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## Taanach[[@Headword:Taanach]]

             (Heb. Taanak', תִּעֲנָךְ, sandy [Gesenius], or fortified [Fürst]; twice [Jdg 21:25; 1Ch 7:29] more briefly Tanak', תִּעְנָךְ, A.V. “Tanach;” Sept. Θανάχ or Θαανάχ v.r. Τανάχ, Σανάκ, etc.), an ancient Canaanitish city, whose king is enumerated among the thirty-one conquered by Joshua (Jos 12:21). It came into the hands of the half- tribe of Manasseh (Jos 17:11; Jos 21:25; 1Ch 7:29), though it would appear to have lain within the original allotment of Issachar (Jos 17:11). It was bestowed on the Kohathite Levites (Jos 21:25). Taanach was one of the places in which, either from some strength of position, or from the ground near it being favorable for their mode of fighting, the aborigines succeeded in making a stand (Jos 17:12; Jdg 1:27); and in the great struggle of the Canaanites under Sisera against Deborah and Barak it appears to have formed the headquarters of their army (Jdg 5:19). After this defeat the Canaanites of Taainach were probably made, like the rest, to pay a tribute (Jos 17:13; Jdg 1:28), but in the town they appear to have remained to the last. Taanach is almost always named in company with Megiddo, and they were evidently the chief towns of that fine, rich district which forms the western portion of the great plain of Esdraelon (1Ki 4:12).

It was known to Eusebius, who mentions it twice in the Onomasticon (Θαανάχ and Θαναή) as a “very large village” standing between three and four Roman miles from Legio, the ancient Megiddo. It was known to hap-Parchi, the Jewish medieval traveler, and it still stands about four miles south-east of Lejjum, retaining its old name with hardly the change of a letter. Schubert, followed by Robinson, found it in the modern Ta'annuk, now a mean hamlet on the south-east side of a small hill, with a summit of table-land (Schubert, Morgenland, 3, 164; Robinson, Bibl. Res. 3, 156; Bibl. Sacra, 1843, p. 76; Schwarz, Palest. p. 149). The ancient town was planted on a large mound at the termination of a long spur or promontory, which runs out northward from the hills of Manasseh into the plain, and leaves a recess or bay, subordinate to the main plain on its north side, and between it and Lejjun (Van de Velde, 1, 358). Ruins of some extent, but possessing no  interest; encompass it (Porter, Handbook, p. 371). The houses of the present village are mud huts, with one or two stone buildings (Ridgaway, The Lord's Land, p. 588).

## Taanach (2)[[@Headword:Taanach (2)]]

             The present Tannuk lies six miles north-west of Zerin (Jezreel), and is "a small village on the south-east side of the great tell or mound of the same name, at the [south-west] edge of the great plain[of Esdraelon]. It has olives on the south, and wells on the north, and is surrounded by cactus hedges. There is a white dome in the village... The rock on the sides of the tell is quarried in places, the wells are ancient, and rock-cut tombs occur on the north, near the foot of the mound" (Memoirs to Ordnance Survey, 2:46; comp. page 63).

## Taanah[[@Headword:Taanah]]

             SEE TAANATH-SILOH.

## Taanath-Shiloh[[@Headword:Taanath-Shiloh]]

             (Heb. Taanath' Shiloh', שַׁלֹה תִּאֲנִת, Taanah' [Gesenius, approach; Furst, circle] of Shiloh, so called prob. from its vicinity to that place; Sept. Τηνὰθ Σηλώ v.r. Θήνασα καὶ Σέλλης), a place mentioned (Jos 16:6) as situated near the northern border of Ephraim at its eastern end between the Jordan and Janohah. SEE TRIBE.

With this agrees the statement of Eusebius (nomast. s.v.), who places Janoh'ah twelve and Thenaet ten Roman miles east of Neapoli. It is probably W. Thena. (Θῆνα) mentioned by Ptolemy (Geog. 5, 16, 5) of the chief cities of Samaria, in connection with Neopolis. In the Talmud (Jerusalem Megillah, 1), Taahath-Shiloh is said to be identical with Shiloh, a statement which Kurtz' (Gesch. des Alt. Bundes, 2, 70) understands as meaning that Taanath was the ancient Canaanitish name of the place, and Shiloh the Hebrew name, conferred on it in token of the “rest” which allowed the tabernacle to be established there after the conquest of the country had been completed. But this is evidently conjecture arising from the probable proximity of the two places. Taanah-of-Shiloh is probably the Ain Tana seen by Robinson north-east of Mejdel (Later Res. 3, 295), and by Van de Veldee (Memoir, p. 121, although erroneously marked Meraj ed-Din on his Map), about a mile from the road between Aerabi and Mejdel, consisting of “a small tell with a ruin, on the first lower plateau into which the Ghor descends.”

## Taanath-Shiloh (2)[[@Headword:Taanath-Shiloh (2)]]

             is thought by Tristram (Bible Places, page 195) and Conder (Tent Work, 2:340) to be the present ruin Tana, seven miles south-east of Shechem, and two north of Janohoh (Yanfim), containing "foundations, caves, cistern, and rock-cut tombs" (Memoirs to Ordnance Survey, 2:245, comp. page 232).

## Taanith[[@Headword:Taanith]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Tabaoth[[@Headword:Tabaoth]]

             (Ταβαώθ v.r. Ταβώθ), a less correct form (1Es 5:29) of the name TABBAOTH SEE TABBAOTH (q.v.) of the Heb. lists (Ezr 2:43; Neh 7:46).

## Tabaraud, Matthieu Mathurin[[@Headword:Tabaraud, Matthieu Mathurin]]

             a French controversialist, was born at Limoges in 1744. He was educated by the Jesuits, was for some time professor of belles-lettres at Nantes, professor of theology and Hebrew at Arles, in 1783 superior of the college at Pdzenas, in 1787 at Rochelle, emigrated in 1791 to England, and died at Limoges, January 9, 1832. He published, Traite Historique et Critique de l'Election des Eveques (Paris, 1792, 2 volumes): — De la Necessite d'une Religion d'Etat (1803, 1804): — Principes sur la Distinction du Contrat et dut Sacrement de Mariage (1802, 1816): — Histoire de Pierre de Berulle, Fondateur de la Congregation de l'Oratoire (1817, 2 volumes). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:726, 820; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.).

## Tabbaoth[[@Headword:Tabbaoth]]

             (Heb. Tabbadth', טִבָּעוֹת, rings [Gesenius], or spots [Fiirst]; Sept. Ταββαώθ v.r. Ταβαώθ and Ταβώθ), one:of the Nethinim whose; descendants or family returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra 2, 43; Neh 7:46). B.C. ante 536.

## Tabbath[[@Headword:Tabbath]]

             (Heb. Tabbath', טִבָּת, perh. celebrated [Gesenius]; Sept. Ταβάθ v.r. Γαβάθ), a place mentioned in describing the flight of the Midianitish host after Gideon's night attack; they fled to Beth-shittah, to Zererath, to the brink of Abel-meholah on (על) Tab- bath (Jdg 7:22). As all these places were in or near the Ghor, Tabbath is probably the present Tubuhhat Fahil, i.e. “Terrace of Fahil,” a very striking natural bank, 600 feet in height, with a long horizontal and apparently flat top, which is embanked against the western face of the mountains east of the Jordan, and descends with a very steep front to the river (Robinson, Bibl. Res. 3, 325).

## Tabeal[[@Headword:Tabeal]]

             (Isa 7:6). SEE TABEIL, 1. Tab'eal (Heb. Tabeel', ט בְאֵל [in: pause Tabedl', ט בְאֵל, Isa 7:6, A. V. “Tabeal'”], God is good; Sept. Ταβεήλ), the name of two men. SEE TOBIEL.

1. The father of the unnamed person on whom Rezin, king of Syria, and Pekah, king of Israel, proposed to bestow the crown of Judah in case they succeeded in dethroning Ahaz (Isa 7:6). B.C. ante 738. Who “Tabeal's son” was is unknown, but it is conjectured that he was some factious and powerful Ephraimite (perhaps Zichri, 2Ch 28:7), who promoted the war in the hope of this result. — Kitto. The Aramaic form of the name, SEE TABRIMMON, however, has been thought to favor the supposition that he was a Syrian in the army of Rezin. The Targum of Jonathan renders the name as an appellative, “and we will make king in the midst of her him who seems good to us” (יִת מִן דנְכָשִׁר לָנָא). Rashi by Gematria turns the name into רמלא, Rimla, 1,v which apparently he would understand Remaliah.

2. An officer of the Persian government in Samaria in the reign of Artaxerxes (Ezr 4:7). B.C. 519. It has been argued that he, too, was  an Aramaean, from the fact that the letter which he and his companions wrote to the king was in the Syrian or Aramaean language. Gesenius, however (Jesa, 1, 280), thinks that he may have been a Samaritan.

## Tabellius[[@Headword:Tabellius]]

             (Ταβέλλιος), a Grsecized form (1Es 2:16) of the Heb. name (Ezr 4:7) TABEEL SEE TABEEL (q.v.).

## Taberah[[@Headword:Taberah]]

             (Heb. Taberah', תִּבְעֵרָה, consumption; Sept. ἐμπυρισμός), a place in the wilderness of Paran; so called from the fact that “the fire of Jehovah burned” (בָּעֲרָה) among the Israelites there in consequence of their complaints (Num 11:3). It lay at the next station beyond Horeb, and must therefore be sought somewhere in Wady Saal. SEE EXODE. Keil argues (Comment. ad loc.) from the expression that it was “in the uttermost part of the camp,” and from the omission of the name in Numbers 33 :that the place was identical with the station Kibroth-hattaavah next named; but he overlooks the fact that both these are separately mentioned in Deu 9:22.

## Tabering[[@Headword:Tabering]]

             (מְתֹפְפוֹת; Sept. φθεγγόμεναι; Vulg. murmurantes), an obsolete word used in the A. V. of Nah 2:7 in the sense of drumming, or making regular sounds. The Hebrew word is derived from תֹּ, “a timbrel,” and the image which it brings before us in this passage is that of the women of Nineveh, led away into captivity, mourning with the plaintive tones of doves, and beating on their breasts in anguish, as women beat upon their timbrels (comp. Psa 68:25 [26], where the same verb is used). The Sept. and Vulg., as above, make no attempt at giving the exact meaning. The Targum of Jonathan gives a word which, like the Hebrew, has the meaning of “tympanizantes.” The A.V., in like manner, reproduces the original idea of the words. The “tabour” or “tabor” was a musical instrument of the drum type, which with the pipe formed the band of a country village. We retain a trace at once of the word and of the thing in the “tabourine” or “tambourine” of modern music, in the “tabret” of the A.V. and older English writers. To “tabour,” accordingly, is to beat with loud strokes as men beat upon such an instrument. The verb is found in  this sense in Beaumont and Fletcher, The Tamer Tamed (“I would tabor he”), and answers with a singular felicity to the exact meaning of the Hebrew. See Plumptre, Bible Educator, 4:210.

## Tabernacle[[@Headword:Tabernacle]]

             is the rendering, in the A. V., of the following Heb. and Gr. words;

1. אֹהֶל, ohel, the most frequent term, but often signifying and rendered a common “tent;”

2. משְֹׁכָּן, mishken, the distinctive term, always so rendered, except (“dwelling”) in 1Ch 6:32; Job 18:21; Job 21:28; Job 39:6; Psa 26:8; Psa 49:11; Psa 74:7; Psa 87:2; Isa 32:18; Jer 9:19; Jer 30:8; Jer 51:30; Eze 25:4; Heb 1:6; (“habitation”) 2Ch 29:6; Psa 78:28; Psa 132:5; Isa 22:16; Isa 54:2; (“tent”) Son 1:8;

3. סֹךְ [once שׂךְ, Lam 2:6], suk (Psa 76:2), סֻכָּה, sukkah (Lev 23:34; Deu 16:13; Deu 16:16; Deu 31:10; 2Ch 8:13; Ezr 3:4; Job 36:29; Isa 4:6; Amo 9:11; Zec 14:16; Zec 14:18-19), or סַכּוּת, sikkuth (Amo 5:26), all meaning a booth, as often rendered;

4. σκηνή, σκῆνος (2Co 5:1; 2Co 5:4) or σκήνωμα (Act 7:46 [rather habitation]; 2Pe 1:13-14), a tent. Besides occasional use for an ordinary dwelling, the term is specially employed to designate the first sacred edifice of the Hebrews prior to the time of Solomon; fully called אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד, the tent of meeting, or (especially in Numbers) מַשְׁכִּן הָעֵדוּת, tabernacle of the congregation (Sept. σκηνὴ) [1Ki 8:4; 1Ki 8:6, σκήνωμα] τοῦ μαρτυρίου; Philo, ἱερὸν φορητόν, Opp. 2 146; Josephus, μεταφερόμενος καὶ συμπερινοστῶν ναός, Ant. 3, 6, 1). (In the discussion of this interesting subject we have availed ourselves of MS. contributions from Prof. T Paine, LL.D., author of Solomon's Temple, etc., in addition to the suggestions in the book itself. For an exhaustive treatment we refer to the most recent Volume and charts, entitled The Tabernacle of Israel in the Desert, by Prof. James Strong, Providence, 1888.)

I. Terms and Synonyms. —

1. The first word thus used (Exo 25:9) is מַשְׁכָּן, mishkan, from

שָׁכִן, to lie down or dwell, and thus itself equivalent to dwelling. It connects itself with the Jewish, though not scriptural, word Shechinah (q.v.), as describing the dwelling place of the divine glory. It is noticeable, however, that it is not applied in prose to the common dwellings of men, the tents of the patriarchs in Genesis, or those of Israel in the wilderness. It seems to belong rather to the speech of poetry (Psa 87:2; Son 1:8). The loftier character of the word may obviously have helped to determine its religious use, and justifies translators who have the choice of synonyms like “tabernacle” and “tent” in a like preference. In its application to the sacred building, it denotes (a) the ten tri-colored curtains; (b) the forty-eight planks supporting them; (c) the whole building, including the roof. SEE DWELLING.

2. Another word, however, is also used, more connected with the common life of men; אֹהֶל, ohel, the tent of the patriarchal age, of Abraham and of Isaac and of Jacob (Gen 9:21, etc.). For the most part, as needing something to raise it, it is used, when applied to the sacred tent, with some distinguishing epithet. In one passage only (1Ki 1:39) does it appear with this meaning by itself. The Sept., not distinguishing between the two words, gives σκηνή for both. The original difference appears to have been that אֹהֶל represented the uppermost covering, the black goats-hair roof, which was strictly a tent, in distinction from the lower upright house-like part built of boards. The two words are accordingly sometimes joined, as in Exo 39:32; Exo 40:2; Exo 6:29 (A.V. “the tabernacle of the tent”). Even here, however, the Sept. gives σκηνή only, with the exception of the var. lect. of ἡ σκηνὴ τῆς σκεπῆς in Exo 40:29. In its application to the tabernacle, the term ohel means (a) the tent-roof of goats-hair; (b) the whole building. SEE TENT.

3. בִּיַת, bayith, house (οικος, domus), is applied to the tabernacle in Exo 23:19; Exo 34:26; Jos 6:24; Jos 9:23; Jdg 18:31; Jdg 20:18, as it had been, apparently, to the tents of the patriarchs (Gen 33:17).

So far as it differs from the two preceding words, it expresses more definitely the idea of a fixed settled habitation. It was therefore fitter for the sanctuary of Israel after the people were settled in Canaan than during their wanderings. For us the chief interest of the word lies in its having descended from a yet older order, the first word ever applied in the Old  Test. to a local sanctuary, Bethel, “the house of God” (Gen 28:17; Gen 28:22), keeping its place, side by side, with other words — tent, tabernacle, palace, temple, synagogue-and at last outliving all of them; rising, in the Christian Ecclesia, to yet higher uses (1Ti 3:15). SEE HOUSE.

4. קֹדֶשׁ, kódesh, or מַקְדָּשׁ. mikdash (ἁγίασμα, ἁγιαστήριον, τὸ ἃγιον, τὰ ἃγια, sanctuarium'), the holy, consecrated place, and therefore applied, according to the graduated scale of holiness of which the tabernacle bore witness, sometimes to the whole structure (Exo 25:8; Lev 12:4), sometimes to the court into which none but the priests might enter (Lev 4:6; Num 3:38; Num 4:12), sometimes to the innermost sanctuary of ail, the Holy of Hohes. (Lev 16:2). Here also the word had an earlier starting-point and a far-reaching history. En-Mishpat, the city of judgment, the seat of some old oracle, had been also Kadesh, the sanctuary (Gen 14:7; Ewald, Gesch. Isr. 2, 307). The name El-Kuds still clings to the walls of Jerusalem. SEE SANCTUARY.

5. הֵיכָל, heykal, temple (ναός, templum), as meaning the stately building, or palace of Jehovah (1Ch 29:1; 1Ch 29:19), is applied more commonly to the Temple (2Ki 24:13, etc.), but was used also (probably at the period when the thought of the Temple had affected the religious nomenclature of the time) of the tabernacle at Shiloh. (1Sa 1:9; 1Sa 3:3) and Jerusalem (Psa 5:7). In either case the thought which the word embodies is that the “tent,” the “house,” is royal, the dwelling-place of the great king. SEE TEMPLE.

The first two of the above words receive a new meaning in combination with מוֹעֵד(moed), and with הָעֵדוּת(ha-eduth). To understand the full meaning of the distinctive titles thus formed is to possess the key to the significance of the whole tabernacle.

(a.) The primary force of יָעִדis “to meet by appointment,” and the phrase אֹהֶל מוֹעֵדhas therefore the meaning of “a place of or for a fixed meeting.” Acting on the belief that the meeting in this case was that of the worshippers, the A.V. has uniformly rendered it by “tabernacle of the congregation” (so Seb. Schmidt, “tentorium convents;” and Luther, “Stiftshutte” in which Stift = Pfarrkirche) while the Sept. and Vulg., confounding it with the other epithet, have rendered both by ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου, and “tabernaculum testimonii.” None of these renderings,  however, bring out the real meaning of the word. This is to be found in what may be called the locus classicus, ῥas the interpretation of all words connected with the tabernacle. “This shall be a continual burnt-offering at the door of the tabernacle of meeting (מוֹעֵד) where I will meet you (אַוָּעֵד, γνωσθήσομαι) to speak there unto thee. And there will I meet (נֹעִדנְתּי, τάξομαι) with the children of Israel. And I will sanctify (קַדִּשְׁתַּי) the tabernacle of meeting... and I will dwell (שָׁכִנְתַּי) among the children of Israel, and will be their God. And they shall know that I am the Lord their God” (Exo 29:42-46). The same central thought occurs in Exo 25:22, “There I will meet with thee” (comp. also 30:6, 36; Num 17:4). It is clear, therefore, that “congregation” is inadequate. Not the gathering of the worshippers, but the meeting of God with his people, to commune with them, to make himself known to them, was what the name embodied. Ewald has accordingly suggested Offenbarungszelt= tent of revelation, as the best equivalent (Alterthümer, p. 130). This made the place a sanctuary. Thus it was that the tent was the dwelling, the house of God (Bahr, Symb. 1, 81). SEE CONGREGATION.

(b.) The other compound phrase, אֹהֶל הָעֵדנְת, as connected with עוּד(= to bear witness), is rightly rendered by ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου, tabernaculum testimonii, die Wohnung des Zeugnisses, “the tent of the testimony” (Num 9:15) “the tabernacle of witness” (Num 17:7; Num 18:2). In this case the tent derives its name from that which is the center of its holiness. The two tables of stone within the ark are emphatically the testimony (Exo 25:16; Exo 25:21; Exo 31:18). They were to all Israel the abiding witness of the nature and will of God. The tent, by virtue of its relation to them, became the witness of its own significance as the meeting-place of God and man. The probable connection of the two distinct names, in sense as well as in sound (Bahr, Synb. 1, 83; Ewald, Alt. p. 230), gave, of course, a force to each which no translation can represent. SEE TESTIMONY.

