tween Lacedaemon and Crete, by describing the one as cultivating brevity of speech, ἑξαχολογίαν, and the other, not so much multiplicity of words, as multiplicity of thoughts, ταλιτᾶτα μᾶλλον ἢ ταλιτολογίαν (Leg. i. p. 780), a facility in suiting the thought to the occasion. Heathen authors have dwelt less upon the other tendencies of the Cretans referred to by the apostle, and we may hence naturally infer that they did not form quite so marked and general a characteristic. That they prevailed to a very considerable extent, there can be no doubt; as the apostle himself had good opportunities for judging. It is clear that he personally laboured for a time on the island, as he speaks of having left Titus there, not to commence a new work, but to carry forward what the apostle had begun, and complete the organization of the Christian churches, Tit. i. 5. He did not despair of the gospel even on so corrupt a soil; but charged it the more earnestly on believers, that the very prevalence of corruption should have the effect of making them the more watchful of their behaviour and exemplary in their conduct.

Mention is made of Crete in the narrative of St. Paul's voyage and shipwreck. Contrary winds preventing the voyagers from continuing their direct course on the north side of the island, they sailed southward, rounding Cape Sphoene, the eastern promontory of Crete, and took shelter in the Fair Havens, near Cape Matala. Afterwards, in endeavouring to make for Phoenice (now Port Lutro), a more secure and commodious harbour farther west, they were driven off the coast by a violent storm, and passing under the small island of Claada were washed to Malta. (See Smith's Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul.)

CRISPUS, a ruler in the Jewish synagogue at Corinth, and one of those who were converted to the faith of Christ by the ministry of Paul, Ac. xvii. 8; 1 Co. i. 14. As he and his household had been baptized by the apostle, we may suppose they were among the earlier converts.

CROSS, CRUCIFY. The Greek word for cross, σταυρός, properly signified a στήριξις, an upright pole, or piece of paling, on which anything might be impaled or which might be used in impaling a piece of ground. But a modification was introduced as the dominion and usages of Rome extended themselves through Greek-speaking countries. Even amongst the Romans the cross (from which our cross is derived) appears to have been originally an upright pole, and this always remained the more prominent part. But from the time that it began to be used as an instrument of punishment, a transverse piece of wood was commonly added: not, however, always even then. For it would seem that there were more kinds of death than one by the cross; this being sometimes accomplished by transfixing the criminal with a pole, which was run through his back and spine, and came out at his mouth (adactum per medium hominem, qui per os emergat, stiptem, Seneca, Ep. xiv.) In another place (Consol. ad Marcian. x.), Seneca mentions three different forms: "I see," says he, "three crosses, not indeed of one sort, but fashioned in different ways: one sort suspending by the head poisons bent toward the earth, others transfixing them through their secret parts, others extending their arms on a patula." There can be no doubt, however, that the latter sort was the more common, and that about the period of the gospel age crucifixion was usually accomplished by suspending the criminal on a cross piece of wood.

But this does not of itself determine the precise form of the cross; for crosses of three different shapes were known to have been in use. One, and that probably the most ancient, was in the form of the letter Τ, which as commonly written consisted simply of a perpendicular line with another laid across the top, making two right angles, Τ. In the earlier Christian writers this letter is often referred to as a symbol of the cross, and, on account of such a resemblance, Lucian, in his usual style, prefers a charge against the letter (Iust. Voc. xii.) The letter Χ represents another sort, which has received the name of St. Andrew, from a tradition that on a cross of this description the apostle of that
name suffered martyrdom. But the commonest form, it is understood, was that in which the upright piece of wood was crossed by another near the top, but not precisely at it, the upright pole running above the other, thus +— and so making four, not merely two right angles. It was on a cross of this form, according to the general voice of tradition, that our Lord suffered; but there is nothing in the narratives of the evangelists which determines this to have been the form employed, rather than either of the other two. It is, however, the one most commonly met with in the paintings and sculptures that have survived from the earlier ages.

