and one or two governors must be supplied between Varus, ending B.C. 4, and Volusius, A.D. 4 or 5. Just in that interval falls the census of Luke 2:2. Could Quirinus have been governor at any such time? From January to August, B.C. 12, he was consul. Soon after that he triumphed over the

Homonadenses (Tacit. *Ann.* 3, 48). Now Zumpt applies the exhaustive process to the provinces which could by any possibility have been under Quirinus at this time, and eliminates from the inquiry Asia — Pontus and Bithynia — and Galatia. Cilicia only remains. But at this time, as he shows, that province had been reduced by successive diminutions, had been separated (Dion. Cass. 54:4) from Cyprus, and — as is shown by the history of the misconduct of Piso soon afterwards, who was charged with having, as ex-governor of Syria, attempted a forcible repossession of the province (Tacit. *Ann.* 3, 12), because he had attacked Celenderis, a fort in Cilicia (ib. 2:78-80), attached to the province of Syria. This Zumpt also confirms by the accounts in Tacitus (*Ann.* 6:41; 12:55) of the Clitae, a seditious tribe of Cilicia Aspera, who on two occasions were repressed by troops sent by the governors of Syria. Quirinus then appears to have been governor of Syria at some time during this interval. But *at what time*? We find him in the East (Tacit. *Ann.* 3, 48) in connection with Caesar's campaign against the Armenians; and this cannot have been during his well-known governorship of Syria, which began in A.D. 6; for Caius Caesar died in A.D. 4. Zumpt, by arguments too long to be reproduced here, but very striking and satisfactory, fixes the time of his first governorship at from B.C. 4 to B.C. 1, when he was succeeded by M. Lollius. — Smith, s.v. This, however, still leaves a discrepancy of one or two years between his first appointment and Christ's birth, which cannot be brought down so late as B.C. 4. (See Lutheroth, *Recensement de Quirinius en Judee*, Par. 1865.) *SEE CENSUS*.

Cyria

(Κυρία, "lady," 2 John, ver. 1, 5), a Greek term signifying *mistress*, and used as an honorary title of address to a female (so Epict. Ench. 40), as in English. But in 2 John it appears to be the proper name of the distinguished female to whom John directed his epistle (see Alford, *Gr. Test.* vol. v, proleg p. 185 sq.), That *Cyria* was often a proper name of females among the Greeks there is no doubt (Gruteri *Inscript.* p, 1127). Others regard the associated term ἐκλεκτή ("elect") as a proper name, q. d. *Electa* (q. o), and the word in question as a common title. *SEE JOHN, EPISTLES OF*.

Cyriacus

said to have been pope, and, according to Romish tradition, to have, for the sake of St. Ursula and her 11,000 maidens, forsaken the papal see to

suffer martyrdom with them at Cologne (Aug. 8th). His existence is probably as mythical and fictitious as that of the 11,000 virgins. The church and college of St. Cyriac (formerly St. Dionysii), at Neuhausen; near Worms, claims to have possessed his relics since the beginning of the 9th century.

Cyriacus

patriarch of Constantinople at the end of the 6th century, and successor of *John Jejunator* after 595, took, like his predecessor, the title of ἐπίσκοπος οἰκουμενικός, which he caused to be confirmed by a council. The Romish bishop, Gregory the Great, opposed him at first without success, but by giving his support to the usurper Phocas he finally gained his end, and Cyriacus had to renounce his title. He is said to have died of grief in 606. —Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 3, 221.

Cyril

(ST.) (Κύριλλος), of Alexandria, was born in Alexandria towards the end of the 4th century, and was educated under his uncle Theophilus, bishop of that place. Theophilus died in 412, and Cyril was elected patriarch of Alexandria. One of his first steps, according to Socrates, was to plunder and shut up the churches of the Novatians (Socr. *Hist. Eccl.* 7:7). He led on a furious mob, which drove out the Jews, who had enjoyed many privileges in the city for ages. This proceeding excited the anger of Orestes, the governor of the city, and made him henceforth the implacable opponent of the bishop. An attack was made on the governor in his chariot by a band of 500 monks; and one who severely wounded him having suffered death on the rack, Cyril, in his church, pronounced a eulogy over his body as that of a martyr (Socrates, 1. vii, c. 14). He is also charged with the murder of Hypatia, the celebrated daughter of the mathematician Theon; but his share in this atrocity was only indirect. *SEE HYPATIA*. The titles of Doctor of the Incarnation and Champion of the Virgin have been given to Cyril on account of his violent dispute with Nestorius. “The condemnation and deposition of Nestorius having been decreed by Pope Celestine, Cyril was appointed to execute the sentence, for which he presided at a council of sixty bishops at Ephesus. John, patriarch of Antioch, having a few days afterwards held a council of forty-one bishops, who supported Nestorius and excommunicated Cyril, the two parties appealed to the emperor Theodosius, who forthwith committed both Cyril and Nestorius to prison,