II. History. —

1. We may distinguish in the Old Test. three sacred tabernacles:

(1.) The Ante-Sinaitic, which was probably the dwelling of Moses, and was placed by the camp of the Israelites in the desert, for the transaction of public business. Exo 33:7-10, “Moses took the tabernacle, and pitched it without the camp, afar off from the camp, and called it the  Tabernacle of the Congregation. And it came to pass, that every one which sought the Lord went out unto the tabernacle of the congregation, which was without the camp. And it came to pass, when Moses went out unto the tabernacle, that all the people rose up, and stood every man at his tent- door, and looked after Moses until he was gone into the tabernacle. And it came to pass, as Moses entered into the tabernacle, the cloudy pillar descended, and stood at the door of the tabernacle, and the Lord talked with Moses. And all the people saw the cloudy pillar stand at the tabernacle-door: and all the people rose up and worshipped, every one in his tent-door.” This was neither the sanctuary of the tabernacle described in ch. 25 sq., which was not made till after the perfect restoration of the covenant (ch. 35 sq.), nor another sanctuary that had come down from their forefathers and was used before the tabernacle proper was built (as Le Clerc, J. D. Michaelis, and Rosenmüller supposed); but an ordinary tent used for the occasion and purpose (Keil, Comment. ad loc.).

(2.) The Sinaitic tabernacle superseded the tent which had served for the transaction of public business probably from the beginning of the Exode. This was constructed by Bezaleel and Aholiab as a portable mansion- house, guildhall, and cathedral, and set up on the first day of the first month in the second year after leaving Egypt. Of this alone we have accurate descriptions. It was the second of these sacred tents, which, as the most important, is called the tabernacle par excellence. Moses was commanded by Jehovah to have it erected in the Arabian desert, by voluntary contributions of the Israelites, who carried it about with them in their migrations until after the conquest of Canaan, when it remained stationary for longer periods in various towns of Palestine (as below).

(3.) The Davidic tabernacle was erected by David, in Jerusalem, for the reception of the ark (2Sa 6:12); while the old tabernacle remained to the days of Solomon at Gibeon, together with the brazen altar, as the place where sacrifices were offered (1Ch 16:39; 2Ch 1:3).

2. Varied Fortunes of the Sinaitic Tabernacle.

(1.) In the Wilderness. —The outward history of the tabernacle begins with Exodus 25. It comes after the first great group of laws (ch. 19-23), after the covenant with the people, after the vision of the divine glory (ch. 24). For forty days and nights Moses is in the mount. Before him there lay a problem, as measured by human judgment, of gigantic difficulty. In what fit  symbols was he to embody the great truths without which the nation would sink into brutality? In what way could those symbols be guarded against the evil which he had seen in Egypt, of idolatry the most degrading? He was not left to solve the problem for himself. There rose before him, not without points of contact with previous associations, yet in no degree formed out of them, the “pattern” of the tabernacle. The lower analogies of the painter and the architect seeing, with their inward eye, their completed work before the work itself begins, may help us to understand how it was that the vision on the mount included all details of form, measurement, materials, the order of the ritual, the apparel of the priests. lie is directed in his choice of the two chief artists, Bezaleel of the tribe of Judah, Aholiab of the tribe of Daniel (Exodus 31). The sin, of the golden calf apparently postpones the execution. For a moment it seems as if the people were to be left without the Divine Presence itself without any recognized symbol of it (Exo 33:3). As in a transition period, the whole future depending on the patience of the people, on the intercession of their leader, a tent is pitched (probably that of Moses himself, which had hitherto been the headquarters of consultation), outside the camp, to be provisionally the tabernacle of meeting. There the mind of the lawgiver enters into ever-closer fellowship with the mind of God (Exo 33:11), learns to think of him as “merciful and gracious” (Exo 34:6); in the strength of that thought is led back to the fulfillment of the plan which had seemed likely to end, as it began, in vision. Of this provisional tabernacle it has to be noticed that there was as yet no ritual and no priesthood. The people went out to it as to an oracle (Exo 33:7). Joshua, though of the tribe of Ephraim, had free access to it (Exo 33:11).

Another outline law was, however, given; another period of solitude, like the first; followed. The work could now be resumed. The people offered the necessary materials in excess of what was wanted (Exo 36:5-6). Other workmen (Exo 36:2) and workwomen (Exo 35:25) placed themselves under the direction of Bezaleel and Aholiab. The parts were completed separately, and then, on the first day of the second year from the Exode, the tabernacle itself was erected and the ritual appointed for it begun (Exo 40:2).

The position of the new tent was itself significant. It stood, not, like the provisional tabernacle, at a distance from the camp, but in its very center. The multitude of Israel, hitherto scattered with no fixed order, were now, within a month of its erection (Num 2:2), grouped round it, as  around the dwelling of the unseen Captain of the Host, in a fixed order, according to their tribal rank. The priests on the east, the other three families of the Levites on the other sides, were closest in attendance, the “body-guard” of the Great King. SEE LEVITE. In the wider square, Judah, Zebulun, Issachar, were on the east; Ephraim, Manasseh, Benjamin, on the west; the less conspicuous tribes, Dan, Asher, Naphtali, on the north; Reuben, Simeon, Gad, on the south side. When the army put itself in order of march, the position of the tabernacle, carried by the Levites, was still central, the tribes of the east and south in front, those of the north and west in the rear (ch. 2). Upon it there rested the symbolic cloud, dark by day and fiery-red by night (Exo 40:38). When the cloud removed, the host knew that it was the signal for them to go forward (Exo 40:36-37; Num 9:17). As long as it remained — whether for a day, or month, or year they continued where they were (Exo 40:15-23). Each march, it must be remembered, involved the breaking up of the whole structure, all the parts being carried on wagons by the three Levitical families of Kohath, Gershon, and Merari, while the “sons of Aaron” prepared for the removal by covering everything in the Holy of Holies with a purple cloth (Exo 4:6-15). SEE ENCAMPMENT.

In all special facts connected with the tabernacle, the original thought reappears. It is the place where man meets with God. There the Spirit “comes upon” the seventy elders, and they prophesy (Num 11:24-25). Thither Aaron and Miriam are called out when they rebel against the servant of the Lord (Num 12:4). There the “glory of the Lord” appears after the unfaithfulness of the twelve spies (Num 14:10) and the rebellion of Korah and his company (Num 16:19; Num 16:42) and the sin of Meribah (Num 20:6). Thither, when there is no sin to punish, but a difficulty to be met, do the daughters of Zelophe had come to bring their cause “before the Lord” (Num 27:2). There, when the death of Moses draws near, is the solemn “charge” given to his successor (Deu 31:14).

(2.) In Palestine. — As long as Canaan remained unconquered and the people were still therefore an army, the tabernacle was probably moved from place to place, wherever the host of Israel was for the time encampedat Gilgal (Jos 4:19), in the valley between Ebal and Gerizim (Jos 8:30-35), again, at the headquarters of Gilgaal (Jos 9:6; Jos 10:15; Jos 10:43); and, finally, as at “the place which the Lord had chosen,” at Shiloh (Jos 9:27; Jos 18:1). The reasons of this last  choice are not given. Partly, perhaps, its central position, partly its belonging to the powerful tribe of Ephraim, the tribe of the great captain of the host, may have determined the preference. There it continued during the whole period of the judges, the gathering-point for “the heads of the fathers” of the tribes (Jos 19:51), for councils of peace or war (Jos 22:12; Jdg 21:12), for annual solemn dances, in which the women of Shiloh were conspicuous (Jdg 21:21). There, too, as the religion of Israel sank towards the level of an orgiastic heathenism, troops of women assembled, shameless as those of Midian, worshippers of Jehovah, and, like the ἱερόδουλοι of heathen temples, concubines of his priests (1Sa 2:22). It was far, however, from being what it was intended to be, the one national sanctuary, the witness against a localized and divided worship. The old religion of the high places kept its ground. Altars were erected, at first under protest, and with reserve, as being not for sacrifice (Jos 22:26), afterwards freely and without scruple (Jdg 6:24; Jdg 13:19). Of the names by which the one special sanctuary was known at this period, those of the “house” and the “temple” of Jehovah (1Sa 1:9; 1Sa 1:24; 1Sa 3:3; 1Sa 3:15) are most prominent.

A state of things which was rapidly assimilating the worship of Jehovah to that of Ashtaroth or Mylitta needed to be broken up. The ark of God was taken, and the sanctuary lost its glory; and the tabernacle, though it did not perish, never again recovered it (1Sa 4:22). Samuel, at once the Luther and the Alfred of Israel, who had grown up within its precincts, treats it as an abandoned shrine (so Psa 78:60), and sacrifices elsewhere-at Mizpeh (1Sa 7:9), at Ramah (1Sa 9:12; 1Sa 10:3), at Gilgal (1Sa 10:8; 1Sa 11:15). It probably became once again a movable sanctuary; less honored, as no longer possessing the symbol of the Divine Presence, yet cherished by the priesthood, and some portions at least of its ritual kept up. For a time it seems, under Saul, to have been settled at Nob (1Sa 21:1-6)., which thus became what it had not been before — a priestly city. The massacre of the priests and the flight of Abiathar must, however, have robbed it yet further of its glory. It had before lost the ark. It now lost the presence of the high-priest, and with it the oracular ephod, the Urim and Thummim (1Sa 22:20; 1Sa 23:6). What change of fortune then followed we do not know.

The fact that all Israel was encamped, in the last days of Saul, at Gilboa, and that there Saul, though without success, inquired of the Lord by Urim (1Sa 28:4-6), makes it probable that the tabernacle, as of old, was in the encampment,  and that Abiathar had returned to it. In some way or other it found its way to Gibeon (1Ch 16:39). The anomalous separation of the two things which, in the original order, had been joined brought about yet greater anomalies, and while the ark remained at Kirjath-jearim, the tabernacle at Gibeon connected itself with the worship of the high-places (1Ki 3:2). The capture of Jerusalem, and the erection there of a new tabernacle, with the ark, of which the old had been deprived (2Sa 6:17; 1Ch 15:1), left it little more than a traditional, historical sanctity. It retained only the old altar of burnt-offerings (1Ch 21:29). Such as it was, however, neither king nor people could bring themselves to sweep it away. The double service went on; Zadok, as high- priest, officiated at Gibeon (1Ch 16:39); the more recent, more prophetic service of psalms and hymns and music, under Asaph, gathered round the tabernacle at Jerusalem (1Ch 16:4; 1Ch 16:37). The divided worship continued all the days of David. The sanctity of both places was recognized by Solomon on his accession (1 Kings 3, 15; 2Ch 1:3). But it was time that the anomaly should cease. As long as it was simply tent against tent, it was difficult to decide between them. The purpose of David, fulfilled by Solomon, was that the claims of both should merge in the higher glory of the Temple. Some, Abiathar probably among them, clung to the old order, in this as in other things; but the final day at last came, and the tabernacle of meeting was either taken down or left to perish and-be forgotten. So a page in the religious history of Israel was closed. Thus the disaster of Shiloh led to its natural consummation.

III. Description. — The written authorities four the restoration of the tabernacle are, first, the detailed account to be found in Exodus 26 and repeated in Exo 36:8-38, without any variation beyond the slightest possible abridgment; secondly, the account given of the building by Josephus (Ant. 3, 6), which is so nearly a repetition of the account found in the Bible, that we may feel assured that he had no really important authority before him except the one which is equally accessible to us. Indeed, we might almost put his account on one side if it were not that, being a Jew, and so much nearer the time, he may have had access to some traditional accounts which may have enabled him to realize its appearance more readily than we can do, and his knowledge of Hebrew technical terms may have assisted him to understand what we might otherwise be unable to explain. The additional indications contained in the Talmud and in Philo are so few and indistinct,  and are, besides, of such doubtful authenticity, that they practically add nothing to our knowledge, and may safely be disregarded.

For a complicated architectural building, these written authorities probably would not suffice without some remains or other indications to supplement them; but the arrangements of the tabernacle were so simple that they are really all that are required. Every important dimension was either five cubits or a multiple of five cubits, and all the arrangements in plan were either squares or double squares, so that there is, in fact, no difficulty in putting the whole together, and none would ever have occurred, were it not that the dimensions of the sanctuary, as obtained from the “boards” that formed its walls, appear at first sight to be one thing, while those obtained from the dimensions of the curtains Which covered it appear to give another. The apparent discrepancy is, however, easily explained, as we shall presently see, and never would have occurred to any one who had lived long under canvas or was familiar with the exigencies of tent architecture.

The following close translation of Exodus 26 will set the subject generally before the reader. We have indicated, by the use of italics, marked variations from the A.V.

1. And the tabernacle (מַשְׁכָּן) thou shalt make ten curtains; twisted linen, and violet and purple and crimson of cochineal: cherubs, work of (an) artificer, thou shalt

2. make them. (The) length of the one curtain (shall be) eight and twenty by the cubit, and (the breadth) four by the cubit, the one curtain: one measure (shall be)

3. to all the curtains. Five of the curtains shall be joining each to its fellow, and five of the curtains joining

4. each to its fellow. And thou shalt make loops (לוּל) of violet upon (the) edge of the one curtain from (the) end in the joining, and so shall thou make in (the) edge

5. of the endmost curtain in the second joining: fifty loops shalt thou. make in the one curtain, and fifty loops shalt thou make in (the) end of the curtain which is in the second joining, the loops standing opposite (מִקְבַּלוֹת)

6. the one to its fellow. And thou shalt make fifty taches I (קֵרֶס) of gold, and thou shalt join the curtains one to its fellow with the taches, and the tabernacle shall be one.

7. And thou shalt make curtains of goats (hair) for a tent (אֹהֶל) upon the tabernacle, eleven curtains shalt

8. thou make them. (The) length of the one curtain (shall be) thirty by the cubit, and (the) breadth four by the cubit, the one curtain: one measure (shall be) to

9. (the) eleven curtains. And thou shalt join five of the curtains separately, and six of the curtains separately; and thou shalt double the sixth curtain towards (the)

10. fore front of the tent. And thou shalt make fifty loops upon (the) edge of the one curtain-the endmost in the joining, and fifty loops upon (the) edge of the cur-

11. tain — the second joining. And thou shalt make taches of copper-fifty; and shalt bring the taches in the loops, and thou shalt join the tent, and (it) shall be

12. one. And (the) overplus hang in (the) curtains of the tent- half of the overplus curtain shall hang upon

13. the back of the tabernacle; and the cubit from this (side) and the cubit from that (side) in the overplus in (the) length of (the) curtains of the tent shall be hung, upon (the) sides of the tabernacle from this (side) and from that (side), to cover it.

14. And thou shalt make (a) covering to the tent, skins of rams reddened, and (a) covering of skins of tach-ashes from above.

15. And thou shalt make the planks (קֶרֶשׁ) for the tabernacle, trees [wood] of acacias (שַׁטַים), standing.

16. Ten cubits (shall he the) length of the plank; and (a) cubit and (the) half of the cubit (the) breadth of the

17. one plank. Two hands [teons] (shall there be) to the one plank, joined (מְשְׁלָּבוֹת, others corresponding) [comp. Exo 36:22] each to its fellow: so shalt thou

18. make [or do] for all (the) planks of the tabernacle. And thou shalt make the planks for the tabernacle, twenty planks for (the) Nogeb [south] quarter towards Tey-

19. man [the south]. And forty bases (אֶדֶן) of silver shalt thou make under the twenty planks, two bases under the one plank four its two hands, and two bases under

20. the one [next] plank for its two hands., And for the second rib [flank] of the tabernacle to (the) Tsaphrnm

21. [north] quarter (there shall be) twenty planks; and their forty bases of silver, two bases under the one plank, and two bases under the one [next] plank.

22. And for (the) thighs [rear] of the tabernacle seaward

23. [west] thou shalt make six planks. And two planks shalt thou make for (the) angles (מַקְצוֹע, cutting off)

24. of the tabernacle in the thighs [rear]: and (they) shall be twinned (תֹּאֲמַים, perhaps jointed, hinged, or bolted) from below together, and shall be twins upon its head [top] towards the one ring: so shall (it) be too both of them; for the two angles shall (they) be.

25. And (there) shall be eight planks, and their bases of silver-sixteen bases, two bases under the one plank, and two bases under the one [next] plank.

26. And thou shalt make bars (בְּרַיחִ) of trees [wood] of acacias [Shittim]; five for (the) planks of the one rib

27. [flank] of the tabernacle, and five bars for (the) planks of the second rib [flank] of the tabernacle, and five bars for (the) planks of (the) rib [flank] of the taber-

28. nacle for the thighs [rear] seaward [west]. And the middle bar, in (the) middle of the planks (shall) bar (מִבְרַיחִ, be bolting through) from the end to the end.

29. And the planks thou shalt overlay (with) gold, and the rings then shalt make (of) gold, (as) houses [places] for the bars; and thou shalt overlay the bars (with) gold.

30. And thou shalt rear the tabernacle like it — judgment [style] which I made thee see in the mountain.

1. The court (חָצֵר) was a large rectangular enclosure, open to the sky, and with its entrance at the east end. Its dimensions are given more than once, being 100 cubits long and 50' broad. Its construction was very simple, being composed of a frame of four sides of distinct pillars, with curtains hung upon them. In other words, it was surrounded by canvas screens-in the East called kannats, and still universally used to enclose the private apartments of important personages. The pillars were probably of shittim- wood (that is, the desert acacia), a light, close-grained, imperishable wood, easily taking on a fine natural polish, though it is nowhere directly intimated of what material they were; they were five cubits in height (sufficient to prevent a person from looking over them into the enclosure), but their other dimensions are not given, so that we cannot be sure whether they were round (Ewald) or four-cornered (Bähr), probably the latter. At the bottom these pillars were protected or shod by sockets of brass (copper). It is not quite easy to say whether these sockets were merely for protection, and perhaps ornament, or if they also helped to give stability to the pillar. In the latter case, we may conceive the socket to have been of the shape of a hollow wedge or pointed funnel driven into the ground, and then the end of the pillar pushed down into its cavity; or they may have been simply plate laid on the ground, with a hole for the reception of the tenoned foot of the pillar, as in the case of the “boards” noticed below.

Other appliances were used to give the structure firmness, viz. the common articles of tent architecture, ropes and pins (Exo 35:18). At the top these pillars had a capital or head (Exo 38:17, chapter), which was overlaid with silver; but whether the body of the pillar was plated with any metal is not said. Connected with the head of the pillar were two other articles, hooks, and things called חֲשֻׁקַים, chashukim, rendered “fillets,” i.e. ornamental chaplets in relief round the pillar (so Ewald, Alterthümer, p. 335, note 5), but most probably meaning rods (so Gesenius, Fürst, and others), joining one pillar to another. These rods were laid upon the hooks, and served to attach the hangings to and suspend them from. The hooks and rods were silver, though Knobel conjectures the latter must have been merely plated (Exodus p. 278). The mode of adjusting these hangings was similar to that of the doorway screens and “vail” described below. The  circumference of the enclosure thus formed was 300 cubits, and the number of pillars is said to have been 20 + 20 + 10 + 10 = 60, which would give between every two pillars a space of 3-0 =5 cubits. There has been considerable difficulty in accurately conceiving the method adopted by the writer in calculating these pillars. This difficulty arises from the corner pillars, each of which, of course, belongs both to the side and to the end. It has been supposed by many, that the author calculated each one corner pillar twice; that is, considered it, though one in itself, as a pillar of the side and also as a pillar of the end. This would make in all 56 actual pillars, and, of course, as many spaces (Biahr, Knobel, etc.); that is, nineteen spaces on each side, and nine on the end. Now since the side was 100 cubits and the end 50, this would give for each side space 10'=5 and for each end space 54=5 cubits, spaces artificial in themselves and unlike each other. It is certainly most probable that the spaces of side and end were of exactly the same size, and that each of them was some exact, and no fractional, number of cubits. The difficulty may be completely removed by assuming the distance of 5 cubits to each space, and counting as in the accompanying ground-plan. Thus, since each side was 100 cubits, this needs twenty spaces. But twenty spaces need twenty-one pillars.

