'shave their heads and abandon their ruler and their parents.' 1
The memorialist says again: 'Before the Western Tsin Dynasty
[A.D. 256-317] reigned, the ruling dynasties enacted stringent
laws by which the people of the Middle Kingdom were prevented
from shaving the head at pleasure.' 2
In A.D. 995 an edict threatened severe punishment to those
who were 'shaved surreptitiously' without first obtaining permission of their district prefect to become monks or nuns.'
In A.D. 1408 it was decreed that, 'if any person surreptitiously
took the tonsure to become a monk,' he should be punished
with a term of hard labour, and after that become a husband-

with a term of hard labour, and after that become a husband-man.<sup>4</sup>

The determination of the Chinese Government to keep the tonsure as well as the age of receiving it under their control is seen in other enactments. Taoists are also mentioned in some of these cases.<sup>5</sup> Eight blows was the punishment under the Manchu dynasty to Buddhist or Taoist who in the one case took the tonsure and in the other did up his hair on his own account.<sup>6</sup> At the same time monks were not allowed to go about without the tonsure, and pupils adopted by the Buddhist clergy had to be tonsured. Those in monasteries without the tonsure had to return to secular life, being neither monks nor laymen. This was the case also in A.D. monks nor taymen. It is was the case also in A.D. 1458 for those who had been tonsured after twenty, but the culprits were to be banished for life; and in A.D. 1537 it was decreed that not only those who privately shaved their heads, but also their parents,

privately shaved their heads, but also their parents, neighbours, and helpers, were to be punished.

5. Ridicule of the tonsure.—The tonsure of the Buddhist lends itself to the derision of the Chinese, who are very susceptible to anything that opens a way to mockery or banter. One term applied to the Buddhist monk is 'bald-headed ass,' another is 'bald-headed thief.' 10 As a further example of the way in which the shorn and shaven priest is despised may be instanced the curious custom of despised may be instanced the curious custom of shaving the head of a young boy in order that the evil spirits may think that he is of no consequence —in fact worthless to the parents—and thus pass him by uninjured. The boy is then called 'Bud-dhist priest.' The present writer saw an instance of this in the case of a neighbour's son in Canton.<sup>11</sup>

6. The Manchu tonsure.—A species of tonsure was practised by every male except monks in China under the Manchu rule of the country. The hair is now allowed to grow, instead of the greater part

of it being shaved off.
7. Tonsure of children.—Young children's heads are also shaved to a large extent. The first shaving of an infant's head, when a month old, often has a religious character, being done before an idol or the ancestral tablets. 12

LITERATURE.—See the works referred to in the footnotes.

J. DYER BALL.

TONSURE (Hindu).— $Ch\bar{u}d\bar{d}$ , 'tonsure,' is the name of an ancient rite in India, also called chūdākaraņam or chūdākarma, chaulam, which is performed on boys, sometimes on girls also, and derives its name from the tuft of hair left on the top of the boy's head  $(ch\bar{u}d\bar{a})$ . According to the ancient rule, this rite is to be performed when the boy is three years old, or, in the lower castes, in his fifth or seventh year. The boy is dressed in new clothes, and placed on his mother's lap. A barber cuts his hair with a razor, while sacred verses from the Veda are recited. The hair is thrown on a heap of cow-dung, and afterwards dug into the ground (see Hillsbrood). into the ground (see Hillebrandt, Rituallitteratur, Strassburg, 1897). It is interesting to note that this rite, as pointed out in Gerini's monograph on the tonsure rite in Siam, has spread into Siam, together

the same king introduced in Jerusalem the innova
1 The Religion of the Semites<sup>2</sup>, p. 377.