where they remained for some time under rigorous treatment. Cyril, by the influence of Celestine, was at length liberated and restored (431) to the see of Alexandria, which he retained until his death, which occurred in 444" (*Engl. Cyclop*. s.v.). *SEE NESTORIUS*. Cyril's doctrinal writings are chiefly on topics connected with the controversies on the Trinity. The following are some of the principal treatises: *Thesaurus on the Trinity*, intended as a complete refutation of Arianism. In *Dialogues on the Incarnation*, in *Five Books against Nestorius*, and in an ample *Commentary on St. John's Gospel*, the same subject is continued. Ten books against Julian contain replies to that emperor's three books against the Gospels, which, if Cyril's quotations are faithful, were as weak and absurd as the answers. *Seventeen books On Worship in Spirit and Truth* show that all the Mosaical institutions were an allegory of the Gospel; "a proof," says Dr. Adam Clarke, "how Scripture may be tortured to say anything." *Thirteen books on the Pentateuch and the Prophets* are written with a similar view. *Thirty paschal Homilies* announce, as customary at Alexandria, the time of Easter. Sixty-one epistles nearly all relate to the Nestorian controversy. Cyril's *Synodical Letter* contains twelve solemn curses against Nestorius, who as solemnly replied with twelve curses against Cyril. His writings abound in turgid praises of Mary, though he did not hold her to be with out sin. "The history of none among the Christian fathers is more disgraceful to the Christian character than that of St. Cyril of Alexandria — a man immoderately ambitious, violent, and headstrong; a breeder of disturbances; haughty, imperious, and as unfit for a bishop as a violent, bigoted, unskillful theologian could possibly be but resolved that if the meek inherit the earth, the violent should have possession of the sees" (Clarke, *Succession of Sacred Literature*, 2:137). "But the faults of his personal character should not blind us to the merits of Cyril as a theologian. He was a man of vigorous and acute mind, and extensive learning, and is clearly to be reckoned among the most important dogmatic and polemic divines of the Greek Church. Of his contemporaries Theodoret alone was his superior. He was the last considerable representative of the Alexandrian theology and the Alexandrian Church, which, however, was already beginning to degenerate and stiffen; and thus he offsets Theodoret, who is the most learned representative of the Antiochian school. He aimed to be the same to the doctrine of the incarnation and the person of Christ that his purer and greater predecessor in the see of Alexandria had been to the doctrine of the Trinity a century before. But he overstrained the supranaturalism and mysticism of the Alexandrian theology, and in his zeal

for the reality of the' incarnation and the unity of the person of Christ he went to the brink of the Monophysite error, even sustaining himself by the words of Athanasius, though not by his spirit, because the Nicene age had not yet fixed beyond all interchange the theological distinction between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις" (Schaff, *Church History*, § 171). The best edition of the *Opera Omnnia of Cyril*, in Greek and Latin (Paris, 1638), is that of Aubert (7 vols. fol.). This edition is followed by Migne, in his *Patrol. Cursus Completus* (lxviii-lxxvii). His *Comm. in Lucca Evangeliumn* was re-edited in Latin by R. P. Smith (Oxford, 1858); and in an English version; by the same, with notes (Oxf. 1859). See Clarke, *Succession Sac. Lit.* 2:137; Cave, *Hist. Lit. Anno* 412; Tillemont, *Memoir*es, 14:272; Butler, *Lives of Saints*, Jan. 28; Neander, *Church History*, 2:453-498; Lardner, *Works*, vol. iv; Dorner, *Person of Christ* (Edinb. trans.), div. i, vol. ii.

Cyril

(ST.) (Κύριλλος), of Jerusalem, is supposed to have been born in that city about A.D. 315. He was ordained deacon by Macarius about 335, and priest by the patriarch Maximus about 345. On the death of Maximus, Cyril was chosen to succeed him (A.D. 350). A luminous appearance in the heavens, called the "Apparition of the Cross," is said to have marked the beginning of his episcopate (Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 2:28). He soon became involved in disputes with the Arian Acacius, bishop of Caesarea, who commenced a persecution against him, which terminated in his deposition by a council in 357. He was restored to his see, but was deposed a second time by the Arian Council of Constantinople in 360. On the accession of Julian, Cyril returned to his bishopric, but was expelled a third time (A.D. 367). Finally, under Theodosius, he was restored by the Council of Constantinople in 381, and died, cleared of all charges against his orthodoxy, May, 386. "An incident noticed by all the biographers of St. Cyril is the celebrated attempt and failure of the emperor Julian to rebuild the temple of the Jews at Jerusalem, ostensibly for the purpose of promoting their religion, but really with the sinister view of falsifying the prophecies respecting its irreparable destruction" (see Gregory Nazian. *Orat. 4 advers. Julian*; Theodoret, Socrates, Philostorgius, Sozomen, and bishop Warburton's Dissertation on the subject, p. 88).