So that, supposing us to start from the south-east corner and go along the south side, we should have for 100 cubits twenty-one pillars and twenty spaces; but of these we should count twenty spaces and pillars for the south side, and call the south-west corner pillar, not the twenty-first pillar of the side, but the first of the end. Then going up the end, we should count ten pillars and spaces as end, but consider the north-west corner pillar not as eleventh of the end, but first of the north side; and so on. In this way we gain sixty pillars and as many spaces, and have each space exactly 5 cubits. The hangings- (קַלָעַים, kelaim') of the court were of twined shesh; that is, a fabric woven out of twisted yarn of the material called shesh. This word, which properly means white, is rendered by our version “fine linen,'” a rendering with which most concur, while some decide for cotton. At all events, the curtains were a strong fabric of this glancing white material, and were hung upon the pillars, most likely outside, though that is not known, being attached to the pillar sat the top by the hooks and rods already described, while the whole was stayed by pins and cords, like a tent. The entrance, which was situated in the center of the east end and was twenty cubits in extent, was formed also of a hanging (technically מָסָךְ, masak) of “blue, purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen, work of the רוֹקֵ, roken” (A.V.  “needle-work”). The last word has usually been considered to mean embroiderer with the needle, and the curtain fancied to have had figures, flowers, etc., of the mentioned colors wrought into it. But such kinds of work have always a “wrong” side, and, most probably taking into account the meaning of the word in Arabic, and the fondness of the Arabs at this day for striped blankets, the word means “weaver of striped cloth,” and the hanging is to be conceived as woven with lines or stripes of blue, purple, and scarlet an the white ground of shesh (Knobel, Keil, etc.). In other words, the warp, or longitudinal threads, was of white linen, while the woof made cross-bars (which would hang vertically) of brilliantly dyed wool in a treble thread. They were merely spun and woven, without gold or embroidered figures. The furniture of the court consisted of the altar of burnt-offering and the laver. These are sufficiently described under their appropriate headings. SEE ALTAR; SEE LAVER. What concerns us is the position of them. In all probability, the tabernacle proper stood with its entrance exactly in the middle of the court, that is, fifty cubits from the entrance of the court; and very possibly the altar of burnt-offering stood, again, midway between the door of the court and that of the tabernacle, i.e. twenty-five cubits from each, and somewhere in the twenty-five cubits between the altar and the tabernacle stood the laver (Josephus, Ant. 3, 6, 2).

2. The Tabernacle itself – Following the method pursued with the outer court, we begin with the walls. These were built of boards, or, rather, planks (קְרָשַׁים, kerashim), in close contact with each other. They were of shittim-wood, overlaid with gold on both sides, ten cubits high and one and a half cubit broad, their thickness being nowhere given. From the foot of each plank came out two “tenons” (יָדוֹת, yadoth-hands), which must not be conceived as connecting the planks with each other laterally, as if there corresponded to a tenon in one plank a mortise in another; they were for connecting each particular plank with the ground, and must be conceived as two wedge-shaped or pointed pieces (probably of copper, or perhaps of  silver); projecting from the lower end of the plank. These tenons were thrust into silver sockets, of which two were prepared for each plank, each socket being the weight of a talent of silver. Whether these sockets were wedge shaped or pointed, and themselves went into the ground, or whether they were mere foot-plates for the plank, with holes for the tenons to pass through into the ground (the last more probable), is not intimated. Prof. Paine has ingeniously suggested the thickness of these sockets as one sixth of a cubit, SEE METROLOGY, and likewise their form (half a cubit square), as in the adjoining cut. He also calculates from this size of the sockets, or foot-plates, that the planks should be (as Josephus says) one third of a span, i.e. one sixth of a cubit thick (which is quite sufficient for strength), in order to turn the corners neatly as illustrated in the subjoined cut. This might indeed have been effected on the supposition that the planks were one cubit thick as the accompanying cut will show; but we can hardly suppose that the planks overhung the bases which supported them. These bases did not require to enter deeply into the ground, as there was no lateral strain upon them, and the whole weight of the building kept them firmly in their place. Their only object was to keep the bottom of the planks level and even. The upper ends of the planks, however, needed to be kept from separating, as they would certainly do under the traction of the stay- cords fore and aft. Hence the tenons mentioned in Exo 26:17 are carefully distinguished from those (already described) referred to in Exo 26:19; and they are designated (without any sockets assigned to them) by a peculiar term, מַשֻׁלָּבוֹת, meshullaboth, which occurs here only. It is regarded by Gesenius as radically signifying notched, but he understands it here as meaning joined, a sense in which Furst and Milhlau emphatically concur, to the exclusion of that adopted by the Sept. (ἀντιπίπτοντες) and the A.V. (“set in order”). Prof. Paine refers the term to the top of the planks, and renders it clasped, understanding a separate plate with holes corresponding to pins or tenons (probably all of copper) in the upper end of the planks likewise, as in the annexed cut. This is an essential provision for the stability of the structure, of which no one else seems to have thought. Nevertheless, as he privately informs us, he has since abandoned this distinction between the top and bottom tenons, and in his forthcoming second edition he will dispense with the clasps. The long middle bar, if pinned to each end plank, would subserve a similar purpose. Something of this sort is perhaps intimated by the bolting (מִבְרַיחִ, לַבְרֹחִ) of Exo 26:28; Exo 36:33. The roof-curtains would likewise assist in holding the planks together.

Of these boards, which, being one and a half cubit, i.e. about two and a half feet broad, must have been formed of several smaller ones jointed together, there were twenty on the north and twenty on the south side, thus making each side the length of thirty cubits. For the west end were made six boards, yielding nine cubits, and in addition two boards for the corners (Exo 26:22 sq.), making in all eight boards and twelve cubits; and as the end is thought (so Josephus, Ant. 3, 6, 3) to have been ten cubits (proportionate to that in Solomon's Temple, 1Ki 6:2; 1Ki 6:20), this would imply that each corner plank added half a cubit to the width, but nothing to the length, the measurements being taken inside. Were the planks supposed a cubit thick, which is the usual calculation (but an extravagant one on account of the weight), the remaining cubit of the corner plank would exactly cover the thickness of the side plank. The description given of the corners is exceedingly perplexing, and the diversity of opinion is naturally great. The difficulties all lie in Exo 26:24. It goes on, “they shall be coupled together;” rather, they shall be “twins,” or “twinned” (תֹּאֲמַם, toamim). “They” evidently refers to the corner planks; and, setting aside the idea that they make twins together, which cannot be, since they are at opposite corners, the expression may mean that each corner plank of itself makes twins, which it would do if it had two legs containing the angle between them. If the corner plank be two-legged, it adds necessarily something to the length, and thus destroys the measurement.

One explanation is therefore to regard the end of the corner plank, e, as twin, i.e. corresponding to the side plank a. Further, each corner plank must be “entire (תִּמַּים, tammim) at or on its head (A. V., with many others, considers tammim the same as todnim). Now if the “head” be not the top of the plank, but the edge or point of the corner; then the statement implies that the corner plank of the end wall, though prolonging the side wall outside, must not be cut away or sloped, for example, in the fashion indicated by the dotted lines c d. Once more, the words are added “unto one ring,” accurately “unto the first ring.” Keil (Comment. ad loc.) understands that “the two corner boards at the back were to consist of two pieces joined together at a right angle, so as to form, as double boards, one single whole from the top to the bottom,” and that “one ring was placed half-way up the upright board in the corner or  angle, in such a manner that the central bolt, which stretched along the entire length of the walls, might fasten into it from both the side and back.” Murphy (Comment. ad loc.) suggests a form which we represent by the annexed figure. But Paine's arrangement, as in the cut below, seems to us to meet all the requirements of the case in the simplest and most effectual manner. The ring and staples at the top and bottom of the corner planks formed a hinge, so that the adjoining planks were twinned, or carried together as one. That the end planks went in between the last side planks (as neatness and usage in such structures dictated), making the interior width of the tabernacle the full twelve cubits, is probable from the length of the roof-curtains presently described, if they were longitudinally arranged.

The walls or planks, in addition to the stability they may have derived from the sockets at the bottom (and perhaps the clasps at the top), were bound together by five bars or bolts, thrust into rings attached to each plank. These bars, in all probability, ran along the outside, though that is not intimated, and Ewald thinks otherwise. One bar is said to have gone in the middle (בְּתוֹךְ): this is usually taken to mean half-way up the plank, and with two bars on each side of it, above and below; but some interpret “through the heart of the boards” (Riggenbach), and others understand it of the rear bar alone. Thus there seem to have been three rows of bars, the top and bottom one on each of the sides being in two pieces. Josephus's account is somewhat different: “Every one,” he says (Ant. 3, 6, 3), “of the pillars or boards had a ring of gold affixed to its front outwards, into which were inserted bars gilt with gold, each of them five cubits long, and these bound together the boards; the head of one bar running into another after the manner of one tenon inserted into another. But for the wall behind there was only one bar that went through all the boards, into which one of the ends of the bars on both sides was inserted.” The whole edifice was doubtless further stayed by ropes attached to tent-pins in the ground from knobs on the outside of the planks. (See below.)

3. Drapery of the Tabernacle. —The wooden structure was completed as well as adorned by four kinds of hangings, each of which served a useful and even needful purpose.

(1.) The Roof. — The first question that arises here is whether the roof was flat, like that of Oriental houses, or peaked and slanting, as in Occidental buildings. The old representations, such as Calmet's, take the former view; but to this it may be forcibly objected that it would in that case be impossible to stretch the roof covering sufficiently tight to prevent the rain and-snow from collecting in the middle, and either crushing the whole by its weight or flooding the apartments. Hence most later writers assume a peaked roof, although there is no mention of a ridge-pole, nor of supports to it; but the name “tent” given to the upper part of the edifice is itself conclusive of this form, and then these accessories would necessarily follow.

The roofing material was a canvas of goats hair, the article still employed by the Bedawin for their tents. It consisted of eleven “curtains” (יַרַיעות), i.e. breadths or pieces of (this camlet) cloth, each thirty cubits long and four cubits wide, which is as large, probably, as could well be woven in the loom at once. Ten of these were to-be “coupled” (חַבֵּר), i.e. sewed together, five in one sheet, and five in another, evidently by the selvage; thus making two large canvases of thirty cubits by twenty each. But as the building was only twelve cubits wide, one of them alone would more than suffice for a roof, even with a peak. Hence most interpreters understand that the surplus width was allowed to hang down the sides. But what is to be done with the other sheet? Fergusso (in Smith's Dict. of the Bible, s.v. “Temple”) supposes (with interpreters in general) that the two sheets were thrown side by side across the ridgepole, the extra length (some fifteen cubits) being extended at the eaves into a kind of wings, and the surplus width (ten cubits) furled along the slope of the gable, or perhaps stretched out as a porch. But there is no authority whatever for this disposal; and if  the two pieces of canvas were intended to be thus adjoined, there appears no good reason why they should not have been sewed together at the first, like the individual breadths. Hence, Paine suggests that they were designed as a double roof, so as to more effectually to shed rain somewhat in the manner of a “fly” or extra roof to a modern tent. For this the size is exactly adequate.

If the angle at the peak were a right angle, as it naturally would be, the gable, of course, being an isosceles triangle, eight and a half cubits would be required for each slope of the roof (these being the two legs of which twelve is the hypotenuse); thus leaving one cubit to cover each of the eaves (as specified in Exo 24:13), and lone cubit for seams, and perhaps hems. The seams, in order to be water-tight (especially since they ran parallel with the ridge and eaves) as well as smooth, would best be formed by overlapping the edges, in shingle style. The sixth “curtain,” or extra single piece, was to be “doubled in the fore-front of the tabernacle” (Exo 26:9, וְכָפִלְתָּ אֶלאּמוּל פְּנֵי הָאֹהֶל), which interpreters generally have understood as meant to close the gable. This, as Paine suggests, it would neatly do if folded in two thicknesses (like the rest of the goat's hair cloth) across the lower part of the rear open space above the “boards,” as it is just long enough (twice fifteen cubits; the surplus three cubits being employed exactly as in the case of the other sheets), and sufficiently wide (four cubits up the six of the perpendicular; leaving only a small triangle at the peak for ventilation); the gores or corners probably being tucked in between the two thicknesses of the roof-sheets. This sixth curtain, of course, was sewed endwise to one of the outer pieces of the under canvas. These roof-curtains were joined by means of fifty “loops” (לֻלָאֹת, luslsth) of unspecified (probably the same strong) material, and as many taches (קְרָסַים, keraszin) of “brass.” With most interpreters, Fergisson understands these to be intended for connecting the edges of the two sheets together so as to form one roof canvas. But besides the uselessness of this (as above pointed out), on this plan the rain would find an easy inlet at this imperfect suture. Hence Paine more reasonably concludes that they were designed for buttoning down the double canvas at the eaves so as to form “one tent” (Exo 26:11, אֹהֶל אֶחָד, i.e. the upper or tent part of the building). The taches, accordingly, were not hooks (as most understand: Fergusson thinks “S hooks”), but knobs in the planks on the outside, placed one cubit below the top (Exo 26:12). The number of the taches would thus exactly correspond to the requirements of the “boards,” i.e. twenty for each side and eight for the end, with one additional for each rear corner  (where a tache would be needed for both edges of the board. the others being in the front edge, as the first board would necessarily have it there; in the rear boards the knob would be in the middle). SEE TACHE.

(2.) Another set of curtains was provided, consisting of ten pieces of stuff, each twenty-eight cubits long and four cubits wide, to be sewed into two large cloths of five “curtains” or breadths each. From the general similarity of the description, interpreters have naturally inferred that they were to be joined and used in like manner; but the necessity or. practicability of employing them over head is far from obvious. Nor does the size in that case suit; for besides the difficulty of disposing of the surplusage in breadth (in length they would be scant if double), we naturally ask, Why were they different in number and size from the other roofing material? Prof. Paine therefore thinks that they were sewed end to end (the original is

אַשָּׁה אֶלאּאֲחֹתָהּ, one to the other, exo Exo 26:3; different from לְבָד, separately, Exo 26:9, of the roof-curtains) in two long pieces (they: would probably have been woven thus had it been possible), and' then hung double in loose drapery around the interior of the tabernacle, being just high enough (four cubits) to cover the joints of the boards and prevent any one from looking through the cracks from without. These curtains were suspended on fifty knobs or taches of gold by means of fifty loops of the same material as the curtains themselves; these fastenings may be arranged as in the case of the roof canvas. It thus became “one tabernacle (Exo 26:6, אֶהָד מַשְׁכָּן, i.e. these curtains belonged to the upright [wooden] part of the structure, in distinction from the sloping [canvas] or “tent” part above it)., The material of these inner curtains was similar to that of the door of the outer court (Exo 27:16), but it was also to be embroidered with cherubim, like the interior “vail” (Exo 26:31), which will be considered below.

(3.) A coat of “rams skins dyed red and tachash (A. V. “badgers',” probably seal or some other fur) skins” was furnished as an additional covering (Exo 26:14, מַלְמִעְלָה, millenalah, from upward). This is usually regarded as a part of the roof; but to pile them there would have been sure to catch, the rain, and so prove worse than useless. Paine places them on the outside of the “boards” to hide the cracks and prevent the wind nd d rain from driving in. Hence the number of skins is not specified; they were  to form a blanket sufficiently large to cover the walls, and run up under the edge of the roof-canvas so as to catch the drip from the eaves. Doubtless the tachash fur was placed next the smooth gilding, and in its natural state, because hidden; and the rougher but more durable ram's-wool was exposed, the hair shingling downward to the weather, but dyed a brilliant color for effect. They would naturally be hung upon the copper taches, which served so many useful purposes in the “boards.” They are called in Exo 26:14 “a covering (מַכְסֶה, mikseh, not necessarily a roof, for it is used only of this fur robe [or some similar one, Num 4:8-12] and of the screen [whatever that may have been] of Noah's ark [Gen 42:13]) for the tent” (לָאֹהֶל), apparently as completing the canvas or tent-like part of the structure.

Saalschiitz (Archiol. der Hebraer, 2, 321 sq.) represents the hangings of the tabernacle as suspended in the form of a tent, but in a peculiar form. He thinks the מַשְׁכָּןwas properly the space enclosed by the boards of acacia- wood; and that these formed the outer wall, so to speak, within which the tabernacle, the אֹהֶל properly so called, was reared in the form of a peaked tent. Of this the byssus curtains, he supposes, formed the internal drapery, while the goats'-hair curtains, covered with leather and tachash skins, formed the outer covering. The whole structure would thus present the appearance externally of a peaked tent, reared within a high palisade of wood, and open at the front. This representation has the advantage of allowing the ornamental curtain, and also the gilded boards with their golden rings and silver sockets, to be fully visible. There seems, however, at least one fatal objection to it, viz. that it does not fulfill the condition that the joining of the curtains shall be over the pillars that separate the holy from the most holy place-a condition of essential significance, as we shall see.

(4.) The doorways of the tabernacle were formed or rather closed in a manner altogether analogous to the entrance of the exterior court, namely, by a vertical screen or sheet of cloth made of heavy material, and (in one case) still further stiffened by embroidery, similar to the piece of tapestry that hangs at the portal of modern cathedrals in Italy, or (to speak more Orientally) like the flap at the opening of a modern tent and the carpet or camlet partition between the male and female apartments of a Bedawin  abode. Of these there were two, each of which is denoted by a distinctive term rarely varied.

(a.) The front opening (פֶּתִח, pethach; A.V. “door”) was closed sufficiently high to prevent a passer-by from looking in, by a “hanging” (מָכָךְ, masak, a screen, or covering from the sun [Psa 105:39] or from observation [2Sa 7:19; Isa 22:8]) of materials exactly like that of the entrance to the court already described, suspended upon five copper-socketed and gilded pillars (עִמוּדַים) of acacia-wood by means of golden hooks (וָוַים, pegs, spoken only of these and those at the outer entrance), the whole being probably of the same height, proportions, and style in other respects as the exterior one just referred to. The number of these pillars is significant: as there were five of them, one must necessarily stand in the center, and this one was probably carried up, so as to support one end of the ridge-pole, which we have above seen is presumable. A corresponding pillar in the rear of the tent may be inferred to sustain the other end, and possibly one or more in the middle of the building. (b.) A “vail” (פָּרֹכֶת, paroiketh, separatrix, used only of this particular thing, sometimes [Exo 35:12; Exo 39:34; Exo 40:21] with the addition of the previous term for emphasis) divided the interior into two apartments, called respectively the “holy place” and the “most holy.” This partition-cloth differed only from the exterior ones in being ornamented (perhaps on both sides; comp. 1Ki 6:29) with figures of cherubim stitched (probably with gold thread, i.e. strips of goldleaf rolled and twisted) upon it, apparently with the art of the embroiderer (מִעֲשֵׂה חשֵׁב, the work of an arficer; A.V. “cunning work”). It was suspended upon four pillars precisely like those of the door “hanging,” except that their sockets were of silver. A special statement of the text (Exo 26:33), “And thou shalt hang up the vail under the taches” (תִּחִת הִקְּרָסַי וְנָתִתָּה אֵתאּהִפְּרֹכֶת), evidently meaning that the pillars to which its ends were to be attached were to be placed directly beneath the golden knobs opposite in the walls, on which-likewise hung the side-curtains, shows both that these latter were thus completed by a drapery on the remaining side of each room (it will be remembered that the front knobs likewise correspond in position to that of the doorway screen), and likewise proves the character and situation of the taches themselves (not hooks in the roof, which at the eaves was at least five cubits above the top of the “vail”). As the vail,” like the two outer screens, was stretched tight across the space it occupied, it  was of course made exactly long enough for that purpose; thus, too, the embroidered figures (which, if of life-size, were of just the height to extend upright across the stuff-about four cubits) would show to the finest effect, not being it folds like the interior side-curtains.