Punishment by the cross was confined to slaves or to malefactors of the worst class (Her. Sat. i. 3. 82; Juv. vi. 215). When a person was condemned to this punishment he was usually stripped and scourged (Livy, xxiii. 59; Vol. Max. i. 17). But there is nothing in the narratives of the earlier ages.
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Our Lord himself so uses it when he says, "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me," Mat xvi. 24. And the cross, by way of eminence, that namely of Christ, is taken as an emblem of the doctrine or religion with which it is so closely connected, Fst. iii. 18. The enemies of the cross of Christ, are such as in their heart and behaviour are opposed to the spirit and design for which he suffered on the accursed tree.

CROWN. The common Hebrew word for this is כתר (kōtor); it is derived from the root which signifies to surround, then to encircle in a distinguishing or honorary manner, especially with chaplets, diadems, or such like things upon the head; so that the כתר in the emphatic sense of crown was just the capital diadem of royalty; in priests, of sacerdotal dignity (though in Scripture another term is commonly used for this—מגן, mînegâbeh); in combatants, of victory.

In ancient times such crowns, though called by a common name, would naturally differ according to the elevated, elaborately wrought, and perhaps gaudy turban. That they were usually made of costly materials, and were for dignity and ornament rather than for use, appears from the allusions to them found in ancient writers. Even the comparatively petty king of the Ammonites had a crown which contained a talent of gold and precious stones, which David took with the city Rabbah, and placed upon his own head, 2 Sa. xii. 30. Reference is made in Ps. xxi. 3 to a crown of pure gold as the proper badge of a king, whose state corresponded to his position; so that in David's time gold must be understood to have formed the chief material for the manufacture of royal crowns; but nothing is indicated respecting the form.

It was a Grecian custom to crown with a wreath of leaves, or a chaplet of flowers, those who came off victorious in the public games. We read of nothing corresponding to this in the Old Testament; but reference is made to the custom by St. Paul as one perfectly familiar to his Corinthian readers (near whose city some of those games were celebrated), and he draws the distinction between such and the Christian prize, by designating the one corruptible, and the other incorruptible. 1 Co. ix. 25. In reference also, partly to this worldly custom, and partly to the usage of kings, the final inheritance of the saints is represented as a crown, to which they are at once born as heirs of glory, and to which they must fight their way as spiritual combatants—a crown of righteousness, 2 Ti. iv. 8, because it is attained to only as the final issue of a life of righteousness; a crown of life, Ro. ii. 10, or a crown of glory, 1 Pe. v. 4, because a perennial life of blessedness and glory shall be the portion of those who receive it. But another and less creditable custom of the ancient Hebrews is referred to, at least once, in the Old Testament scripture—the custom, namely, of encircling with a coronal of leaves and flowers the heads of those who were engaged in the mirth and revelry of public festivals. Thus the prophet Isaiah apostrophizes the drunkards of Ephraim, as having on them a crown of pride, a glorious beauty of a fading flower, ch. xxii. 1. And in the apocryphal book of Wisdom the reference is still more distinct—"Let us fill ourselves with costly wine and ornaments, and let us flowers of the spring pass by us; let us crown ourselves with rose-buds before they are uttered," ch. ii. 7, 8. Occasionally allusions are made to crowns in a quite general way, as to what is peculiarly honourable and glorious; as when a virtuous wife is called "a crown to her husband," Pr. xii. 4; when the wise are said to get riches, and old men grandchildren, for a crown, Ps. xiv. 2; or when faithful ministers of the gospel have their converts reckoned to them for a crown of joy, 1 Th. ii. 19. In such cases the crown is simply regarded as the sign or emblem of the state.

CRYSTAL. There is no further peculiarity in the reference made to crystal in Scripture, than that in the original Hebrew two terms are so rendered, גליז (gôlîh), and קרב (kôrb). These both properly signify ice, the one from the congelation that causes it, the other from the smoothness that appears on its surface. It was an ancient opinion, that crystal was simply ice in a harder state of congelation than usual; and hence, not merely the Hebrew gôlîh, but the Greek κρυστάλλος, from which our crystal comes, signified equally clear ice and rock-crystal, the two being regarded as but one