"The extant writings of St. Cyril are in the Greek language, and consist of eighteen books of *Catecheses*, or sermons, delivered during Lent to the catechumens (called before baptism *Illuminati*); five similar discourses

delivered during Easter week to the neophytes after baptism, called *Mystagogic*, being explanatory of the mysteries of the Christian sacraments; a treatise on words, and the letter to Constantius, besides which several homilies and epistles are sometimes improperly included. Rivetus (lib. in, c. 8, 9, 10, *De Cyrilli Catechesibus*) considers the five Mystagogics and the letter to Constantius as supposititious; but by Vossius, Cave, Mill, Whittaker, and bishop Bull, they are received as genuine. The books of Catecheses are crowded with quotations from Scripture, and the style is dull and tiresomely prolix; but the facts they contain relating to the doctrines and discipline of the Eastern Church in the 4th century are extremely interesting to the student of Christian antiquities. In the first Catechesis are described the effects of baptism. The fourth gives an *Exposition* of all the Christian doctrines, and treats of numerous questions concerning the body, soulvirginity, marriage, etc. The subsequent discourses exhibit and enjoin a belief in the miraculous virtues of the relics of saints, which are represented as worthy of all veneration; in the efficacy of prayers and sacrifices for the dead; in the powers of exorcism, consecrated unction, oil, and water. Christians are exhorted to cross themselves on every occasion and action throughout the day. The enthusiastic adoration of the cross displayed by St. Cyril was probably owing to his officiating in the church of the Holy Cross in Jerusalem, where, after the 'Invention of the Cross,' it was deposited in a silver case, and shown by the archbishop to thousands of pilgrims, who each took a little chip of it without occasioning any diminution of its bulk! A description of this cross is given by Touttee at the end of his edition of Cyril's works. His chief theological work is the above-named Κατηχήσεις φωτιζομένων, Catecheses, delivered in preparing a class of catechumens for baptism, and it is the first example we have of a popular compend of Christian doctrine. The perpetual virginity of Mary is taught by Cyril. The state of virginity in general is extolled as equal to that of angels, with an assurance that, in the day of judgment, the noblest crowns will be carried off by the virgins. The resurrection is proved and illustrated by the story of the Phoenix" (*English Cyclopaedia*). The best editions of his works are, Mille, *Opera Omsia, Graece et Latine* (fol., 1703, with notes, indices, and various readings); Touttee (*Benedictine, Gr. et Lat.*, Paris, fol., 1720); also in Migne, *Patrologice Curs. Grae*. vol. 33. The Catecheses are given in English in the Library of the Fathers (vol. ii), Oxford, 1839, 8vo.See Clarke, *Succession Sac. Liter*. 1:279; Lardner, *Works*, iv; Neander, *Church*

History, 2:98; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* 1:211; Taylor, *Ancient Christianity*; Schaif, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, § 168.

Cyril, St.

the apostle of the Slavi, was born in Thessalonica about 820. His original name was Constantine. He was educated at Constantinople, where he became acquainted with Photius, and gave for some time lectures on philosophy. He therefore received and always retained the name "The Philosopher." After some time he took orders, became a monk, and soon, with his brother Methodius, withdrew into solitude. He now fell out with Photius, defended the veneration of images, and wrote against the Mohammedans. About 860 he was sent by the emperor Michael III as a missionary to a Tartar tribe, the Chazari, which at that time inhabited the northern shores of the Black Sea as far as the Lower Volga. Jews and Mohammedans vied with Christian missionaries to gain an influence upon this tribe, and the selection of Constantine by the emperor for this difficult mission indicates the high reputation which he enjoyed. He first went to Kherson, acquired a knowledge of the language, and put himself in possession of some relics of Clemens Romanus, which he seems to have always carried with him from this time. A portion of the tribe embraced Christianity, but there is no proof of a Christianization of the whole tribe and of the organization of a national Church. After his return to Constantinople he again lived with his brother Methodius in ascetic retirement until he was sent by the emperor as a missionary to the South Slavic tribes. Both Greek and Roman missionaries had for some time been at work among this people, which, anxious to preserve its independent nationality, mistrusted both. Constantine gained their confidence by convincing them that he sympathized with their national sentiments, and had in view nothing but their conversion to Christianity. He became the founder of a Slavic literature by translating into their language portions of the Scriptures and the most important liturgical books. For this purpose he used an alphabet which either had been invented by him or modified from one (the "Glagolitic") more ancient. The new alphabet, called after him the "Cyrillic," was adopted by most of the Eastern Slavi (Bulgarians, Servians, Bosnians, Slavonians, Russians, etc.), but subsequently underwent in the several countries a number of modifications. By prince Rastislav he was called as a missionary into the Slavic countries outside of the Greek empire. This Rastislav is probably the same whom the Germans call Rastices, the founder of a great Moravian empire whose exact limits cannot