It is not a little singular that the exact position of the “vail” is not otherwise prescribed than by the above requirement; nor is the length of either of the apartments which it separated given, although together they amounted ) to thirty cubits. On the supposition (sustained by the analogy in the Temple) that the Most Holy was an exact square, i.e. (according to our determination above) twelve cubits each way, the knob or tache opposite which it would hang must have been that which stood in the forward edge of the eighth plank from the rear of the building. Whether it was in front of or behind the pillars is not certain; but the former is probable, as it would thus seem a more effectual barrier from without. The end pillars apparently stood in immediate contact with the side walls, both in order to sustain the ends of the vail, and to leave a wider space between them for ingress and egress. The vail was suspended directly upon golden pins (A.V. “hooks'”) inserted in the face of the pillars near their summit; and thus differed (as did likewise the screen of the door of the tabernacle) from the hangings of the outer court, which hung upon silver rods (A. V. “fillets”) (doubtless by loops running on the rods) resting on similar pins or “hooks.” The reason of this difference seems to have been that the greater space between the court pillars (so as to admit animals as well as men) would have caused too much sag in the hanging without intermediate support, which could only be furnished by the rods and attachments along the upper edge.

4. Supplementary Note. — Since the above was in type we have reconsidered a few points concerning the structure of this edifice which admit of further elucidation.

(1.) The “Corner-boards.” — The fact that the dimensions of the courts and the building itself were in decimal proportions, and that in the temple subsequently erected for the same purpose, which maintained multiples of these dimensions, the holy and most holy were exactly twenty cubits wide (1Ki 6:2), leads so strongly to the presumption that in the tabernacle these rooms were ten cubits wide, that we are disposed to recall the arrangement adopted in the foregoing discussion, which gives these apartments a width of twelve cubits, leaving for the holy place the irregular dimensions of eighteen by twelve cubits. Adopting the suggestion of Keil  (Commentary, ad loc.) that the corner-boards were constructed of two- parts, forming a right angle with each other, we have only to take a plank one and a half cubits wide, like all the others, divide it lengthwise into two portions, one four sixths and the other five sixths of a cubit wide, and fasten these together in that manner, in order to obtain the needed half cubit necessary at each end of the rear, and allow one wing of the corner- board to lap around the end of the last side-board, and cover the joint neatly and symmetrically, as in the following figure. This last is the adjustment adopted by Brown (The Tabernacle, etc. [Lond. 1872], p. 23), who reviews and justly rejects the conjectures of Josephus (Ant. 3, 6, 3), Kalisck (Commentary, ad loc.), and Von Gerlach (ibid.). His complicated arrangement of the sockets, however, is unnecessary, as may be seen from the following diagram.

The statement respecting these corner -planks in Exo 26:24, “And they shall be twinned (תֹּאֲמַים) from below, and together they shall be complete (תִּמַּים) upon its top to the first (or same) ring,” we may then understand to mean that they were to be in that, manner jointed throughout their length, and were to use the first or end ring of the side-plank in common for the topmost bar, thus holding the corner firm in both directions, as seen in the accompanying figure. The topmost rear bar may have been dowelled into the end of the side-bar for further security.

(2.) Position of the Curtains. The use of these pieces of drapery will not be materially affected by this change in the width of the structure. We need only raise the peak into an acute instead of a right angle in order to dispose of the roof-canvas. The curtain across the rear gable may be wrapped a little farther along the side at each end, and it will at the same time cover the tops of the rear planks, and close the joint where the ends of the roof- curtains fall short of doing so.

On the supposition of a flat roof stretched directly across the tops of the planks, the dimensions of both sets of curtains may readily be made to correspond with the requirements of the building. The embroidered curtains may either be used around the walls, as previously, or they may be joined together into one large sheet to cover the ceiling and walls on the  inside. Their length (twenty-eight cubits) would in the latter case reach to within one cubit of the ground; and their combined breadth (forty cubits) would in like manner cover the end wall (ten cubits + thirty cubits of length of building). The suture, where the two canvases are ordinarily supposed to be joined by the loops, would thus also exactly fall over the “vail,” separating the holy from the most holy place.

The same would be true likewise of the goats'-hair curtains if similarly joined and spread over the roof and outside of the tabernacle, reaching to within one sixth cubit of the ground on each side and rear. The only difficulty would be as to the eleventh or extra goats hair curtain. If this were attached in the same manner as the other breadths, it would be wholly superfluous, unless used to close the entire front, as it might be if doubled (according to the usual interpretation of Exo 26:9). But it seems agreed upon by all critics that it must be employed upon the rear of the building (as explicitly stated in Exo 26:12). Keil understands that it was divided between the back and the front equally; but this answers to neither passage, makes part of the rear trebly covered in fact, and brings (by his own confession) the suture one cubit behind the “vail” (contrary to Exo 26:33). Brown reviews and confutes the explanations of other interpreters (Kalisch, Von Gerlach, and Fergusson), but frankly admits his own inability to solve the problem (p. 43). Paine's interpretation is the only one that meets the case.

This last insuperable difficulty, together with the impossibility of shedding the rain and snow, seems to us a conclusive objection against the flat-roof theory of the building. Brown innocently remarks (p. 47), “Admitting that snow sometimes falls on the mountains of Sinai, it seldom, if ever, falls in the wadies or plains; and if slight showers ever do occur, they must be like angels visits, few and far between. None of the many authors I have followed across the desert of wandering seem ever to have witnessed snow, and very rarely even rain.” This last circumstance is probably owing to the fact that travelers almost invariably avoid the winter or rainy season. The writer of this article was overtaken, with his party, by a snow-storm in March, 1874, which covered the ground in the plains and bottoms of the wadies of Mount Sinai ankle-deep; and every traveler must have observed the unmistakable traces of terrific. floods or freshets along the valleys of the whole region. It often rains here in perfect torrents (see Palmer, Desert of the Exodus, p. 33,177). “A single thunder-storm, with a heavy shower of rain, falling on the naked granite mountains, will be sufficient to convert  a dry and level valley into a roaring river in a few short hours” (ibid. p. 129). It is essential to any reconstruction of the tabernacle that the roof be made water-tight, and this can only be done effectually by the true tent- form, with ridge and peak. SEE TENT.

5. Furniture of the Tabernacle. — The only piece of furniture within the inner or most holy place was the ark of the covenant; and the furniture of the outer room or holy place consisted of the altar of incense, the table of show-bread, and the “golden candlestick,” the position of each of which is given in Exo 26:34-35. They are all described in detail under their respective heads in this Cyclopaedia, but we subjoin the following particulars as supplementary to the article on the last-named piece. The candelabrum, as described in Exo 25:31-37 (of which 37:17-23 is almost verbatim a copy), differs considerably from that in the account of Josephus (Ant. 3, 6, 7), and from the sculptured figure still extant upon the Arch of Titus (Reland, De Spoliis Templi, p. 6; in which work other representations, all slightly varying, are given from Rabbinical sources and coins). Hence it is probable that the “candlestick” as constructed for the tabernacle by Moses was not exactly the same in form as in the later models of Solomon's and Herod's temples; it would naturally be simpler and less ornamental in the earliest case, and the Herodian fabrication (if, indeed, this were other than that of the restoration from Babylon), to which all the later Jewish and profane statements apply (Solomon does not appear to have furnished his Temple with any other than the original candelabrum of the tabernacle), would of course depart most widely from the severity of the primitive type.

(1.) In the original object, the following elements are clearly defined by the language (as above) employed: There was a main or central stem (יָרֵךְ, yarek, thigh, A.V. “shaft”), doubtless flaring or enlarged at the bottom, for a secure foot. From each side of this went off (apparently opposite each other, and at equal intervals), three arms (קָנַים, kanimr, reeds, “branches”), having each along their course three almond-shaped calyces (גְּבַיעַים, gebiim, cups, “bowls”), one crown (כִּפַתֹּר, kaphtor, circlet, “knop”), and one blossom (פֶּרִח, perach, flower”): the middle stem had four such calyces, and at least three crowns, placed each immediately beneath the several junctions of the arms with the main stem; also more  than one blossom. Finally, there were seven burners (נֵרַים, nerzi, lights, “lamps”), evidently one for the extremity of each arm, and one for the top of the central stem.' Every part of the candelabrum (including the burners, only so far as applicable to them) was a continuous rounded (hammered or turned) piece of refined gold (מַקְשָׁה אִחִת זָהָב טָהוֹר, “one beaten work of pure gold”). It has usually been assumed that the arms were all in the same plane with the main stem, and their summits all of equal height, and equidistant from each other, as is the case with the representation on the Arch of Titus.

(2.) The following are the principal points that remain uncertain: The relative position of the calyces, crowns, and blossoms on the arms; for although they are always enumerated in this order, there is nothing to show absolutely whether the enumeration begins at the intersection with the shaft or with the extremities. The former view, which is countenanced by the rest of the description (since this proceeds upward from the base), is adopted by Dr. Conant (in the Amer. ed. of Smith's Dict. of the Bible, s.v. “Candlestick”); the latter, which is favored by the difficulty (or rather impossibility) of assigning more than one blossom to the summit of the central stem (as the text would then seem to require), is adopted by Prof. Paine (Solomon's Temple, etc., p. 10). The signification of the terms is not decisive; for the kaphtor, or “knop,” may quite as well signify a little ornamental ball or globular enlargement in the necks of the arms and in the stem at their points of departure, as a capital or surmounting decoration (the three ranged along the main stem certainly were not such in strictness). The perach, or “flower,” is regarded by both the above writers (who thus agree in making these, after all, the extreme points of the chandelier) as- the ” receptacles” of the lamps themselves; these last being regarded by Paine as denoted by the gebiim, or “bowls,” having a trial form in the case of the side arms, and a quaternal in that of the main stem a view which leads to great complexity in their construction and in the form of their sockets, and which, moreover, is incongruent with the number (seven only) assigned to the lights. Furthermore, in the comparison of the ornament in question with the shape of almonds, it is not clear whether the flower or fruit of that tree is referred to; we prefer the latter as being more properly designated by the simple word, and because the former is denoted by a different term in the same connection, the blossom shaped ornament. It must also be noted that the arms had each three of the first-named ornament, and but one of the other two; whereas the main stem had four  of' the first, and at least three of the second and two of the third: the three kinds, therefore, did not invariably go together, although they may have done so in the case of the central stem. Perhaps the whole may be best adjusted by assigning such a group or combination of the three kinds to each summit and to each intersection of the arms with the main stem, and merely two others of one kind (the gebia, or “bowl”) to the side arms, probably at equidistant points; the group itself consisting simply of an ovate cup-like enlargement of the rod colstituting the shaft, with a raised band just above the bulb, and the rim opening into petal-like lips, forming a cavity or socket for the lamp. SEE LAMP.

IV. Relation of the Tabernacle to the Religious Life of Israel. —1. Whatever connection may be traced between other parts of the Mosaic ritual and that of the nations with which Israel had been brought into contact, the thought of the tabernacle meets us as entirely new. Spencer (De Leg. Hebraeor. 3, 3) labors hard, but not successfully, to prove that the tabernacles of Moloch of Amo 5:26 were the prototypes of the tent of meeting. It has to be remembered, however, (1) that the word used in Amos (sikkuth) is never used of the tabernacle, and means something very different; and (2) that the Moloch-worship represented a defection of the people subsequent to the erection of the tabernacle. The “house of God” SEE BETHEL of the patriarchs had been the large “pillar of stone” (Gen 28:18-19), bearing record of some high spiritual experience, and tending to lead men upward to it (Bahr, Symbol. 1, 93), or the grove which, with its dim, doubtful light, attuned the souls of men to a divine awe (Gen 21:33). The temples of Egypt were magnificent and colossal, hewn in the solid rock, or built of huge blocks of stone as unlike as possible to the sacred tent of Israel. The command was one in which we can trace a special fitness. The stately temples belonged to the house of bondage which they were leaving. The sacred places of their fathers were in the land towards which they were journeying. In the meanwhile, they were to be wanderers in the wilderness. To have set up a bethel after the old pattern would have been to make that a resting-place, the object then or afterwards of devout pilgrimage; and the multiplication of such places at the different stages of their march would have led inevitably to polytheism. It would have failed utterly to lead them to the thought which they needed most of a Divine Presence never absent from them, protecting, ruling, judging. A sacred tenat, a moving bethel, was the fit sanctuary for a people still nomadic. It was capable of being united afterwards, as it actually came  to be, with “the grove” of the older cultus (Jos 24:26). Analogies of like wants, met in a like way, with no ascertainable historical connection, are to be found among the Gaetulians and other tribes of Northern Africa (Sil. Ital. 3, 289), and in the sacred tent of the Carthaginian encampments (Diod. Sic. 20:65).

2. The structure of the tabernacle was obviously determined by a complex and profound symbolism, but its meaning remains one of the things at which we can but dimly guess. No interpretation is given in the law itself. The explanations of Jewish writers long afterwards are manifestly wide of the mark. That which meets us in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the application of the types of the tabernacle to the mysteries of redemption, was latent till those mysteries were made known. Yet we cannot but believe that, as each portion of the wonderful order rose before the inward eye of the lawgiver, it must have embodied distinctly manifold truths which he apprehended himself and sought to communicate to others. It entered, indeed, into the order of a divine education for Moses and for Israel, and an education by means of symbols, no less than by means of words presupposes an existing language. So far from shrinking, therefore, as men have timidly and unwisely shrunk. (Witsius, Egyptiae, in Ugolijo, Thesaur. vol. 1), from asking what thoughts the Egyptian education of Moses would lead him to connect with the symbols he was now taught to use, we may see in it a legitimate method of inquiry almost the only method possible. Where that fails, the gap may be filled up (as in Bahr, Symbol. passim) from the analogies of other nations, indicating, where they agree, a widespread primeval symbolism. So far from laboring to prove, at the price of ignoring or distorting facts, that everything was till then unknown, we shall as little expect to find it so, as to see in Hebrew a new and heaven- born language, spoken for the first time on Sinai, written for the first time on the two tables of the covenant.

3. The thought of a graduated sanctity, like that of the outer court, the holy place, the holy of holies, had its counterpart, often the same number of stages, in the structure of Egyptian temples (Bahr, Symbol. 1, 216). SEE TEMPLE.

(1.) The interior adytum (to proceed from the innermost recess outward) was small in proportion to the rest of the building, and commonly, as in the tabernacle (Josephus, Ant. 2, 6. 3), was at the western end (Spencer, De Leg. Hebreor. 3, 2), and was but little lighted. In the adytum, often at least,  was the sacred ark, the culminating point of holiness, containing the highest and most mysterious symbols-winged figures generally like those of the cherubim (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 5, 275; Kenrick, Egypt, 1, 460), the emblems of stability and life. Here were outward points of resemblance. Of all elements of Egyptian worship this was old which could be transferred with least hazard, with most gain. No one could think that the ark itself was the likeness of the God he worshipped. When we ask what gave the ark its holiness, we are led on at once to the infinite difference, the great gulf between the two systems. That of Egypt was predominantly cosmical, starting from the productive powers of nature. The symbols of those powers, though not originally involving what we know as impurity, tended to it fatally and rapidly (Spencer) Leg. Hebreor. 3, 1; Warburton, Divine Legation, 2, 4, note). That of Israel was predominantly ethical. The nation was taught to think of God, not chiefly as revealed in nature, but as manifesting himself in and to the spirits of men. In the ark of the covenant, as the highest revelation then possible of the Divine nature, were the two tables of stone, on which were graven, by the teaching of the Divine Spirit, and therefore by the finger of God” (Mat 12:28; Luk 11:20; see also Clement of Alexandria [Strom. 6:133] and 1Ki 18:46; 2Ki 3:15; Eze 1:3; Eze 3:14; 1Ch 28:19), the great unchanging laws of human duty which had been proclaimed on Sinai. Here the lesson taught was plain enough. The highest knowledge was as the simplest, the esoteric as the exoteric. In the depths of the holy of holies, and for the high-priest as for all Israel, there was the revelation of a righteous Will requiring righteousness in man (Saalschtitz, Archaöl. c. 77). SEE ARK.

Over the ark was the kophereth (“mercy-seat”), so called with a twofold reference to the root-meaning of the word. It covered the ark. It was the witness of a mercy covering sins. As the “footstool” of God, the “throne” of the Divine glory, it declared that over the law which seemed so rigid and unbending there rested the compassion of one forgiving “iniquity and transgression.” Ewald, however, giving to כָּפִר, the root of kophereth, the meaning of “to scrape,” “erase,” derives from that meaning. the idea implied in the Sept. ἱλαστήριον, and denies that the word ever signified ἐπίθεμα (Alterth. p. 128, 129). SEE MERCY-SEAT.

Over the mercy-seat were the cherubim, reproducing, in part, at least, the symbolism of the great Harnitic races, forms familiar to Moses and to Israel, needing ri1o description for them, interpreted for us by the fuller  vision of the later prophets (Eze 1:5-13; Eze 10:8-15; Eze 41:19), or by the winged forms of the imagery of Egypt. Representing as they did the manifold powers of nature, created life in its highest form (Bihr, De Leg. Hebreor. 1, 341), their “overshadowing wings,” “meeting” as in token of perfect harmony, declared that nature as well as man found its highest glory in subjection to a divine law, that men might take refuge in that order, as under “the shadow of the wings” of God (Stanley, Jewish Church, p. 98). Placed where those and other like figures were, in the temples of Egypt, they might be hindrances and not helps, might sensualize instead of purifying the worship of the people. But it was part of the wisdom which we may reverently trace in the order of the tabernacle that while Egyptian symbols are retained, as in the ark, the cherubim, the urim, and the thummim, their place is changed. They remind the high-priest, the representative of the whole nation, of the truths in which the order rests. The people cannot bow down and worship that which they never see. SEE CHERUBIM.

The material, not less than the forms, in the holy of holies was significant. The acacia or shittim-wood, least liable of woods then accessible to decay, might well represent the imperishableness of divine truth, of the laws of duty (Bahr, Symbol. 1, 286). Ark, mercy seat, cherubim, the very walls, were all overlaid with gold, the noblest of all metals, the symbol of light and purity-sunlight itself, as it were, fixed and embodied, the token of the incorruptible, of the glory of a great king (ibid. 1, 282). It was not without meaning that all this lavish expenditure of what was most costly was placed where none might gaze on it. The gold thus offered taught man that the noblest acts of beneficence and sacrifice are not those which are done that they may be seen of men, but those which are known only to him who “seeth in secret” (Mat 6:4).

Dimensions also had their meaning. Difficult as it may be to feel sure that we have the key to the enigma, there can be but little doubt that the older religious systems of the world did attach a mysterious significance to each separate number; that the training of Moses, as afterwards the far less complete initiation of Pythagoras in the symbolism of Egypt, must have made that transparently clear to him, which to us is almost impenetrably dark. A full discussion of the subject is obviously impossible here, but it may be useful to exhibit briefly the chief thoughts which have been connected with the numbers that are most prominent in the language of symbolism. Arbitrary as some of them may seem, a sufficient induction to  establish each will be found in Bahr's elaborate dissertation (Symbol. 1, 128-255) and other works (comp. Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 4:190-199; Leyrer, in Herzog's Real-Encyklop. s.v. “Stiftshüte”). ONE

 — The Godhead, eternity, life, creative force, the sun, man.

TWO

 — Matter, time, death, receptive capacity, the moon, woman.

THREE

 — (as a number or in the triangle) — The universe in connection with God, the absolute in itself, the unconditioned, God.

FOUR

 — (the number, or in the square or cube)-Conditioned existence, the world as created, divine order, revelation.

SEVEN

 — (as 3 + 4)-The union of the world and God, rest (as in the Sabbath), peace, blessing, purification.

TEN

 — (as = 1 + 2 + 3 + 4) — Completeness, moral sand physical, perfection.