with other Brāhmanical institutions. In India it has been invested with some legal importance, the Sanskrit lawbooks stating that a boy on whom the ceremony of tonsure has been performed in the family of his birth is no longer capable of being affiliated to another person (see Jolly, *Tagore Law Lectures*, Calcutta, 1885). The tonsure rite is carefully kept by many cases of the present day, though the time of its performance varies. Thus the Kanoj Brāhmans of Poona perform the rite when a boy is from six months to two years old; the when a boy is from six months to two years old; the Lingayats, after a year; the Vanis, at any time from six months to five years. Sometimes the child is taken to the village temple for the ceremony, or after its performance (see the Bombay Gazetteer, passim; Rai Bahadur L. B. Nath, Hinduism, Meerut, 1899). The tonsure rite is supposed to belong to the common heirloom of Indo-European nations, because similar rites and superstitions occur in the Avesta of the Zoroastrians and paroccur in the Avesta of the Zoroastrians, and, particularly, among some Slavic nations, such as the Servians and Bohemians.

LITERATURE.—J. Kirste, 'Indogermanische Gebräuche beim Haarschneiden,' Analecta Graeciensia, Graz, 1893; Potanski, Die Ceremonie der Haarschur bei den Slaven und Germanen, Cracow, 1896.

TOPHET. - Although the OT references to Tophet, the scene of the Moloch sacrifices in the Valley of Hinnom, leave no doubt as to its great importance in the popular religion of Judah in the period before the reformation under Josiah, the place itself is mentioned only in the following places: 2 K 23<sup>10</sup>, Is 30<sup>33</sup>, Jer 7<sup>31f.</sup> 19<sup>6.11.12-13</sup>. The similar word in Job 17<sup>6</sup> is clearly not to be understood in this connexion. The original pronunciastood in this connexion. The original pronunciation of the word, which is transliterated in the LXX  $\text{T} \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \theta$  or  $\theta \alpha \phi \epsilon \theta$ , is unknown, the Masoretic pronunciation in this case, as in others, being due to the substitution of the vowels of  $\eta \ddot{\psi} \ddot{\omega}$ , 'shame.' Moreover, the etymology of the word is quite uncertain, and it cannot be determined whether the final t is radical or is merely the feminine ending. In Is  $30^{33}$  indeed the form is  $\eta \ddot{\phi} \ddot{\phi} \ddot{\phi}$ , which, if the text could be trusted, would be evidence of the former alternative unless the word should be the former alternative, unless the word should be understood as having a double feminine ending such as τημιψ, (Ps 33). But against this supposition is the fact that the word is construed as masculine in its immediate context. In any case, since, with the exception of Is 3033, it always has the definite article or is capable of being so pointed, it is evident that it is not strictly a proper name. We may reasonably infer that there were several templets although we know only of the one which

may reasonably infer that there were several tophets, although we know only of the one which was situated in the Valley of Hinnom.

Robertson Smith, arguing from the fact that 'at the time when the word nen first appears in Hebrew, the chief foreign influence in Judæan religion was that of Damascus (2 K 16), sought to connect the word with the Aramaic tfaya, which means a 'stand or tripod set upon a fire . . . of which we might, according to known analogies, have a variant tfāth. The corresponding Hebrew word is nöwk (for shfāth), which means an ashpit or dunghill, but primarily must have denoted the fireplace. But this explanation of the word by an Aramaic etymology takes for granted that the cult practised at the tophet, or at any rate the precise ritual of the cult, was a comparatively new-fangled thing in the 7th cent. B.C., and there are grave difficulties in such an assumption. Even if Ahaz did bring from Damascus a new contrivif Ahaz did bring from Damascus a new contriv-ance for burning the children's bodies, why should it have kept in Hebrew its Aramaic name, when the Hebrew language itself possessed the same word with the ordinary dialectic difference? When

<sup>1</sup> J. J. M. de Groot, Sectarianism and Religious Persecution in China, Amsterdam, 1903, p. 37.

2 Ib. p. 39.

3 Ib. p. 73 f.

4 Ib. p. 83.

5 Ib. pp. 97, 114.

6 Ib. p. 100; also see p. 80.

7 Ib. p. 114.

8 Ib. p. 85.

9 Ib. p. 88.

10 E. J. Dukes, Every-day Life in China, London, 1885, p. 183, and see also Chinese-English dictionaries.

11 Also see Gray, i. 112, note 1.

12 Doolittle, i. 122 f.