at present be defined. About 863 they arrived at the court of Rastislav, the seat of which we do not know, but which was probably at a point far to the south-east from the present Moravia. By disseminating the Scriptures and celebrating divine worship in the Slavic language, they soon founded a flourishing Slavic Church in the territory of Rastislav and other Pannonian princes. When pope Nicholas I heard of their successes he invited them to Rome. In 868 they followed this invitation, accompanied by many disciples. Their Slavic Bible and Slavic mass attracted great attention, and the successor of Nicholas (who in the meanwhile had died), Adrian II, received them with marks of great favor. They presented the pope with the relics of Clemens Romanus, and the pope approved their work, inclusive of the Slavic translation of the Bible and the Slavic liturgy, and declared his intention to organize the new churches in the Slavic provinces as an independent ecclesiastical province, under Constantine and Methodius as bishops. But Constantine, who felt the end of his life approaching, preferred to remain as a monk in Rome, assumed the name of Cyril, under which he has since been known in Church history, and died a few weeks later, Feb. 14, 869. The work of evangelization was continued by his brother Methodius. The works which were formerly ascribed to Cyril (*Apologi Morales*, Vienna, 1630; *Opusculum de Diction*. Venice, 1497) are spurious. —Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. 3*, 223; Schafarik, *Slav. Alterthimer*, 2:471; Wattenbach, *Beitragie zur Geschichte der christl. Kirche in Mihren u. Bohmen* (Vienna, 1849); *Acta Sanctorum, Mart*. 2:14; Dobrowsky, *Cyrill und Method* (Prague, 1823); Philaret (Russian bishop of Riga), *Cyrillus und Methodius* (German transl., Mittau, 1847); McLear, *Missions in the Middle Ages*, chap. 13.

Cyril Lucar

(CYRILLUS LUCARIS), a Greek patriarch of Constantinople, noted for his efforts to introduce into his Church the doctrines of the Reformed (Calvinistic) churches. He was born about 1568 in Candia, which at that time was under the sovereignty of Venice and the chief seat of Greek scholarship. He studied for several years in Venice and Padua, and subsequently made a journey through several European countries. In Geneva, where he staid for some time, he became acquainted with several prominent theologians of the Reformed Church. In Lithuania he was rector of a literary institution at Ostrog, and took a prominent part in opposing the projected union of the Greek churches of Poland and Lithuania with Rome. After his return to his native land, he was soon promoted by the

patriarch of Alexandria to the dignity of an archimandrite. In 1602 Cyril succeeded Meletius as patriarch of Alexandria. While holding this position he carried on an active correspondence with David le Leu, de Wilelm, and the Remonstrant Uytenbogaert of Holland, Abbot, archbishop of Canterbury, Leger, professor of Geneva, the republic of Venice, the Swedish king Gustavus Adolphus, and his chancellor, Axel Oxenstierna. Many of these letters, written in different languages, are still extant. They show that Cyril was an earnest opponent of Rome, and a great admirer of the Protestant Reformation. He sent for all the important works, Protestant and Roman Catholic, published in the Western countries, and sent several young men to England to get a thorough theological education. The friends of Cyril in Constantinople, and among them the English, Dutch, and Swedish ambassadors, endeavored to elevate Cyril to the patriarchal see of Constantinople. They would have succeeded in 1613, after the banishment of the patriarch Timotheus, but for the unwillingness of Cyril to pay the amount demanded by the Turkish government. After the death of Timotheus in 1621, he was elected his successor by a unanimous vote of the synod. His life as patriarch was full of vicissitudes. The Jesuits, in union with the agents of France, several times procured his banishment, while his friends, supported by the ambassadors of the Protestant powers in Constantinople, obtained, by means of large sums of money, his recall. During all these troubles, Cyril, with remarkable energy, pursued the great task of his life. In 1627 he obtained a printing-press from England, and at once began to print his Confession of Faith and several catechisms. But, before these documents were ready for publication, the printing establishment was destroyed by the Turkish government at the instigation of the Jesuits. Cyril then sent his Confession of Faith to Geneva, where it appeared, in 1629, in the Latin language, under the true name of the author, and with a dedication to Cornelius de Haga. It created throughout Europe a profound sensation, and many were inclined to regard it as spurious. Cyril, however, openly confessed the authorship, published in 1633 a Greek edition of the Confession, and in 1636, in a letter to the professors of Geneva, declared his concurrence in the principal doctrines of the Reformed Church. Many opponents, however, now rose against him in the Greek Church, and in 1638 a synod convened at Constantinople to try him. But, before sentence was pronounced, the Janissaries arrested him by order of the government, carried him to a boat, strangled him, and cast the corpse into the sea. Some friends found the corpse and buried it upon an island, and ten years later a solemn funeral was held at Constantinople.