FIVE

 — Perfection half attained, incompleteness.

TWELVE

 — The sign of the zodiac, the cycle of the seasons; in Israel the ideal number of the people, of the covenant of God with them. To those who think over the words of two great teachers, one heathen (Plutarch, De Is. et Os. p. 411) and one Christian (Clem. Al. Strom. 6:84-87), who had at least studied as far as they could the mysteries of the religion of Egypt, and had inherited part of the old system, the precision of the numbers in the plan of the tabernacle will no longer seem unaccountable. If, in a cosmical system, a right-angled triangle, with the sides three, four, five, represented the triad of Osiris, Isis, Orus, creative force, receptive matter, the universe of creation (Plutarch, loc. cit.), the perfect cube of the holy of holies, the constant recurrence of the Numbers 4, 10, may well be accepted as symbolizing order, stability, perfection (Bahr, Symbol. 1, 225). The symbol reappears in the most startling form in the closing visions of the Apocalypse. There the heavenly Jerusalem is described, in words which absolutely exclude the literalism that has sometimes been blindly applied to it, as a city four-square-12,000 furlongs in length and breadth and height (Rev 21:16). SEE NUMBER.

Into the inner sanctuary neither people nor the priests as a body ever entered. Strange as it may seem, that in which everything represented light  and life was left in darkness and solitude. Once only in the year, on the day of atonement, might the high-priest enter. The strange contrast has, however, its parallel in the spiritual life. Death and life, light and darkness, are wonderfully united. Only through death can we truly live. Only by passing into the “thick darkness” where God is (Exo 20:21; 1Ki 8:12) can we enter at all into the “light inaccessible” in which he dwells everlastingly. The solemn annual entrance, like the withdrawal of symbolic forms from the gaze of the people, was itself part of a wise and divine order. Intercourse with Egypt had shown how easily the symbols of truth might become common and familiar things, yet without symbols the truths themselves might be forgotten. Both dangers were met. To enter once, and once only in the year, into the awful darkness-to stand before the law of duty, before the presence of the God who gave it, not in the stately robes that became the representative of God to man, but as representing man in his humiliation in the garb of the lowly priests, barefooted and in the linen ephod to confess his own sins and the sins of the people this was what connected the atonement-day (kippur) with the mercy-seat (kophereth). To come there with blood, the symbol of life, touching with that blood the mercy-seat-with incense, the symbol of adoration (Lev 16:12-14), what did that express but the truth (1) that man must draw near to the righteous God with no lower offering than the pure worship of the heart, with the living sacrifice of body, soul, and spirit; (2) that could such a perfect sacrifice be found, it would have a mysterious power working beyond itself, in proportion to its perfection, to cover the multitude of sins?

From all others, from the high-priest at all other times, the holy of holies was shrouded by the heavy vail, bright with many colors and strange forms, even as curtains of golden tissue were to be seen hanging before the adytum of an Egyptian temple, a strange contrast often to the bestial form behind them (Clem. Al. Peed. 3, 4). In one memorable instance, indeed, the vail was the witness of higher and deeper thoughts. On the shrine of Isis at Sais, there were to be read words which, though pointing to a pantheistic rather than an ethical religion, were yet wonderful in their loftiness, “I am all that has been (πᾶν τὸ γεγονός), and is, and shall be, and my vail no mortal hath withdrawn” (ἀπεκάλυψεν) (Plutarch, De Is. et Osir. p. 394). Like, and yet more unlike, the truth, we feel that no such words could have appeared on the vail of the tabernacle. In that identification of the world and God all idolatry was latent, as, in the faith of Israel, in the I am all  idolatry was excluded. In that despair of any withdrawal of the vail, of any revelation of the Divine will, there were latent' all the arts of an unbelieving priestcraft, substituting symbols, pomp, ritual, for such a revelation. But what, then, was the meaning of the vail which met the gaze of the priests as they did service in the sanctuary? Colors, in the art of Egypt, were not less significant than number, and the four bright colors, probably, after the fashion of that art, in parallel bands-blue, symbol of heaven, and purple of kingly glory, and crimson of life and joy, and white of light and purity (Bahr, Symbol. 1, 305-330)-formed in their combination no remote similitude of the rainbow, which of old had been a symbol of the Divine covenant with man, the pledge of peace and hope, the sign of the Divine Presence (Eze 1:28; Ewald, Alterth. p. 333). SEE COLOR. Within the vail, light and truth were seen in their unity. The vail itself represented the infinite variety, the πολυποίκιλος σοφία of the divine order in creation (Eph 3:10). There, again, were seen copied upon the vail the mysterious forms of the cherubim; how many, or in what attitude, or of what size, or in what material, we are not told. The words “cunning work” in Exo 36:35, applied elsewhere to combinations of embroidery and metal (Exo 28:15; Exo 31:4), seem to justify the conjecture that here also they were of gold. In the absence of any other evidence, it would have been perhaps natural to think that they reproduced on a larger scale the number and the position of those that were over the mercy-seat. The visions of Ezekiel, however, reproducing, as they obviously do, the forms with which his priestly life had made him familiar, indicate not less than four (Ezekiel ch. 1 and 10), and those not all alike, having severally the faces of a man, a lion, an ox, and an eagle strange symbolic words, which elsewhere we should have identified with idolatry, but which here were bearing witness against it, emblems of the manifold variety of creation as at once manifesting and concealing God.

(2.) The outer sanctuary was one degree less awful in its holiness than the inner. Silver, the type of human purity, took the place of gold, the type of the Divine glory (Bahr, Symbol. 1, 284). It was to be trodden daily by the priests as by men who lived in the perpetual consciousness of the nearness of God, of the mystery behind the vail. Barefooted and in garments of white linen, like the priests of Isis, SEE PRIEST, they accomplished their ministrations. Here, too, there were other emblems of divine realities. It was specially illumined by the golden lamp with its seven lights, never all extinguished together, the perpetual symbol of all derived gifts of wisdom  and holiness in man, reaching their mystical perfection when they shine in God's sanctuary to his glory (Exo 25:31; Exo 27:20; Zec 4:1-14). The shew-bread (the “bread of faces”) of the Divine Presence, not unlike in outward form to the sacred cakes which the Egyptians placed before the shrines of their gods, served as a token that, though there was no form or likeness of the Godhead, he was yet there, accepting all offerings, recognizing in particular that special offering which represented the life of the nation at once in the distinctness of its tribes and in its unity as a people (Ewald, Alterth. p. 120). The meaning of the altar of incense was not less obvious. The cloud of fragrant smoke was the natural, almost the universal, emblem of the heart's adoration (Psa 141:2). The incense sprinkled on the shew-bread and the lamp taught men that all other offerings needed the intermingling of that adoration. Upon that altar no “strange fire” was to be kindled. When fresh fire was needed it was to be taken from the altar of burnt-offering in the outer court (Lev 9:24; Lev 10:1). (Very striking, as compared with what is to follow, are the sublimity and the purity of these symbols. It is as if the priestly order, already leading a consecrated life, were capable of understanding a higher language which had to be translated into a lower for those that were still without (Saalschütz. Archaöl. § 77).

(3.) Outside the tent, but still within the consecrated precincts, was the court fenced in by an enclosure, yet open to all the congregation as well as to the Levites, those only excepted who were ceremonially unclean. No Gentile might pass beyond the curtains of the entrance, but every member of the priestly nation might thus far “draw near” to the presence of Jehovah. Here, therefore, stood the altar of burnt-offerings, at which sacrifices in all their varieties were offered by penitent or thankful worshippers (Exo 27:1-8; Exo 38:1), the brazen laver at which those worshippers purified themselves before they sacrificed, the priests before they entered into the sanctuary (Exo 30:17-21). Here the graduated scale of holiness ended. What Israel was to the world, fenced in and set apart, that the court of the tabernacle was to the surrounding wilderness, just as the distinction between it and the sanctuary answered to that between the sons of Aaron and other Israelites; just as the idea of holiness culminated personally in the high-priest, locally in the holy of holies.

V. Theories of Later Times. —

1. It is not probable that the elaborate symbolism of such a structure was understood by the rude and sensual multitude that came out of Egypt. In its fullness, perhaps, no mind but that of the lawgiver himself ever entered into it, and even for him, one half, and that the highest, of its meaning must have been altogether latent. Yet it was not the less, was perhaps the more fitted, on that account, to be an instrument for the education of the people. To the most ignorant and debased it was at least a witness of the nearness of the Divine King. It met the craving of the human heart, which prompts to worship, with an order that was neither idolatrous nor impure. It taught men that their fleshly nature was the hindrance to worship; that it rendered them unclean; that only by subduing it, killing it, as they killed the bullock and the goat, could they offer up an acceptable sacrifice; that such a sacrifice was the condition of forgiveness, a higher sacrifice than any they could offer as the ground of that forgiveness. The sins of the past were considered as belonging to the fleshly nature, which was slain and offered, not to the true inner self of the worshipper. More thoughtful minds were led inevitably to higher truths. They were not slow to see in the tabernacle the parable of God's presence manifested in creation. Darkness was as his pavilion (2Sa 22:12). He has made a tabernacle for the sun (Psa 19:4). The heavens were spread out like its curtains. The beams of his chambers were in the mighty waters (Psa 104:2-3 : Isaiah 40, 22; Lowth, De Sac. Poes. 8). The majesty of God seen in the storm and tempest was as of one who rides upon a cherub (2Sa 22:11). If the words He that dwelleth between the cherubim” spoke on the one side of a special, localized manifestation of the Divine Presence, they spoke also on the other of that Presence as in the heaven of heavens, in. the light of setting suns, in the blackness and the flashes of the thunder-clouds.

2. The thought thus uttered, essentially poetical in its nature, had its fit place in the psalms and hymns of Israel. It lost its beauty, it led men on a false track, when it was formalized into a system. At a time when Judaism and Greek philosophy were alike effete, when a feeble physical science which could read nothing but its own thoughts in the symbols of an older and deeper system was after its own fashion rationalizing the mythology of heathenism, there were found Jewish writers willing to apply the same principle of interpretation to the tabernacle and its order. In that way, it seemed to them, they would secure the respect even of the men of letters who could not bring themselves to be proselytes. The result appears in Josephus and in Philo, in part also in Clement of Alexandria and Origen.  Thus interpreted, the entire significance of the two tables of the covenant and their place within the ark disappeared, and the truths which the whole order represented became cosmical instead of ethical. If the special idiosyncrasy of one writer (Philo, De Profug.) led him to see in the holy of holies and the sanctuary that which answered to the Platonic distinction between the visible (αἰσθητά) and the spiritual (νοητά), the coarser, less intelligent Josephus goes still more completely into the new- system. The holy of holies is the visible firmament in which God dwells, the sanctuary is the earth and sea which men inhabit (Ant. 3, 6, 4, 7; 7, 7). The twelve loaves of the shew-bread represented the twelve months of the year, the twelve signs of the zodiac. The seven lamps were the seven planets. The four colors of the vail were the four elements (στοιχεῖα), air, fire, water, earth. Even the wings of the cherubim were, in the eyes of some, the two hemispheres of the universe, or the constellations of the greater and the lesser bears (Clem. Alex. Strom. 5, 35). The table of shew-bread and the altar of incense stood on the north, because north winds were most fruitful; the lamp on the south, because the motions of the planets were southward (ibid. § 34, 35). We need not follow such a system of interpretation further. It was not unnatural that the authority with which it started should secure for it considerable respect. We find it reappearing in some Christian writers-Chrysostom (Hom. in Joann. Bampt.) and Theodoret (Quaest. in Exodus); in some Jewish-Ben-Uzziel, Kimchi, Abarbanel (Bahr, Symbol. 1, 103 sq.). It was well for Christian thought that the Church had in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse of St. John that which helped to save it from the pedantic puerilities of this physico-theology. It is curious to note how in Clement of Alexandria the two systems of interpretation cross each other, leading sometimes to extravagances like those in the text, sometimes to thoughts at once lofty and true. Some of these have already been noticed. Others, not to be passed over, are that the seven lamps set forth the varied degrees and forms (πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως) of God's revelation, the form and the attitude of the cherubim, the union of active ministry and grateful, ceaseless contemplation (Strom. 5, 36, 37).

3. It will have been clear from all that has been said that the Epistle to the Hebrews has not been looked on as designed to limit our inquiry into the meaning of the symbolism of the tabernacle, and that there is consequently no ground for adopting the system of interpreters who can see in it nothing but an aggregate of types of Christian mysteries. Such a system has, in fact,  to choose between two alternatives. Either the meaning was made clear, at least to the devout worshippers of old, and then it is no longer true that the mystery was hid “from ages and generations,” or else the mystery was concealed and then the whole order was voiceless and unmeaning as long as it lasted, then only beginning to be instructive when it was “ready to vanish away.” Rightly viewed, there is, it is believed, no antagonism between the interpretation which starts from the idea of symbols of great eternal truths, and that, which rests on the idea of types foreshadowing Christ and his Work and his Church. If the latter were the highest manifestation of the former (and this is the keynote of the Epistle to the Hebrews), then the two systems run parallel with each other. The type may help us to understand the symbol. The symbol may guard us against: misinterpreting the type. That the same things were at once symbols and types may take its place among the proofs of an insight and a foresight more than human. Not the vail of nature only, but the vail of the flesh, the humanity of Christ, at once conceals and manifests the Eternals glory. The rending of that vail enabled all who had eves to see and hearts to believe to enter into the holy of holies, into the Divine Presence, and to see, not less clearly than the high-priest, as he looked on the ark and the mercy-seat, that righteousness and love, truth and mercy, were as one. Blood had been shed, a life had been offered which, through the infinite power of its love, was able to atone, to satisfy, to purify.

The allusions to the tabernacle in the Apocalypse are, as might be expected, full of interest. As in a vision, which loses sight of all time limits, the temple of the tabernacle is seen in heaven (Rev 15:5), and yet in the heavenly Jerusalem there is no temple seen (Rev 21:22). In the heavenly temple there is no longer any vail; it is open, and the ark of the covenant is clearly seen (Rev 11:19).

4. We cannot here follow out that strain of a higher mood, and it would not be profitable to enter into the speculations which later writers have engrafted on the first great thought. Those who wish to enter upon that line of inquiry may find materials enough in any of the greater commentaries on the Epistle to the Hebrews (Owen's, Stuart's, Bleek's, Tholuck's, Delitzsch's, Alford's), or in special treatises, such as those of Van Till (De Tabernac. in Ugolino, Thesaurus, 8), Bede (Expositio Mystica et Moralis Hosaici Tatbernaculi), Witsils (De Tabemn. Levit. Mysteriis, in the Miscell. Sacr.). Strange outlying hallucinations, like those of ancient rabbins, inferring from “the pattern showed to Moses in the  Mount” the permanent existence of a heavenly tabernacle, like in form, structure, proportions to that which stood in the wilderness (Leyrer, loc. cit.), or of later writers who have seen in it (not in the spiritual, but the anatomical sense of the word) a type of humanity, representing the outer bodily framework, the inner vital organs (Friederich, Syinb. der M- os. Stiftshütte, in Leyrer, loc. cit., and Ewald, Alterth. p. 338), may be dismissed with a single glance. The Judaic and patristic opinion in the main, though not in the details, was advocated by Bahr in his Symbolik (1837), in which he considered the tabernacle a symbol of the universe, the court representing earth, and the tabernacle, strictly so named, heaven, though not in a material sense, but as the place and instruments of God's revelation of himself. In his work on the temple, ten years later, Bihr retracted much of his former theory, and advocated the opinion that the tabernacle symbolized the idea of the dwelling of God in the midst of Israel. Another view, which seems an exaggeration into unwarrantable detail of the true idea that each Christian is a temple of God, proceeds to adapt to the elements of human nature the divisions and materials of the tabernacle. Thus the court is the body, the holy place the soul, the holiest the spirit-true dwelling place of God. This might do very well as a general illustration, and was so used by Luther; but the idea has been fully developed and defended against the attack of Bahr by Friederich in his Symb. der Mos. Stiftshütte (Leips. 1841).

5. Nevertheless, as the central point of a great symbolical and typical institute, the tabernacle necessarily possessed, both as a whole and in its contents, a symbolical and typical significance, which has been recognized by all orthodox interpreters. On this head, as we see above, much fanciful and unregulated ingenuity has been indulged; but this must not induce us to neglect those conclusions to which a just application of the principles of typological interpretation conducts.

(1.) Under the Old-Test. economy, the primary idea of the tabernacle was that of a dwelling for Jehovah in the midst of his people and this was prominently kept in view in all' the arrangements concerning the construction and location of the structure. “Let them,” said God to Moses, “make me a sanctuary that I may dwell among them” (Exo 25:8; Exo 29:45); when the structure was completed it was set up in the midst of the congregation, and there it always remained, whether the people rested or were on their march (Numbers 2); on it rested the cloud which indicated the Divine Presence, and which by its quiescence or removal indicated the  will of the Great Sovereign of Israel as to the resting or the removing of the camp (Exo 40:36-38); and to it the people repaired when they had sacrifice to offer to God, or counsel to ask of in (Lev 1:3; Num 27:2; Deu 31:14, etc.). As Judaism was strictly monotheistic, it knew but one sacred place where Jehovah was to be found. The holy of holies, which the apostle calls “the second tabernacle” (Heb 9:7), was the appropriate residence of Jehovah as the God of Israel. In this the principal thing was the ark, in which was placed “the testimony” (עֵדוּת), and which was covered by “the mercy-seat” (כִּפֹּרֶת). The testimony was the book of the law, and it was put into the ark as a witness against the people because of their sinfulness (Deu 31:26-27).. This symbolized the great truth that the first relation into which Jehovah comes with the sinner is that of a ruler whose law testifies against the transgressor. But this testimony was hid by the mercy-seat, on which the blood of atonement was sprinkled by the high-priest when he entered within the vail, and on which the visible emblem of Jehovah's presence the shechinah between the cherubim of glory-was enthroned; and in this there was an emblem of the fact that the condemning and accusing power of the law was taken away by the propitiatory covering which God had appointed. By all this was indicated the grand truth that the character in which Jehovah dwelt among his people was that of a justly offended but merciful and propitiated sovereign, who, having received atonement for their sins, had put these out of his sight, and would remember them no more at all against them (comp. Philo, De Vit. Mosis, bk. 3).

In the first or outer tabernacle, were the altar of incense, the table with the shew-bread, and the golden candlestick. The first was symbolical of the necessity and the acceptableness of prayer, of which the smoke of sweet incense that was to ascend from it morning and evening appears to be the appointed Biblical symbol (comp. Psa 141:2; Luk 1:10; Rev 5:8; Rev 8:3-4). The second was emblematical of the necessity of good works to accompany our devotions, the bread being the offering of the children of Israel to their Divine King (Lev 24:8), and consecrated to him by the offering of incense along with it as emblematical of prayer. The third was the symbol of the Church, or people of' God, the gold of which it was formed denoting the excellence of the Church, the seven lamps its completeness, and the oil by which they were fed being the appropriate symbol of the Divine Spirit dwelling in his people and causing  them to shine (comp. Zec 4:2-3; Mat 5:14; Mat 5:16; Rev 1:12; Rev 1:20).

In the fore-court of the tabernacle stood the altar of burnt-offering, on which were offered the sacrifices of the people, and the laver, in which the priests cleansed their hands and feet before entering the holy place. The symbolical significance of these is too well known to need illustration. SEE OFFERING; SEE PURIFICATION.

(2.) Under the new dispensation, if we view the tabernacle as a general symbol of Jehovah's dwelling in the midst of his people, then that to which it answers can be no other than the human nature of our Lord. He was “God manifest in the flesh,” “Immanuel,” God with us, and in him “dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily” (1Ti 3:16; Mat 1:23; Col 2:9). Hence John (Joh 1:14), in speaking of his incarnation, says, “The Word became flesh and tabernacled (ἐσκήνωσε) among us,” where the language evidently points to the ancient tabernacle as the symbolical residence of Jehovah; and in the book of Revelation (Rev 21:5) the same apostle, in announcing the final presence of Christ in his glorified humanity with his Church, uses the expression, The tabernacle of God is with men.” From these statements of the New Test. we may hold ourselves justified in concluding that the ancient tabernacle, viewed in its general aspect as the dwelling of Jehovah, found its antitype in the human nature of Christ, in whom God really dwelt. Viewed more particularly in its two great divisions, the tabernacle symbolized in its inner department the reign of Jehovah in his own majesty and glory, and in its outer department the service of God by propitiation and prayer. In keeping, with this, the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews teaches (as above seen) us to regard the outer part of the tabernacle as more strictly typical of the person of Jesus Christ, and the inner of heaven, into which he has now entered.

Thus he speaks of him (Heb 8:2) as now, in the heavenly state, “a minister of the true [i.e. real, ἀληθινή, as distinguished from symbolical] tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man,” where the allusion seems to be partly to the fact that Christ is in heaven, and partly to the fact that he ministers there in human nature. Still more explicit is the language used in Heb 9:11, where the writer, after speaking of the sacerdotal services of the ancient economy as merely figurative and outward, adds, But Christ having appeared— as high-priest of the good things to come, by means of the greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands (that is, not of this creation), nor by means of blood of  goats and calves but by means of his own blood, entered once (for all) into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.” In interpreting this passage, we would follow those who take the whole as far as the words “his own blood” as the subject of the sentence, and consequently join the clauses depending from διά with παραγεμόμενος, and not with εἰσῆλθεν; for it seems to be more natural to suppose that the writer should say that it was by means of a more perfect tabernacle and a holier sacrifice that Christ became the high-priest of spiritual blessings than that it was by these means that he entered into the holy place. The objection to this construction which dean Alford urges, that “in that case οὐδέ would be left without any preceding member of the negation to follow,” is of no weight, for it burdens the construction he adopts as much as that he rejects, and is to be obviated in either case by resolving οὐδέ into καὶ οὐ (see Meyer's note on Heb 8:12).

Assuming this to be the proper construction of the passage, it seems clearly to represent the human nature of our Lord — that in which he made his soul an offering for sin — as the antitype of the ancient tabernacle in which the high-priest offered sacrifice, while the heavenly world into which he had entered as a high-priest was typified by the holy place into which the Jewish high-priest entered to appear in the symbolical presence of Jehovah. For further confirmation of this may be adduced Heb 10:20, where the writer, speaking of the privilege enjoyed by believers under the new dispensation of approaching God through Christ, says we can do it “by a new and living way which he hath inaugurated (ἐνεκαίνισεν) for us through the vail (that is, his own flesh).” The allusion here is undoubtedly to the ancient tabernacle service, and the truth set forth is that as the high-priest of old went with sacrificial blood through the vail into the holy of holies, so we, as made priests unto God by Jesus Christ, may approach the immediate presence of Jehovah through that path which the Savior has inaugurated for us by his death in human nature-that path by which he himself has preceded us as our great intercessor, and which is ever fresh and living for us. There may be some rhetorical confusion in this passage, but the general idea seems plainly this, that the body of Christ, slain for us, affords us a passage, by means of sacrifice, into the presence of God, just as the first tabernacle with its services afforded an entrance to the high-priest of old into the holy of holies (see Hofmann, Schrifibeweis, II, 1, 405 sq.; Weissag. u. Erfüllung, 2, 189 sq.).  For the symbolism, in a New Test. sense, of the various parts and uses of the tabernacle, such as the altar (θυσιαστήριον, Heb 13:10), the vail (καταπέτασμα, 10:20), the mercy-seat (ἱλαστήριον, Rom 3:25), etc., see each word in its place.

6. It is proper in this connection to refer to a speculative hypothesis which, though in itself unsubstantial enough, has been revived under circumstances that have given it prominence. It has been maintained by Von Bohlen and Vatke (Bühr, 1, 117,273) that the commands and the descriptions relating to the tabernacle in the books of Moses are altogether unhistorical, the result of the effort of some late compiler to ennoble the cradle of his people's history by transferring to a remote antiquity what he found actually existing in the Temple, modified only so far as was necessary to fit it into the theory of a migration and a wandering. The structure did not belong to the time of the Exodus, if indeed there ever was an Exodus. The tabernacle thus becomes the mythical after growth of the Temple, riot the Temple the historical sequel to the tabernacle. It has lately been urged as tending to the same conclusion that the circumstances connected with the tabernacle in the Pentateuch are manifestly unhistorical. The whole congregation of Israel are said to meet in a court which could not have contained more than a few hundred men (Colenso, Pentateuch and Book of Joshua, pt. 1, ch. Jos 4:5). The number of priests was utterly inadequate for the services of the tabernacle (ibid. ch. 20). The narrative of the head-money collection, of the gifts of the people, is full of anachronisms (ibid. ch. 14).

Some of these objections those, e.g., as to the number of the first-born, and the disproportionate smallness of the priesthood, have been met by anticipation in remarks under PRIEST and LEVITE. Others bearing upon the general veracity of the Pentateuch history it is impossible to discuss here. SEE PENTATEUCH. It will be sufficient to notice such as bear immediately upon the subject of this article.

(1.) It may be said that this theory, like other similar theories as to the history of Christianity, adds to instead of diminishing difficulties and anomalies. It may be possible to make out plausibly that what purports to be the first period of an institution is, with all its documents, the creation of the second; but the question then comes, How are we to explain the existence of the second? The world rests upon an elephant, and the  elephant on a tortoise, but the footing of the tortoise is at least somewhat insecure.

(2.) Whatever may be the weight of the argument drawn from the alleged presence of the whole congregation at the door of the tabernacle tells with equal force against the historical existence of the Temple and the narrative of its dedication. There also, when the population numbered some seven or eight millions (2Sa 24:9), “all the men of Israel” (1Ki 8:2), “all the congregation” (1Ki 8:5), “all the children of Israel” (1Ki 8:63) were assembled, and the king “blessed” all the congregation (1Ki 8:14; 1Ki 8:55).

(3.) There are, it is believed, undesigned touches indicating the nomadic life of the wilderness. “The wood employed for the tabernacle is not the sycamore of the valleys nor the cedar of Lebanon, as afterwards in the Temple, but the shittim of the Sinaitic peninsula. SEE SHITTAH-TREE; SEE SHITTIM. The abundance of fine linen points to Egypt, the seal or dolphin skins (“badgers” in the A.V., but see Gesenius; s.v. תִּחִשׁ) to the shores of the Red Sea. SEE BADGER. The Levites are not to enter on their office till the age of thirty, as needing for their work as bearers a man's full strength (Num 4:23; Num 4:30). Afterwards, when their duties are chiefly those of singers and gatekeepers, they were to begin at twenty (1Ch 23:2) 1. Would a later history, again, have excluded the priestly tribe from all share in the structure of the tabernacle, and left it in the hands of mythical persons belonging to Judah, and to a tribe then so little prominent as that of Dan?

(4.) There remains the strong Egyptian stamp impressed upon well-nigh every part of the tabernacle and its ritual, and implied in other incidents. SEE BRAZEN SERPENT; SEE LEVITE; SEE PRIEST; SEE URIM AND THUMMIM. Whatever bearing this may have on our views of the things themselves, it points, beyond all doubt to a time when the two nations had been brought into close contact, when not jewels of silver and gold only, but treasures of wisdom, art, knowledge, were “borrowed” by one people from the other. To what other period in the history before Samuel than that of the Exodus of the Pentateuch can we refer that intercourse?

When was it likely that a wild tribe, with difficulty keeping its ground against neighboring nations, would have adopted such a complicated ritual from a system so alien to its own? The facts which, when urged by Spencer, with or without a hostile purpose, were denounced as daring and  dangerous and unsettling, are now seen to be witnesses to the antiquity of the religion of Israel, and so to the substantial truth of the Mosaic history. They are used as such by theologians who in various degrees enter their protest against the more destructive criticism of our own time (Hengstenberg, Egypt and the Books of Moses; Stanley, Jewish Church, lect. 4).

(5.) We may, for a moment, put an imaginary case. Let us suppose that the records of the Old Test. had given us in 1 and 2 Samuel a history like that which men now seek to substitute for what is actually given, had represented Samuel as the first great preacher of the worship of Elohim, Gad, or some later prophet, as introducing for the first time the name and worship of Jehovah, and that the Old Test. began with this (Colenso, pt. 2, ch. 21). Let us then suppose that some old papyrus, freshly discovered, slowly deciphered, gave us the whole or the greater part of what we now find in Exodus and Numbers, that there was thus given an explanation both of the actual condition of the people and of the Egyptian element so largely intermingled with their ritual. Can we not imagine with what jubilant zeal the books of Samuel would then have been “critically examined,” what inconsistencies would have been detected in them, how eager men would have been to prove that Samuel had had credit given him for a work which was not his; that not he, but Moses, was the founder of the polity and creed of Israel; that the tabernacle on Zion, instead of coming fresh from David's creative mind, had been preceded by the humbler tabernacle in the wilderness?

The objection raised against the truthfulness of the narrative (Colenso, ibid. ch. 7) on the ground that the entire congregation of 600,000 is said to have been convened at the door of this small structure (Leviticus 8) is readily obviated by the natural interpretation that only the principal persons stood immediately near, while the multitude easily viewed the ceremonies from a convenient distance (Birks, The Exodus of Israel, p. 111).

VI. Literature. — Besides the commentaries on Exodus ad loc., see Babhr, Symbolik d. mos. (ult. 1, 56 sq.; Lund, Die jid. Heiligthümer dargestellt (Hamb. 1695, 1738); Van Til, Comment. de Tabernac. Mos. (Dord. 1714; also in Ugolino, Thesaur. vol. 8); Conrad, De Tabernaculi Mosis Structura et Figura (Offenbach, 1712); Lamy, De Tabernaculo Faederis (Paris, 1720); Tympe, Tabernaculi e Monumentis Descriptio (Jena, 1731); Carpzov, Appar. p. 248 sq.; Reland, Antiq. Sacr. 1, 3-5;  Schacht, Animadv. ad Iken. Antiq. p. 267 sq.; D'Aquine [Phil.], Du Tabernacle (Paris, 1623-24); Benzelii Dissertationes, 2, 97 sq. Millii Miscellanea Sacra (Amit. 1754), p. 329 sq.; Ravius, De iis quace ex Arabia in usum Tabernaculi fuerant Petita (Ultraj. 1753, ed. J. M. Schröckh, Lips. 1755); Recchiti, ( הִמַּשְׁכָּן(Mantua, 1776); Vriemoet, De Aulceo adyti Tabernaculi (Franec. 1745); Meyer, Bibeldeutung, p. 262 sq.; Lanzi [Michelangelo], La Sacra Scrittura Illustrata con Monum. Fenico A ssiri ed. Egiziani (Roma, 1827, fol.); Neumann, Die Stiftshütte (Gotha, 1861); Friederich, Symbol. d. mos. Stiftshütte (Leips. 1841); Kurtz, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1844, 2, 305 sq.; Riggenbach, Die mos. Stiftshütte (Basel, 1862, 1867); Soltau, Vessels of the Tabernacle (Lond. 1865); Paine, The Tabernacle, Temple, etc. (Bost, 1861); Kitto, The Tabernacle and its Furniture (Lond. 1849): Simpson, Typ. Character of the Tabernacle (Edinb. 1852); Brown, The Tabernacle, etc. (ibid. 1s71, 1872, 8vo).

## Tabernacle (2)[[@Headword:Tabernacle (2)]]

             is a name given to certain chapels or meeting-houses in England erected by Mr. Whitefield, and to similar places of worship reared by Robert Haldane for the accommodation of a few large congregations in Scotland, out of which have chiefly been formed the present churches of Congregational dissenters in that country.

Tabernacle is also a term applied to certain interior portions of churches, etc.:

1. A niche or hovel for an image.

2. An ambry on the right side of the altar, or behind it, for the reservation of the host, chrism, and oil for the sick.

3. A throne carried like a litter on the shoulders of Spanish priests in the procession of Corpus Christi, and supporting the host.

4. A small temple over the central part of an altar for the reservation of the eucharist, contained in the pyx, and often decorated with a crown of three circlets.  Its earliest form was a coffer of wood, or a little arched receptacle; then it became a tower of gold, or of circular shape, being a casket for the chalice and paten, in fact a ciborium. In the 15th century the tabernacle became a magnificent piece of furniture over or on the left side of the high-altar, with statues, towers, foliage, buttresses, and superb work, as at Grenoble, St. John Maurienne, Leau, Tournay, and Nuremberg, the latter sixty-four feet high, and of white stone. SEE CIBORIUM; SEE DOVE; SEE PYX.

## Tabernacles, the Feast of[[@Headword:Tabernacles, the Feast of]]

             the third of the three great annual festivals, the other two being the feasts of the Passover and Pentecost, on which' the whole male population were required to appear before the Lord in the national sanctuary. It was a celebration of the ingathering of all the fruits of the year, and in general import as well as time corresponded to the modern Thanksgiving season. SEE FESTIVAL.

I. Names and their Signification. — This festival is called —

1. חִג הִסֻּכּוֹת, Chag has-Sukkoth; Sept. ἑορτὴ σκηνῶν, the Festival of Tents; Vulg. feriae tabernaculorum; A.V. the Feast of Tabernacles (2Ch 8:13; Ezr 3:4; Zec 14:16; Zec 14:18-19); σκηνοπηγία (Joh 7:2; Josephus, Ant. 8:4, 5); σκηναί (Philo, De Sept. § 24); ἡ σκηνή (Plutarch, Sympos. 4:6, 2); because every Israelite was commanded to live in tabernacles during its continuance (comp. Lev 23:43).

2. חִג הָאָסַי, ἑορτὴ συντελείας, the Feast of Ingathering (Exo 23:16; Exo 34:22), because it was celebrated at the end of the agricultural year, when the ingathering of the fruits and the harvest was completed.

3. It is κατ᾿ ἐξοχήν denominated חִג יְהוָֹה, the Festival of Jehovah (Lev 23:39), or simply חִג הָחִג, the Festival (1Ki 8:2; 2 Chronicles 5, 3; 2Ch 7:8-9; Mishna, Shekalim, 3, 1; Sukkah, 2, 6; Rosh ha- Shana, 1. 2; Megillah, 3, 5; Taanith, 1, 1, 2), because of its importance, and of its being the most joyful of all festivals. The assertion of Winer (Bibl. Realwörterbuch, s.v. “Laubhüttenfest”), repeated by Keil (Archäologie, vol. 1, § 85, note 3) and Bahr (Symbolik, 2, 660), that the rabbins call this festival יום המרובה, dies multiplicationis, is incorrect. The Mishna, which Winer quotes in corroboration of this assertion, does not denominate this festival as such, but simply speaks of the many  sacrifices offered on the first day thereof: “If any one vows wine [for the Temple] he must not give less than three logs; if oil, not less than one log. If he says, I do not know how much I have set apart, he must give as much as is used on the day which requires most” (Menachoth, 13:5) — i.e. as is used on the first day of the festival [of Tabernacles] when it happens to be on a Sabbath, for on such a day there are more libations used than on any other day in the year, inasmuch as 140 logs of wine are required for the different sacrifices.

The following are the principal passages in the Pentateuch which refer to this festival: Exo 23:16, where it is spoken of as the Feast of Ingathering, and is brought into connection with the other festivals under their agricultural designations, the Feast of Unleavened Bread and the Feast of Harvest; Lev 23:34-36; Lev 23:39-43, where it is mentioned as commemorating the passage of the Israelites through the desert; Deu 16:13-15, in which there is no notice of the eighth day, and it is treated as a thanksgiving for the harvest; Num 29:12-38, where there is an enumeration of the sacrifices which belong to the festival; Deu 31:10-13, where the injunction is given for the public reading of the law in the Sabbatical year, at the Feast of Tabernacles. In Nehemiah 8 there is an account of the observance of the feast by Ezra, from which several additional particulars respecting it may be gathered.

II. The Time at which this Festival was celebrated. The time fixed for the celebration of this feast is from the 15th to the 22nd of Tishri when the season of the year is changing for winter (Josephus, Ant. 3, 10, 4); i.e. in the autumn, when the whole of the chief fruits of the ground — the corn, the wine, and the oil-were gathered in (Exo 23:16; Lev 23:39; Deu 16:13-15). Hence it is spoken of as occurring “in the end of the year, when thou hast gathered in thy labors out of the field.” There were thus only four days intervening between this festival and the Great Day of Atonement. But though its duration, strictly speaking, was only seven days (Deu 16:13; Eze 45:25), yet, as it was followed by a day of holy convocation, this festival is sometimes described as lasting eight days (Lev 23:36; Neh 8:18).

III. The Manner in which this Festival was celebrated. As it is most essential, in describing the mode in which this feast was and still is celebrated, to distinguish between the Pentateuchal enactments and those  rites, ceremonies, and practices, which gradually obtained in the course of time, we shall divide our description into three periods.

1. The Period from the Institution of this Festival to the Babylonian Captivity. — The Mosaic enactments about the manner in which this festival is to be celebrated are as follows: The Israelites are to live in tabernacles during the seven days of this festival, “that your generations may know that I made the children of Israel to dwell in tabernacles when I brought them out of the land of Egypt” (Lev 23:42-43). The first day alone, however, is to be a holy convocation (מַקְרָא קָדשׁ), and a Sabbath or day of perfect cessation of business, on which no manner of secular work is to be done (Lev 23:35; Lev 23:39); and all the able-bodied male members of the congregation, who are not legally precluded from it, are to appear in the place of the national sanctuary, as on the Passover and Pentecost (Exo 23:14; Exo 23:17; Exo 34:23). On this day the Israelites are to take “the fruit of goodly trees, with branches of palm-trees, boughs of thick trees, and willows of the brook” (Lev 23:40), most probably to symbolize the varied vegetation which grew in the different localities of their journey, through the wilderness—viz. the palm-tree of the plain where the Israelites encamped, the willow at the mountain stream, from which God gave his people water to drink; and the designedly indefinite thick bush on the mountain heights over which they had to travel; while the fruits of the goodly trees represent the produce of the beautiful land which they ultimately obtained after their pilgrimages in the wilderness (Pressel, in Herzog's Real-Encyklopadie, s.v. “Laubhüttenfest”).

As this, festival, however, though symbolizing by the several practices thereof the pilgrimage through the wilderness, was nevertheless more especially designed to celebrate the completion of the harvest in the Promised Land, as typified by the fruit of the goodly trees in contrast to the plants of the wilderness, the Israelites are enjoined “not to appear before the Lord empty, but every one shall give as he is able, according to the blessing of the, Lord thy God which he hath given thee” (Exo 23:15; Deu 16:16-17). Hence they are to offer burnt offerings, meat- offerings, drink-offerings, and other sacrifices as follows: On the first day, the burnt-offering is to consist of thirteen bullocks, two rams, fourteen lambs, and one kid of the goats for a sin-offering, with the appropriate meat and drink-offerings; the meat-offerings being three tenths of an ephah of flour mingled with one half of a hin of oil to each bullock, two tenths of an ephah of flour mingled with one third of a hin of oil to each ram, and  one tenth of an ephah of flour mingled with one quarter of a hin of oil to each lamb; the drink offering consisting of one half of a hin of wine to each bullock, one third of a hin of wine to each ram, and one quarter of a hin of wine to each lamb (Num 15:2-11; Num 28:12-14). The same number of rams and lambs, and one kid, are to be offered on the following days; the number of bullocks alone is to be reduced by one each day, so that on the seventh day only seven are to be offered (Num 29:12-38). There are accordingly to be offered during the seven days in all seventy bullocks, fourteen rams, ninety-eight lambs, and seven goats, with thirty-three and three-fifths ephahs of flour, sixty four and one-sixth bins of oil, and sixty- four and one, sixth hins of wine. Moreover, the law is to be read publicly in the sanctuary on the first day of the festival every Sabbatical year (Deu 31:10-13). The six following days, i.e. 15th-22nd of Tishri-are to be half festivals; they were most probably devoted to social enjoyments and friendly gatherings, when every head of the family was to enjoy the feasts from the second or festival tithe with his son, daughter, man-servant, maidservant, the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow (Deu 16:14). SEE TITHE.