Several synods condemned the innovations attempted by Cyril, but the Confession of Faith was generally treated by them as spurious.

The Confession of Cyril uses of the procession of the Holy Spirit the compromising formula ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς δῖ υἱοῦ (*a patre per filium*). It teaches absolute predestination, denies moral freedom prior to regeneration, declares strongly against the rights claimed by the popes, and acknowledges only two sacraments, baptism and the Lord’s Supper. It recommends the reading of the Bible, distinguishes the canonical from the deutero-canonical books, and rejects the veneration of images. It has been published by Kimmel in his *Libri symbol. eccles. Groecoe*. — Thom. Smith, *Collectanea de Cyrillo Lucari* (Lond. 1707); Bohnstedt, *De Cyrillo Lucari* (Halle, 1724); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:538; Pichler, *Geschichte des Protestantismus in der Orientalischen Kirche*, etc. (Munich, 1862, 8vo); Stanley, *Eastern Church*; *Princeton Review*, v. 312; Murdoch’s Mosheim, *Church History*, *3*, 347, note 5 (N. Y. 1854).

Cy’rus

Picture for Cy’rus 1

(Hebraized *Ko’resh*, v r /K [twice v r Ķo, <150101>Ezra 1:1 lat. clause, 2], <143622>2 Chronicles 36:22, 23; <150101>Ezra 1:1, 7, 8; 3:7; 4:3, 5; Isaiah xiiv. 28; 45:1; <270121>Daniel 1:21; 10:1; Chald. id, <150513>Ezra 5:13, 14, 17; 6:3, 14; <270628>Daniel 6:28; Greek Κῦρος, as in 1 Esdras 2:3; 4:44, 57; 5:71, 73; 6:17, 21; for the old Persic *Kurush*, supposed by the Greeks to mean the *sun* [Ctesias, *Pers. Exc*. 49; Plutarch, *Artax. I*], but rather connected with the Sanscrit *Kuru*, of unknown signif., Rawlinson, *Herod*. 3, 455), originally called *Agradates* (Ἀγραδάτης, Strabo, 15:729; see Rosenmüller, *Alterth*. I, 1:367), the celebrated Persian king (s r P;Ë l m) and conqueror of Babylon, who promulgated the first edict for the restoration of the Jews to their own land (<150101>Ezra 1:1, etc.). “In consequence of a dream, Astyages, it is said, designed the death of his infant grandson, but the child was spared by those whom he charged with the commission of the crime (Herod. 1:109 sq.), and Cyrus grew up in obscurity under the name of Agradates (Strab. 15:729). His real parentage was discovered by the imperious spirit which he displayed while yet a boy (Herod. 1:114), and when he grew up to manhood his courage and genius placed him at the head of the Persians. The tyranny of Astyages had at that time alienated a large faction of the Medes, and Cyrus headed a revolt which ended in the defeat and capture of

the Median king, B.C. 559, near Pasargadae (now Murgh-Aub) (Strabo, 15:730). After consolidating the empire which he thus gained, Cyrus entered on that career of conquest which has made him the hero of the East. In B.C. 546 (?) he defeated Croesus, and the kingdom of Lydia was the prize of his success. While his general Harpagus was engaged in completing the reduction of Asia Minor, Cyrus turned his arms against the Babylonians. Babylon fell before his army, and the ancient dominions' of Assyria were added to his empire (B.C. 538). The conquest of Babylon opened the way for greater designs. It is probable that Cyrus planned an invasion of Egypt; and there are traces of campaigns in Central Asia, in which he appears to have attempted to extend his power to the Indus (Ctesias, *Pers*. c. 5 sq.). Afterwards he attacked the Massagetse, and, according to Herodotus, (1. 214; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 11:2, 1), he fell in a battle against them B.C. 529 (Clinton; *Fast. Hell*. 2:301 sq.). His tomb is still shown at Pasargadae (Arrian, *Exp. Al*. 6:29), the scene of his first decisive victory (Rawlinson, Herod. 1:273).

"It is impossible to insist upon the details of the outline thus sketched. In the time of Herodotus Cyrus was already regarded as the national hero of Persia, and his history had received various popular embellishments (Herod. 1:95; comp. 3, 18, 160; Xenoph. *Cyrop*. 1:2, 1). In the next century Xenophon chose him as the hero of his romance, and fact and fiction became thenceforth hopelessly confused in classical writers. But, in the absence of authentic details of his actions, the empire which he left is the best record of his power and plans. Like an Oriental Alexander, he aimed at universal dominion; and the influence of Persia, like that of Greece, survived the dynasty from which it sprung. In every aspect the reign of Cyrus marks an epoch in universal history. The fall of Sardis and Babylon was the starting-point of European life; and it is a singular coincidence that the beginning of Grecian art and philosophy, and the foundation of the Roman constitution, synchronize with the triumph of the Arian race in the East (Niebuhr, *Gesch. Ass*. p. 232)." The following points demand especial consideration, and we therefore elaborate them at considerable length.