At the conclusion of the seventh day another festival is to be celebrated, denominated the concluding day (עֲצֶרֶתיוֹם), the eighth concluding day (שְׁמַינַי עֲצֶרֶת; Sept. ἐξόδιον). Like the first day, it is to be a holy convocation, and no manner of work is to be done on it. As it is not only the finishing of the Feast of Tabernacles, but the conclusion of the whole cycle of festivals, the dwelling in the tabernacle is to cease on it, and the sacrifices to be offered thereon are to be distinct, and unlike those offered on the preceding days of Tabernacles. The burnt-sacrifice is to consist of one bullock, one ram, and seven lambs one year old, with the appropriate meat and drink-offerings, and one goat for a sin-offering (Num 29:36-38). The sacrifices, therefore, were it to be like those of the seventh new moon and the Great Day of Atonement. Being, however, attached as an octave to the Feast of Tabernacles, the Sabbatical rest and the holy convocation, which properly belong to the seventh day of the Feast of Tabernacles, are transferred to it, and hence the two festivals are frequently joined together and spoken of as one composed of eight days. There is only one instance on record of this festival being celebrated between the entrance into the Promised Land and the Babylonian captivity (1Ki 8:2; 2Ch 7:8-10 with Neh 8:17). No trace of any  exposition of the Pentateuchal enactments with regard to this festival is to be found until we come to the postexilian period.

2. The Period from the Return from Babylon to the Destruction of the Temple. —In the account of the first celebration of this festival after the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity, the concise Pentateuchal injunction is expanded. Not only are the localities specified in which these booths are to be erected, but additional plants are mentioned, and the use to be made of these plants is stated. The Jews, according to the command of Ezra, made themselves booths upon the roofs of houses in the courts of their dwellings, in the courts of the sanctuary, in the street of-the watergate, and in the street of the gate of Ephraim, from the olive- branches, the pine-branches, the myrtle-branches, the palm-branches, and the branches of the thick trees, which they were told to gather, and dwelt in these booths seven days (Neh 8:15-18). The Sadducees of old, who are followed by the Karaites, took these boughs and the fruits to be identical with those mentioned in Lev 23:39-40, and maintained that these were to be used for the construction and adornment of the booths or tabernacles. The Pharisees and the orthodox Jewish tradition, however, as we shall see hereafter, interpreted this precept differently.

When the Feast of Tabernacles, like all other festivals and precepts of the Mosaic law, began to be strictly and generally kept after the Babylonian captivity, under the spiritual guidance of the Great Synagogue, the Sanhedrim, and the doctors of the law— scribes, more minute definitions and more expanded applications of the concise Pentateuchal injunction were imperatively demanded, in order to secure uniformity of practice, as well as to infuse devotion and joy into the celebration thereof, both in the Temple and in the booths. Hence it was ordained that the tabernacle or booth (סֻכָּה, sukkah) must be a detached and temporary habitation, constructed for the sole purpose of living in it during this festival, and must not be used as a permanent dwelling. The interior of it must neither be higher than twenty cubits, nor lower than ten palms; it must not have less than three walls; it must not be completely roofed in. or covered with any solid material but must be thatched in such a manner as to admit the view of the sky and the stars; and the part open to the rays of the sun must not exceed in extent the part shaded by the cover. It must not be under a tree; neither must it be covered with a cloth, nor with anything which contracts defilement or does not derive its growth from the ground (Mishnsa, Sukkah, 1, 1-2, 7). The furniture of the huts was to be, according to most  authorities, of the plainest description. There was to be nothing which was not fairly necessary. It would seem, however, that there was no strict rule on this point, and that there was a considerable difference according: to the habits or circumstances of the occupant (Carpzov, p. 415; Buxtorf, Syn. Jud. p. 451). (See curious figures of different forms of huts, and of the great lights of the Feast of Tabernacles, in Surenhusius, Mischnar, vol. 2; also a lively description of some of the huts used by the Jews in modern times in La Vie Juive en Alsdae, p. 170, etc.) Every Israelite is to constitute the sukkah his regular domicile during the whole of the seven days of the festival, while his house is only to be his occasional abode, and he is only to quit the booth when it rains very heavily. Even a child, as soon as he ceases to be dependent upon his mother, must dwell in the booth; and the only persons exempt from this duty are those deputed on pious missions, invalids, nurses, women, and infants (Mishna, Sukkah, 2, 8,9). The orthodox rabbins in the time of Christ would not eat any food which exceeded in quantity the size of an egg out of the booth (ibid. 2, 5).

The four species of vegetable productions to be used during prayer (Lev 23:39-40) are the next distinctive feature of this festival, to. which the ancient doctors of the law before the time of Christ devoted much attention. These are-

(1.) “The fruits of the goodly tree” (פְרַי עֵוֹ הָדָר). As the phrase goodly or splendid tree (עֵוֹ הָדָר) is too indefinite, and the fruit of such a tree may simply denote the fruit of any choice fruit-tree, thus leaving it very vague, the Hebrew canons, based upon one of the significations of הָדִר(to dwell, to rest; see Rashi on Lev 23:40), decreed that it means the fruits which permanently rest upon the tree—i.e. the citron, the paradise-apple (אֶתְרוֹג, ethrog). Hence the rendering of Onkelos, the so-called Jerusalem Targum, and the Syriac version of הָדָרby ethrog (=κίτριον, Josephus, Ant. 13:13, 5), citron. Josephts elsewhere (ibid. 3, 10, 4) says that it was the fruit of the persea, a tree said by Plily to have been conveyed from Persia to Egypt (Hist. Nat. 15:13), and which some have identified with the peach (Malus persica). The ethrog must not be from an uncircumcised tree (Lev 19:23), nor from tie unclean heave-offering (comp. Num 18:11-12); it must not have a stain on the crown, nor be without the crown, peeled of its rind, perforated, or defective, else it is illegal (Mishna, Sukkah, 3, 5, 6).

(2.) “Branches of palm-trees” (כִּפֹּת תְּמָרַים). According to the Hebrew canons, it is the shoot of the palm-tree when budding, before the leaves are spread abroad, and while it is yet like a rod, and this is called luláb (לוּלִב), which is the technical expression given in the Chaldee versions and in the Jewish writings for the Biblical phrase in question (Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. col. 1143; Carpzov, App. Crit. p. 416; Drusius, Not. Maj. in Leviticus 23). The luláb must at least be three hands tall, and must be tied together with its own kind (Mishna. Sukkah, 3, 1, 8; Maimonides, lad Ha- Chezaka, Rilchoth Luláb, 7:1).

(3.) “The bough of a thick tree” (עָנִ עֵוֹ עָבֹת). This ambiguous phrase is interpreted by the ancient canons to denote “the myrtle-branch (הֲדִס) whose leaves thickly cover the wood thereof: it must have three or more shoots around the stem on the same level of the stem, but if it has two shoots opposite each other on the same level, and the third shoot is above them, it is not thick, but is called (עבות שוטה) a thin myrtle” (Mishna, Sukkah, 32 b; Maimonides, ibid. 7. 2). This explanation accounts for the rendering of the Chaldee paraphrases of this phrase by hadds (הֲדִס), myrtle-branch. If the point of this myrtle-branch is broken off, or if its leaves are torn off, or if it has more berries on it than leaves, it is illegal (Mishna, Sukkah, 3, 2).

(4.) “The willows of the brook” ( עִרְבֵי נִחִל= salix helix) must be of that species the distinguishing marks of which are dark wood, and long leaves with smooth margin. If any one of these four kinds has been obtained by theft, or comes from a grove devoted to idolatry, or from a town which has been enticed to idolatry (comp. Deu 13:12, etc.), it is illegal (ibid. 3, 1-5). Their legality having been ascertained,: the palm, the myrtle, and the willow are bound up together into one bundle, denominated luláb.

It has already been remarked that the Sadducees in and before the time of Christ maintained that the boughs and fruit here mentioned (viz. Lev 23:40) are to be used for the construction and adornment of the booths, and that they appeal to Neh 8:15-16 in support of this view. This view has not only been espoused by the Karaite Jews, the successors of: the Sadducees, SEE SADDUCEE, but is defended by bishop Patrick Keil, and most modern Christian interpreters. Against this, however, is to be urged that—

(1.) The obvious sense of the injunction (Lev 23:40) is that these boughs are to be carried as symbols during the rejoicing, and that we should expect something more explicit than the single and simple word

וְלָקִחְתֵּם, and ye shall take, had it been designed that these boughs should be employed for the construction of the booths.

(2.) The fruit (פַּרַי) as the margin of the A.V. rightly has it, and not boughs, as it is in the text with which this injunction commences-could surely not be among the materials for the construction of the booths.

(3.) The law about the booths is entirely separated from the ordering of the fruit and boughs, as may be seen from a comparison of Lev 23:40 with Lev 23:42.

(4.) The first day of this festival, as we have seen, was a holy convocation, on which all manner of work was interdicted. It is therefore against the sanctity of the day to suppose that the command to take the fruit and the boughs on the first-day meant that the Israelites are to construct with these plants the booths on this holy day.

(5.) The appeal to Nehemiah 8 is beside the mark, inasmuch as different materials are there mentioned — e.g. olive branches and pine-branches, which were actually mused for making the booths, while the hadâr fruit and the willow specified in the Pentateuchal injunction, are omitted. With the regulations about the tabernacles and the boughs or luláb before us, we can now continue the description of the mode in which this festival was celebrated in the Temple.

14th of Tishri was the Preparation Day ( טוֹב עֶרֶב יוֹם= παρασκευή). The pilgrim's came up to Jerusalem on the day previous to the commencement of the festival, when they prepared everything necessary for its solemn observance. The priests proclaimed the approach of the holy convocation on the eve of this day by the blasts of trumpets. As on the Feasts of the Passover and Pentecost, the altar of the burnt-sacrifice was cleansed in the first night-watch (Mishna, Yoma. 1, 8), and the gates of the Temple, as well as those of the inner court, were opened immediately after midnight for the convenience of the priests who resided in the city, and for the people who filled the court before the cock crew to have their sacrifices and offerings duly examined by the priests (ibid. 1, 8). When the first clay of Tabernacles happened on the Sabbath the people brought their palm- branches or luláb's on the 14th of Tishri to the synagogue on the Temple  mount, where the servants of the synagogue (חזנים) deposited them in a gallery, while the luláb's of the elders of the synagogue (זקנים) were placed in a separate chamber, as it was against the Sabbatical laws to carry the palms on the Sabbath from the booths of the respective pilgrims to the Temple.

15th of Tishri. —At daybreak of the first day of the festival a priest, accompanied by a jubilant procession and by a band of music, descended with a golden pitcher holding three logs to the pool of Siloam, and, having filled it with water from the brook, he endeavored to reach the Temple in time to join his brother priests who carried the morning sacrifice to the altar (Tosiphta Sukkah, c. 3). Following in their steps, he entered from the south through the water-gate into the inner court (Mishna, Middoth, 2, 6; Gemara, Sukketh, 48 a). On reaching the water-gate, he was welcomed by three blasts of the trumpet. He then ascended the steps of the altar with another priest who carried a pitcher of wine for the drink-offering. The two priests turned to the left of the altar where two silver basins were fixed with holes at the bottom; the basin for the water was to the west and had a narrower hole, while the one for the wine was to the east and had a wider hole, so that both might get empty at the same time. Into these respective basins they simultaneously and slowly poured the water and the wine in such a manner that both were emptied at the same time upon the base of the altar. To the priest who poured out the water the people called out, Raise thy hand! The reason for this is that when Alexander Jannai, who officiated as priest, was charged with this duty, being a Sadducee and rejecting the ordinances of the scribes, he poured the water over his feet and not into the basin, whereupon the people pelted him with their ethrôgs, or citrons. At this catastrophe, which nearly cost the life of the Maccabean king, Alexander Jannai called for the assistance of the soldiers, when nearly six thousand Jews perished in the Temple, and the altar was damaged, a corner of it being broken off in the struggle which ensued (Josephus, Ant. 13:13, 5; Mishna, Sukkah, 4:9; Gemara, ibid. 48 a; 51 a; Gratz, Geschichte der Juden [2nd ed. Leips. 1863], 3, 112, 473 sq.). See Scribes. The ceremony of drawing the water-was repeated every morning during the seven days of the festival.

At the same time that the priests went in procession to the pool of Siloam, another jubilant multitude of people went to a place outside Jerusalem called Motsâ (מוֹצִא), which abounded in willows. These willows they  gathered with great rejoicing, carried them into the Temple amid the blasts of trumpets, and placed them at the altar in such a manner that their tops overhung and formed a sort of canopy (Mishna, Sukkah, 4:5). The decorating process of the altar being finished, the daily morning- sacrifice was first offered, Musaph (מוּסָ); then the additional or special sacrifice for this festival prescribed in Num 29:12-38, which, on the first day, consisted of a burnt-offering of thirteen bullocks, two rams, and fourteen lambs, with the appropriate meat- and drink-offering, and a goat for a sin- offering, and then the peace-offerings, the vows, and the free-will offerings, which constituted the repast of the people (Jerusalem, Sukkah, v). While these sacrifices were offered the Levites chanted the Great Hallel, as on the feasts of the Passover and Pentecost. On this occasion, however, each of the pilgrims held in his right, hand the luláb, or palm, to which were tied the twigs of myrtle and willow as described above, and the ethrôg, or citron, in his left, while these psalms were chanted; and, during the chanting of Psalms 118, the pilgrims shook their palms three times—viz. at the singing of Psa 118:1; Psa 118:25; Psa 118:29 (Psa 118:1; Psa 118:25; Psa 118:29) (Mishna, Sukkah, 3, 9). When the Musâph chant was finished the priests in procession went round the altar once, exclaiming: Hosanna, O Jehovah; give us help, O Jehovah, give prosperity! (Psa 118:25). Thereupon the solemn benediction was pronounced by the priests and the people dispersed, amid the repeated exclamations, “How beautiful art thou, O altar!” or “To Jehovah and thee, O altar, we give thanks!” (Mishna, Sukkah, 4:5; Gemara, ibid. 44 b, 45). Each one of the pilgrims then betook himself to his respective booth, there to enjoy his repast with the Levite, the stranger, the poor, and the fatherless who shared his hospitality. This practice explains the remarks of the evangelists (Mat 21:8-9; Mat 21:15; Joh 12:12-13). It is to be remarked that on the first day of the festival every Israelite carried about his luláb, or palm, all day; he carried it into the synagogue, held it in his hand while praying, and only laid it down when called to the reading of the law, as he then had to hold the scroll, SEE SYNAGOGUE; carried it with him when he went to visit the sick and comfort the mourners (Mishna, Sukkah, 41 a; Maimonides, clad Ha- Chezaka, lilchoth Luláb, 7:24).

16th-20th of Tishri. —These days were half-holydays; they were called the middle days of the festival ( מועד חול= μεσούσης τῆς ἑορτῆς, Joh 7:14), or the lesser festival (מועד קטן). Any articles of food or raiment required for immediate use were allowed to be ‘purchased privately during  these days, and work demanded by the emergencies of the public service or required for the festival, the omission of which entailed loss or injury; was permitted to be done. SEE PASSOVER.

On the night of the 15th, and on the five succeeding nights, the rejoicing of the drawing of water (בית השואבה שמחת) was celebrated in the court of the Temple in the following manner: The people assembled in large masses in the court of ‘the women at night, after the expiration of the first day of the festival. The women occupied the galleries which were permanent fixtures in the court (Mishna, Middoth, 2, 15), while the men occupied the space below. Four huge golden candelabra were placed in the center of the court; each of these candelabra had four-golden basins and four ladders, on which stood four lads from the rising youths of the priests with jars of oil wherewith they fed the basins, while the cast-off garments of the- priests were used as wicks. The lights of these candelabra illuminated the whole city. Around these lights pious and distinguished men danced before the people with lighted flambeaux in their hands, singing hymns and songs of praise; while the Levites, who were stationed on the fifteen steps which led into the woman's court, and corresponded to the fifteen psalms of degrees=steps (Psalms 120-134), accompanied the songs with harps, psalteries, cymbals, and numberless musical instruments. The dancing, as well as the vocal and instrumental music, continued till daybreak. Some of these pious men performed dexterous movements with their flambeaux while dancing for the amusement of the people. Thus it is related that R. Simon II (A.D. 30-50), son of Gamaliel I, the teacher of the apostle Paul SEE EDUCATION, used to dance with eight torches in his hands, which he alternately threw up in the air and caught again without their touching each other or falling to the ground (Tosiphta Sukkah, c. 4; Jerusalem, Sukkah, 5, 4; Babylon, ibid. 53 a). It is supposed that it was the splendid light of this grand illumination, which suggested the remark of our Savior— “I am the light of the world” (Joh 8:12). Towards the approach of day two priests stationed themselves, with trumpets in their hands, at the upper gate leading from the court of the Israelites to the court of the women, and awaited the announcement of daybreak by the crowing of the cock. As soon as the cock crew, they blew the trumpets three times and marched out the people of the Temple in such a manner that they had to descend the ten steps, where the two priests again blew the trumpets three times, and when they reached the lowest step in the outer court they for the third time blew the trumpets three times. They continued to blow as  they were marching across the court till they reached the eastern gate. Here they turned their faces westward towards the Temple and said, “Our fathers once turned their back to the sanctuary in this place, and their faces to the east, and worshipped the sun towards the east (comp. Eze 8:15-16); but we lift up our eves to Jehovah.” Thereupon they returned to the Temple, while the people who were thus marched out went to their respective booths. Some, however, formed themselves into a procession, and went with the priests to the pool of Siloam to fetch the water; while others returned to the Temple, to be present at the morning sacrifice (Mishna, Sukkah, 5, 2-4; Maimonides, Iad Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Sukkah, 8:12-15). The Talmud maintains that the ceremony of the drawing of water is anterior to the Babylonian captivity, and that Isa 12:3 refers to it (Sukkah, 48 b). Indeed, it is only on this supposition that the imagery in Isa 12:3 obtains its full force and- significance. As to the import of this ceremony, ancient tradition furnishes two explanations of it.

(1.) Since the Feast of Tabernacles was the time of the latter rain (Joe 2:23), the drawing and pouring out of the water was regarded as symbolical of the forthcoming rain which it was ardently desired might be blessed to the people. Hence the remark that he who will not come up to the Feast of Tabernacles shall have no rain (Sukkah, 48, 51; Rosh ha- Shanah, 16; Taanith, 2 a).

(2.) The Jews seem to have regarded the rite as symbolical of the water miraculously supplied to their fathers from the rock at Meribah. But they also gave to it a more strictly spiritual signification. It was regarded as typical of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Hence the remark: “It is called the house of drawing the water, because from thence the Holy Spirit is drawn in accordance with what is said in Isa 12:3, With joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation” (Jerusalem Sukkah; 1). It is upon this explanation that our Savior's remark is based (Joh 7:37-39) in allusion to this ceremony on this last day of the festival when it was performed for the last time. The two meanings are, of course, perfectly harmonious, as is shown by the use which Paul makes of the historical fact— (1 Corinthians 10, 4) “they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them: and that rock was Christ.”