1. His Parentage. — Herodotus (1. 107) and Xenophon (*Cyrop*. 1:2, 1) agree that he was son of Cambyses, prince of Persia, and of Mandane, daughter of Astyages, king of the Median empire. In an Assyrian inscription he is called the "son of Cambyses the powerful king" (Rawlinson, *Herod.* 1:193). Ctesias denies that there was any relationship

at all between Cyrus and Astyages (*Pers. Exc.* 2). According to him, when Cyrus had defeated and captured Astyages, he adopted him as a grandfather, and invested Amytis, or Amyntis, the daughter of Astyages (whose name is in all probability only another form of Mandane), with all the honors of queen dowager. His object in so doing. was to facilitate the submission of the more distant parts of the empire, which were not yet conquered; and he reaped excellent fruit of his policy in winning the homage of the ancient, rich, and remote province of Bactria. Ctesias adds that Cyrus afterwards married Anmytis. It is easy to see that the latter account is by far the more historical, and that the story followed by Herodotus and Xenophon is that which the courtiers published in aid of the Persian prince's designs. Yet there is no reason for doubting that, on the father's side, Cyrus belonged to the Achsemenidae, the royal clan of the military tribe of the Persians. See Sartorius, *De rationib. cur in expon. vita et rel. gest. Cyri, Xenophonti potius quan Herodot. sit credendum* (Libben, 1771). A different view is taken in Smith's *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v. *SEE DARIUS (THE MEDE)*.

2. *His Elevation to the Throne*. — It was the frequent practice of the Persian monarchs, and probably therefore of the Medes before them, to choose the provincial viceroys from the royal families of the subject nations, and thereby to leave to the vanquished much both of the semblance and of the reality of freedom. This will be sufficient to account for the first steps of Cyrus towards eminence. But as the Persian armies were at that time composed of ruder and braver men than the Medes (indeed, to this day, the men of Shiraz are proverbially braver than those of Isfahan), the account of Xenophon is credible, that in the general wars of the empire Cyrus won the attachment of the whole army by his bravery; while, as Herodotus tells, the atrocious cruelties of Astyages may have revolted the hearts of the Median nobility. *SEE PERSIA*.

3. *Transition of the Empire from the Medes to the Persians*. — Xenophon's romance omits the fact that the transference of the empire was effected by a civil war; nevertheless, the same writer, in his Anabasis, confesses it (in, 4, 7, 12). Herodotus, Ctesias, Isocrates, Strabo, and, in fact, all who allude to the matter at all, agree that it was so. In Xenophon (*l. c.*) we find the Upper Tigris to have been the seat of one campaign. where the cities of Larissa and Mespila were besieged and taken by Cyrus. From Strabo we learn that the decisive battle was fought on the spot where Cyrus afterwards built Pasargadse, in Persis, for his native capital. This

agrees with Herodotus's account of two armies being successively lost, which may mean that the war was ended in two campaigns. Yet Ctesias represents Astyages as finally captured in the palace of Ecbatana. Cyrus (says Herodotus) did Astyages no harm, but kept him by his side to the end of his life. Ctesias, however, states that he was first made ruler of the Barcanians, and afterwards murdered by a eunuch sent by Cyrus to bring him home to visit his family. The date of the accession of Cyrus is fixed by the unanimous consent of the ancient chronologers as occurring in B.C. 559 (Africanus, *ap. Euseb*. 10:10; Clinton, ii, s. an.).

The Medes were by no means made subject to the Persians at first. It is highly probable that, as Herodotus and Xenophon represent, many of the noblest Medes sided with Cyrus, and during his reign the most trusted generals of the armies were Medes. Yet even this hardly explains the phenomenon of a Darius the Mede, who, in the book of Daniel, for two years holds the government in Babylon, after the capture of the city by the Medes and Persians. Indeed, the language used concerning the kingdom of Darius might be explained as Oriental hyperbole, and Darius be supposed to have been a mere satrap of Babylon, were it not for the fact that Cyrus is clearly put forward as a successor to Darius the Mede. Many have been the attempts to reconcile this with the current Grecian accounts; but there is one only that has the least plausibility, viz. that which, with Xenophon, teaches that Astyages had a son still living (whom Xenophon calls Cyaxares), and that this son is no other than Darius the Mede; to whom Cyrus, by a sort of nephew's piety, conceded a nominal supremacy at Babylon. *SEE CYAXARES*. In the reign of the son of Cyrus the depression of the Medes probably commenced. At his death the Magian conspiracy took place, after the defeat of which the Medes doubtless sunk lower still. At a later time they made a general insurrection against the Persian power, and its suppression seems to have brought them to a level with Hyrcanians, Bactrians, and other vassal nations which spoke the tongue of Persia; for the nations of the poetical Irân had only dialectual variations of language (Strabo, 15:2, p. 311). *SEE MEDIA*.

4. *Military Career of Cyrus*. — The descriptions given us in Ctesias, and in Plutarch's Artaxerxes (the latter probably taken from Ctesias), concerning the Persian mode of fighting, are quite Homeric in their character. No skill seems to be needed by the general; no tactics are thought of: he does his duty best by behaving as the bravest of common soldiers, and by acting the part of champion, like a knight in the days of chivalry. We cannot suppose

that there was any greater advance of the military art in the days of Cyrus. It is agreed by all that he subdued the Lydians, the Greeks of Asia Minor, and the Babylonians: we may doubtless add Susiana, which must have been incorporated with his empire before he commenced his war with Babylon; where also he fixed his military capital (Susa, or Shushan), as more central for the necessities of his administration than Pasargadae. Yet the latter city continued to be the more sacred and beloved home of the Persian court, the place of coronation and of sepulture (Strabo, 15:3, p. 318; and Plut. *Artax*. init.). All Syria and Phoenicia appear to have come over to Cyrus peaceably.

With regard to the Persian wars, the few facts from Ctesias, which the epitomator has extracted as differing from Herodotus, carry with them high probability. He states that, after receiving the submission of the Bactrians, Cyrus made war on the Sacians, a Scythlan (i.e. a Slavonic) people, who seem to have dwelt, or perhaps rather roved, along the Oxus, from Bokhara to Khiva; and that, after alternate successes in battle, he attached the whole nation to himself in faithful allegiance. Their king is called Amorges by Ctesias. They are undoubtedly the same people that Herodotus (7. 64) calls *Amyrgian* Sacians; and it is highly probable that they gave to the district of Margiana its name. Their women fought in ranks as systematically as the men. Strabo has cursorily told us of a tradition (15. 2, p. 307) that Cyrus escaped with but seven men through the deserts of Gedrosia, fleeing from the “Indians” — which might denote an unsuccessful war against Candahar, etc., a country which certainly was not reduced to the Persian empire until the reign of Darius Hystaspis.

The closing scene of the career of Cyrus was in battle with a people living on one or both banks of the river Iaxartes, now the Syr-deria. Herodotus calls the enemy the Massagetans, who roamed along the north bank of the river: according to Ctesias it was the Derbices, who seem to have been on the south. Both may, in fact, have combined in the war. In other respects the narrative of Ctesias is beyond comparison more credible, and more agreeable with other known facts, except that he introduces the fiction of Indians with elephants aiding the enemy. Two battles were fought on successive days, in the former of which Cyrus was mortally wounded, but was carried off by his people (B.C. 529, according to Clinton). In the next, the Sacian cavalry and the faithful Amorges came to support him, and the Derbices sustained a total and bloody defeat. Cyrus died the third day after his wound: his body was conveyed to Pasargadae, and buried in the

celebrated monument, which was broken open by the Macedonians two centuries afterwards (Strabo, 15:3). A description is given of the tomb in Arrian (6. 29): it was a neat quadrangular edifice, with a low door leading into a little chamber, in which lay a golden sarcophagus, containing the body of Cyrus. The inscription, reported by Aristobulus, an eyewitness, is this: “O mlan, I am Cyrus, who acquired the empire for the Persians, and was king of Asia. Grudge me not, then, this monument.” It is generally supposed to have perished, but Sir R. K. Porter has sought to identify it with an extant building known by the natives as that of “the mother of Suleiman” (*Travels*, 1:498). His name is found on monuments at Murghab, north of Persepolis (Hock, *Vet. Med. N. Pers. Monum.*).

Picture for Cy’rus 2

5. *Conduct and Relations of Cyrus towards the Jews.* — Hitherto the great kings, with whom the Jews had been brought into contact, had been open oppressors or seductive allies; but Cyrus was a generous liberator and a just guardian of their rights. An inspired prophet (<23A428>Isaiah 44:28) recognized in him “a shepherd” of the Lord, an “anointed” king (<23A501>Isaiah 45:1; jyvm; Messiah); and the title seemed to later writers to in. vest him with the dignity of being in some sense a type of Christ himself (Jerome, *Comm.* in <23A501>Isaiah 45:1). His successes are connected in the prophecy with their religious issue; and if that appear to be a partial view of history which represents the restoration of a poor remnant of captive Israelites to their own land as the final cause of his victories (<23A428>Isaiah 44:28, 45:4), it may be answered that the permanent effects which Persia has wrought upon the world can be better traced through the Jewish people than through any other channel. The laws, the literature, the religion, the very ruins of the material grandeur of Persia have passed away, and still it is possible to distinguish the effects which they produced in preparing the Jews for the fulfillment of their last mission. In this respect, also, the parallel, which has already been hinted, holds good. Cyrus stands out clearly as the representative of the East, as Alexander afterwards of the West. The one led to the development of the idea of order, and the other to that of independence. Ecclesiastically the first crisis was signalized by the consolidation of a Church, the second by the distinction of sects. The one found its outward embodiment in “the great synagogue,” the other in the dynasty of the Asmonaeans.

The kings of Assyria and Babylon had carried the Jews into captivity, both to remove a disaffected nation from the frontier, and to people their new cities. By undoing this work, Cyrus attached the Jews to himself as a garrison at an important post. But we may believe that a nobler motive conspired with this. The Persian religion was primitively monotheistic, and strikingly free from idolatry; so little pagan in its spirit that, whatever of the mystical and obscure it may contain, not a single impure, cruel, or otherwise immoral practice was united to any of its ceremonies. It is credible, therefore, that a sincere admiration of the Jewish faith actuated the noble Persian when he exclaimed, in the words of the book of Ezra, "Go ye up and build in Jerusalem the house of Jehovah, God of Israel; *he is God!"* — and forced the Babylonian temples to disgorge their ill-gotten spoil. It is the more remarkable, since the Persians disapproved the confinement of temples. Nevertheless, impediments to the fortification of Jerusalem afterwards arose, even during the reign of Cyrus (<1504>Ezra 4:5). *SEE CAPTIVITY*.

Perhaps no great conqueror ever left behind him a fairer fame than Cyrus the Great. His mighty achievements have been borne down to us on the voice of the nation which he elevated; his evil deeds had no historian to record them. What is more, it was his singular honor and privilege to be the first Gentile friend to the people of Jehovah in the time of their sorest trouble, and to restore them to the land whence light was to break forth for the illumination of all nations. To this high duty he is called by name by the prophet (<2344>Isaiah 44:28; 45:1), and for performing it he seems to be entitled "the righteous man" (<2341>Isaiah 41:2; 45:13). There are also important passages in Jeremiah (<2425>Jeremiah 25:12; 29:10; 23:7-13) that predict the same event, without mentioning the name of Cyrus as the agent. The corresponding his. tory is found in the books of Daniel and Ezra. The language of the proclamation in <1501>Ezra 1:2, and <1436>2 Chronicles 36:22, seems to countenance the idea that he wu acquainted, as he easily might be through Daniel, with the prophecy of Isaiah respecting him. *SEE DANIEL*.

The "first year of Cyrus" there spoken of is not the year of his elevation to power over the Medes, nor the date of the conquest of Persia, nor yet that of the fall of Babylon, B.C. 538; but at the close of the two years succeeding this last event, during which "Darius the Mede" held the viceroyship of Babylon, i.e. in B.C. 536. It was not till then that Cyrus became actual ruler over Palestine, which continued to be attached to the Babylonian department of his empire (see Browne's *Ordo Soclorum*, p.

173). The edict of Cyrus for the rebuilding of the Temple (<14>2 Chronicles 36:22, 23; <15>Ezra 1:1-4; 3:7; 4:3; 5:13, 17; 6:3) was, in fact, the beginning of Judaism; and the great changes by which the nation was transformed into a church are clearly marked. (On the identity of the times of Cyrus and Daniel, see *Jour. Sac. Lit*. July, 1854, p. 435 sq.; Jan. 1855, p. 364 sq.)

(1.) The lesson of the kingdom was completed by the captivity. The sway of a temporal prince was at length felt to be at best only a faint image of that Messianic kingdom to which the prophets pointed. The royal power had led to apostasy in Israel and to idolatry in Judah, and men looked for some other outward form in which the law might be visibly realized. Dependence on Persia excluded the hope of absolute political freedom, and offered a sure guarantee for the liberty of religious organization.

(2.) The captivity which was the punishment of idolatry was also the limit of that sin. Thenceforth the Jews apprehended fully the spiritual nature of their faith, and held it fast through persecution. At the same time wider views were opened to them of the unseen world. The powers of good and evil were recoghised in their action in the material world, and in this way some preparation was made for the crowning doctrine of Christianity.

(3.) The organization of the outward Church was connected with the purifying of doctrine, and served as the form in which the truth might be realized by the mass. Prayer — public and private — assumed a new importance. The prophetic work came to an end. The Scriptures were collected. The "law was fenced" by an oral tradition. Synagogues were erected, and schools formed. Scribes shared the respect of priests, if they did not supersede them in popular regard.

(4.) Above all, the bond by which "the people of God" were held together was at length felt to be religious and not local, nor even primarily national. The Jews were incorporated in different nations, and still looked to Jerusalem as the center of their faith. The boundaries of Canaan were passed; and the beginnings of a spiritual dispensation were already made when the "Dispersion" was established among the kingdoms of the earth (comp. Niebuhr's *Gesch. Assurs und Babels*, p. 224 sq.; Ewald, *Gesch. d. Volkes Israel*, 4:60 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums*, 1:13 sq.). *SEE DISPERSION (OF JEWS).*