The mode in which the sacrifices were offered in the middle days of the festival, the use of the palm and the citron, the procession round the altar, etc., were simply a repetition of the first day of the festival, with this  exception, however, that the number of animals diminished daily, according to ‘the prescription in Num 29:12-38, and that the Lesser Iallel was chanted by Levites instead of the Great Hallel (q.v.). A peculiarity connected with the sacrificial service of this festival must here be noticed. On all other festivals only those of the twenty-four orders of the priests officiated upon whom the lot fell (comp. 1Ch 24:7-19), but on the seven days of Tabernacles the whole of the twenty-four orders officiated. On the-first day the thirteen bullocks, two rams, and-one goat were offered by sixteen orders, while the fourteen sheep were offered by the other eight. As there was one bullock less offered each of the seven days, one order of priests left each day the sixteen orders who offered these bullocks and joined those who offered the fourteen lambs. Hence, “on the first day six of these orders offered two lambs each, and the two other orders one lamb each. On the second day five orders of the priests offered two lambs each, and the four other orders one lamb each. On the third day four orders offered two lambs each, and six orders one lamb each. On the fourth day three orders offered two lambs each, and eight orders one lamb each. On the fifth day two orders offered two lambs each, and ten orders one lamb each. On the sixth day one order offered two lambs each, and twelve orders one lamb each; while on the seventh day, when the orders of priests who sacrificed the bullocks had diminished to eight, fourteen orders offered one lamb each” (Mishna, Sukkah, 5, 6).

21st of Tishri. —The seventh day, which was denominated the last day of the Feast of Tabernacles (האהרון של חג יום טוב, Mishna, Sukkah, 4:8), was especially distinguished in the following manner from the other six days. After the Musâph, or special festival sacrifice of the day, the priests in procession made seven circuits round the altar (ibid. 4:5), whereas on the preceding days of the festival only one circuit was made. The willows (ערבה) which surrounded the altar were then so thoroughly shaken by the people that the leaves lay thickly on the ground. The people also fetched palm-branches and beat them to pieces at the side of the altar (ibid. 4:6). It is from this fact that the last day of the festival obtained the names of the Day of Willows (יום ערבה, ibid. 4:1), the Great Hosanna Day (יום הושיעה נא רבה), and the Branch-thrashing Day (יום חבוט חריות, ibid.4, 6). Herzfeld suggests that the thrashing of the willows and palms may have been to symbolize that after the last verdure of the year had served for the adornment of the altar the trees might now go on to  cast off their leaves (Gesch. des Volkes Israel, 2, 125). A s soon as the thrashing process was over, the children who were-present, and who also carried about the festive nosegays, threw away their palms and ate up their ethrôgs, or citrons (Mishna, Sukkah; 4, 7); while the pilgrims, “in the afternoon of this day, began to remove the furniture from the Tabernacles in honor of the last day of the festival” (ibid. 4:8) as the obligation to live or eat in the booths ceased in the afternoon of the seventh day, inasmuch as the Feast of Tabernacles itself had now terminated. The eighth day, as we shall presently see, was a holy convocation, whereon no manner of work was allowed to be done, and the Hebrews could no more dismantle their huts on this day without desecrating it than on the Sabbath. It must also be remarked that this last day of the festival, this Great Hosanna day, was regarded as one of the four days whereon God judges the world (Mishna, Rosh ha-Shanah, 1, 2; Gemara, ibid.). There can, therefore, be but little doubt that when John records the memorable words uttered by Christ (ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾷ τῇ μεγάλῃ τῆς ἑορτῆς), in the last great day of the festival (Joh 7:37), he meant this distinguished day.

22nd of Tishri. —The eighth day, which, as we have seen; was a separate festival-was a day of holy convocation whereon no manner of work was allowed to be done. After the daily morning sacrifice and the private offerings of the people, the sacrifices prescribed in Num 29:36-38 were offered, during which the Great Hallel was chanted by the Levites. At the sacrifices, however the twenty-four orders of priests were no longer present, but lots were cast as on other festivals, and that order upon whom the lot fell offered the sacrifices (Mishna, Sukkah, 5, 6). The Israelites dwelt no longer in the booths on this day, the joyful procession for the drawing of water was discontinued, the grand illumination in the court of the women ceased, and the palms and willows were not used any more.

It only remains to be added, that when the Feast of Tabernacles fell on a Sabbatical year (q.v.) the reading of portions of the law (Deu 31:10-13) was afterwards confined to one book of the Pentateuch. This arose from the multiplication of synagogues, in which the law was read every week, thus rendering it less needful to read extensive portions in the Temple during this festival, inasmuch as the people had now ample opportunities of listening in their respective places of worship to the reading of the law and the prophets. Hence also the reading of the law, which in olden days took place in the last hours of the forenoon of every  day of this festival, was afterwards restricted to one day. It was at last assigned to the high-priest, and ultimately to the king.

It is said that the altar was adorned throughout the seven days with sprigs of willows, one of which each Israelite who came into the court brought with him. The great number of the sacrifices has already been noticed. The number of public victims offered on the first day exceeded those of any day in the year (Menach. 13:5). But besides these, the Chagigahs or private peace-offerings were more abundant than at any other time; and there is reason to believe that the whole of the sacrifices nearly outnumbered all those offered at the other festivals put together. It belongs to the character of the feast that on each day the trumpets of the Temple are said to have sounded twenty-one times. Though all the Hebrew annual festivals were seasons of rejoicing, the Feast of Tabernacles was, in this respect, distinguished above them all. The huts and the luláb's must have made a gay and striking spectacle over the city by day, and the lamps, the flambeaux, the music, and the joyous gatherings in the court of the Temple must have given a still more festive character to the night. Hence it was called by the rabbins חג, the festival, κατ᾿ ἐξοχήν. There is a proverb in Sukkah (5, 1), “He who has never seen the rejoicing at the pouring-out of the water of Siloam has never seen rejoicing in his life.” Maimonides says that he who failed at the Feast of Tabernacles in contributing to the public joy according to his means incurred especial-guilt (Carpzov, p. 4-19). The feast is designated by Josephus (Ant. 8:4, 1) ἑορτὴ ἁγιωτάτη καὶ μεγίστη, and by Philo ἑορτῶν μεγίστη. Its thoroughly festive nature is shown in the accounts of its observance in Josephus (ibid. 8:4, 1; 15:33), as well as in the accounts of its celebration by Solomon, Ezra, and Judas. Maccabaeus. From this fact, and its connection with the ingathering of the fruits of the year, especially the vintage, it is not wonderful that Plutarch should have likened it to the Dionysiac festivals, calling it θυρσοφορία and κρατηροφορία (Synmpos. 4).

3. From the Dispersion of the Jews to the Present Time. —Excepting the ordinances which were local and belonged to the Temple and its sacrificial service, and bating the exposition and more rigid explanation of some of the rites so as to adapt them to the altered condition of the nation, the Jews to the present day continue to celebrate the Feast of Tabernacles as in the days of the second Temple. As soon as the Day of Atonement is over, every orthodox Israelite, according to the ancient canons, begins to erect his booth in which he and his family take up their temporary abode during  this festival. Each paterfamilias also provides himself with a luláb=palm, and ethrôg citron, as defined by the ancient canons. Oni the eve of the 14th of Tishri, or of the Preparation Day (ערב סכות), the festival commences. All the Jews, attired in their festive garments, resort to the synagogue, where, after the evening prayer” (מעריב) appointed in the liturgy for this occasion, the hallowed nature of the festival is proclaimed by the cantor (חזן) in the blessing pronounced over the cup of wine (קדוש). After the evening service, every family resorts to its respective booth, which is illuminated and adorned with foliage and diverse fruit, and in which the first festive meal is taken. Before, however, anything is eaten, the head of the family pronounces the sanctity of the festival over a cup of wine. This sanctification or Kiddush (קַדּוּשׁ) was ordained by the men of the Great Synagogue (q.v.), and as there is no doubt that our Savior and his apostles recited it, we shall give it in English. It is as follows: “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast created the fruit of the vine! Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast chosen us from among all nations, hast exalted us above all tongues, and hast sanctified us with thy commandments. In love, O Lord, thou hast given us appointed times for joy, festivals, and seasons for rejoicing; and this Feast of Tabernacles, this time of our gladness, the holy convocation, in memory of the: exodus from Egypt; for thou hast chosen us, and hast sanctified us above all nations, and hast caused us to inherit thy holy festivals with joy and rejoicing. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hast sanctified Israel and the seasons! Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and hast enjoined us to dwell in booths! Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast preserved us alive, sustained us, and brought us to the beginning of this season!” Thereupon each member of the family washes his hands, pronouncing the prescribed benediction while drying them, and all enjoy the repast. The orthodox Jews sleep in the booths all night.

The following morning, which is the first day of the festival, they again resort to the synagogue, holding the palms and citrons in their hands. They lay them down during the former part of the prayer, but take them up after the eighteen benedictions, when they are about to recite the Hallel. Holding the palm in the right hand and the citron in the left, they recite, the following prayer: “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and hast enjoined us to take the palm-branch! Thereupon each one turns his citron upside-down and waves  his palm-branch three times towards the east, three times towards the west, three times towards the south, and three times towards the north. The legate of the congregation pronounces the following benediction: “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and hast enjoined us to recite the Hallel!” and the Hallel is chanted; when they come to Psalms 118, the waving of the palm-branch is repeated at the first, tenth, and twenty-fifth verses, just as it was done in the Temple. Two scrolls of the law are then taken out of the ark (ארון, תיבה) and brought on the platform (בימה), when the lessons for the first day of the festival are read out from the law-Lev 22:26 to Lev 23:44; and Num 29:12-16, as Maphtîr; and from the prophets, Zec 14:1-21. SEE HAPHTARAH.

After this the Musâph prayer is recited, which corresponds to the Musâph or additional sacrifices in the Temple for this special festival. When the legate of the congregation in reciting the Musâph come to the passage where the expression priests (כהנים) occurs, the Aaronites and the Levites arise, and, after the latter haves washed the hands of the former, the priests, with uplifted hands, pronounce the sacerdotal benediction (Num 6:24-27) upon the congregation, who have their faces veiled with the Talîth. SEE FRINGE.

The ark of the Lord is then placed in the center of the synagogue, when the elders form themselves into a procession headed by the legate, who carries the scroll of the law, and all the rest carry the palm- branches in their hands and walk round the ark once, repeating the Hosanna, and waving the palms in commemoration of the procession round the altar in the Temple (Maimonides, lad Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Luláb, 7:23). When the morning service is concluded the people betake themselves to their respective booths to partake of the festive repast with the poor and the stranger; In the afternoon, about five or six o'clock, they again resort to the synagogue to recite the Minchâh (מנחה) prayer, answering to the daily evening sacrifice in the Temple. As soon as darkness sets in or the stars appear, the second day of the festival commences, the Jews having doubled the days of holy convocation. The evening prayer as well as the practices for this evening resemble those of the first evening.

The ritual for the second day in the morning, as well as the rites, with very few variations, is like that of the first day. The lesson, however, from the prophets is different, for on this day 1Ki 8:2-21 is read. After the afternoon service of this day the middle days of the festival begin, which last four days, when the ritual is like that of ordinary days, except that a  few prayers, bearing on this festival are occasionally inserted in the regular formulae, lessons from the law are read on each day as specified in the article HAPHTARAH SEE HAPHTARAH , and the above-named procession goes round the ark. The seventh day, which is the Great Hosanna (רבה הושענא), is celebrated with peculiar solemnity, inasmuch as it is believed that on this day God decrees the weather, or rather the rain, for the future harvest (Mishna, Rosh ha-Shanah, 1, 2; Gemara, ibid.). On the evening preceding this day every Israelite prepares for himself a small bunch of willows tied up with the bark of the palm; some of the pious Jews assemble either ‘in the synagogue or in the booths to read the book of Deuteronomy, the Psalms, the Mishna, etc., all night, and are immersed before the morning prayer. When the time of morning service arrives, numerous candles are lighted in the synagogue, and after the Shachrîth (שחרית) = morning prayer, which is similar to that of the previous day, seven scrolls of the law are taken out of the ark, and from one of them the lesson is read. The Musâph or additional prayer is then recited; thereupon a procession is formed, headed by the rabbi and the legate with the palms in their hands, and followed by those who carry the seven scrolls of the law.

This procession goes seven times round the ark, which is placed in the middle of the synagogue, or round the reading-desk, reciting the Hosannas, in accordance with the seven circuits around the altar which were performed in the Temple on this day, and waving their palms at certain expressions. The palms are then laid down, and every one takes up his bunch of willows and beats off its leaves at a certain part of the liturgy, in accordance with the beating off the leaves from the willows around the altar in the Temple, which took place on this day. On the evening of the seventh day the festival commences which concludes the whole cycle of festival (עצרת שמוני). It is a day of holy convocation, on which no manner of work is done, and is introduced by the Kiddush (קדוש) = proclamation of its sanctity, given in the former part of this, section. On the following morning the Jews resort to the synagogue, recite the morning prayer (שחרית), as is the first two days of the Feast of Tabernacles, inserting, however, some prayers appropriate for this occasion. Thereupon the special lesson for the day is read, the Musâph or additional prayer is offered, and the priests pronounce the benediction in the manner already described. The people no longer take their meals in the booths on this day. On the evening of this day again another festival commences, called the Rejoicing of the Law (שמחת תורה). After the reciting of the Eighteen  Benedictions, all the scrolls of the law are taken out of the ark, into which a lighted candle is placed. A procession is then formed of the distinguished members, who are headed by the legate; they hold the scrolls in their hands, and go around the reading-desk; the scrolls are then put back into the ark, and only one is placed upon the desk, out of which is read the last chapter of Deuteronomy, and to the reading of which all persons present in the synagogue are called, including children. When the evening service is over the children leave the synagogue in procession, carrying banners with sundry Hebrew inscriptions.

On the following morning the Jews again resort to the synagogue, recite the Hallel after the Eighteen Benedictions, empty the ark of all its scrolls, put a lighted candle into it, form themselves into a procession, and with the scrolls in their hands, and amid jubilant songs, go round the reading-desk. This being over, the scrolls of the law are put back into the ark, and from one of the two which are retained is read Deuteronomy 33 :whereunto four persons are at first called, then all the little children are called as on the previous evening, and then again several grown-people are called. The first of these is called the Bridegroom of the Law (חתן תורה) and after the cantor who calls him up has addressed him in a somewhat lengthy Hebrew formula, the last verses of the Pentateuch are read; and when the reading of the law is thus finished all the people exclaim, חזק, be strong! which expression is printed at the end of every book in the Hebrew Bible as well as of every non-inspired Hebrew work. After reading the last chapter of the law the beginning of Genesis (Gen 1:1-3) is read, to which another one is called who is denominated the Bridegrooms of Genesis (חתן בראשית), and to whom again the cantor delivers a somewhat lengthy Hebrew formula; the Maphtîr, consisting of Num 29:35 to Num 30:1, is then read from another scroll; and with the recitation of the Musâph, or additional special prayer for the festival, the service is concluded. The rest of the day is spent in rejoicing and feasting. The design of this festival is to celebrate the annual completion of the perusal of the Pentateuch, inasmuch as on this day the last section of the law is read. “Hence the name of the festival, the Rejoicing of Finishing the Law.

IV. Origin and Import of this Festival. — Like Pentecost, the Feast of Tabernacles owes its origin to the harvest, which terminated at this time, and which the Jews in common with other nations of antiquity celebrated as a season of joy and thankfulness for the kindly fruit of the earth. This is  undoubtedly implied in its very name, the Feast of Ingathering, and is distinctly declared in Exo 23:16 : “Thou shalt keep the feast of ingathering in the end of the year when thou hast gathered in thy labors out of the field” (comp. also. Lev 23:39; Deu 16:13). With this agricultural origin, however, is associated a great historical event, which the Jews are enjoined to remember during the celebration of this festival, and which imparted a second name to-this feast — viz. “Ye shall dwell in booths seven days, that your generations may know that I made the children of Israel to dwell in booths, when I brought them out of the land of Egypt” (Lev 23:42-43), whence its name, the Feast of Booths or Tabernacles. The Feast of Tabernacles, therefore, like the Passover, has a twofold significance—viz. it has a reference both to the annual course of nature and to a great national event. As to the reason for connecting this pre-eminently joyous festival of ingathering with the homeless dwelling of the Israelites in booths in the wilderness, we prefer the one given by the ancient Jews to theories advanced by modern commentators. In the midst of their great joy, when their houses are full of corn, new wine, oil, and all good things, and their hearts overflow with rejoicing-the Israelites might forget the Lord their God, and say that it is their power and the strength of their arm which have gotten them this prosperity (Deu 8:12, etc.). To guard against this the Hebrews were commanded to quit their permanent and sheltered house and sojourn in booths at the time of harvest and in the midst of general abundance, to be reminded thereby that they were once homeless and wanderers in the wilderness, and that they are now in the enjoyment of blessings through the goodness and faithfulness of their heavenly Father, who fulfilled the promises made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. This idea was still more developed after the Babylonian captivity, when the canons about the building of the booths were enacted. The booths, as we have seen, were to be covered in such a manner as to admit the view of the sky and the stars, in order that the sojourners therein might be reminded of their Creator, and remember that, however great and prosperous the harvest, the things of earth are perishable and vanity of vanities. This is the reason why the scribes also ordained that the book of Ecclesiastes should be read on this joyous festival.

The origin of the Feast of Tabernacles is by some connected with Sukkoth, the first halting-place of the Israelites on their march out of Egypt; and the huts are taken, not to commemorate the tents in the wilderness, but the  leafy booths (succoth) in which they lodged for the last time before they entered the desert. The feast would thus call to mind the transition from settled to nomadic life (Stanley, Sinai and Palestine, Appendix, § 89).

Philo saw in this feast a witness for the original equality of all the members of the chosen race. All, during the week; poor and rich, the inhabitant alike of the palace and the hovel, lived in huts, which, in strictness, were to be of the plainest and most ordinary materials and construction. From this point of view the Israelite would be reminded with still greater edification of the perilous and toilsome march of his forefathers through the desert, when the nation seemed to be more immediately dependent on God for food, shelter, and protection, while the completed harvest stored up for the coming winter set before him the benefits he had derived from the possession of the land flowing with milk ld honey which had been of old promised to his race. But the culminating-point of this blessing was the establishment of the central spot of the national worship in the Temple at Jerusalem. Hence it was evidently fitting that the Feast of Tabernacles should be kept with an unwonted degree of observance at the dedication of Solomon's Temple (1Ki 8:2; 1Ki 8:65; Josephus, Ant. 8:4, 5), again after the rebuilding of the Temple by Ezra (Neh 8:13-18), and a third time by Judas Maccabaeus, when he had driven out the Syrians and restored the Temple to the worship of Jehovah (2Ma 10:5-8).

V. Literature. —Maimonides, Iad-Chezaka, Hilchoth Luláb; Meyer, De Temp. et Festis Diebus Hebraeorum (Utrecht, 1755), p. 317, etc.; Bahr, Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus (Heidelberg,.1839), 2, 624 sq., 652 sq.; Herzfeld, Geschichte des Volkes Israel (Nordhausen, 1857), 2, 120 sq., 177 sq.; The Jewish Ritual, entitled Dereka Ha-Chajim (Vienna, 1859)p., 2-14 b sq., 295 sq.; Keil; Handbuch der biblischen Archäologie (2nd ed. Frankforton-the-Main, 1859), p. 412 sq.; Carpzov, App. Crit. p.414; Buxtorf, Syn. Jud. c. 21; Reland, Ant. 4:5; Lightfoot, Temple Service, 16:and Exercit. in Joan. 7:2,37; Otho, Lex. Rab. 230; the treatise Sukkah, in the Mishna, with Surenhusius's Notes; Hupfeld, De Fest. hebr. pt; 2; comp. the monographs De Libatione Aquae in Fest. Tab. by Iken (in the Symbol. etc. [Bremen, 1744], 1, 160), Biel (Vitemb. 1716), and Tresenreuter (Alt. 1743), Groddek, De Ceremonia Palmarum in Fest. Tab. (Lips. 1694-95, also in Ugolino, vol. 18); Dachs, on Sukkah, in the Jerusalem Gemara (Utrecht, 1726); Tirsch, De Tabernac. Feriis (Prag. s. Let an.).

## Tabitha[[@Headword:Tabitha]]

             (Ταβιθά; Vulg. Tabitha), also called, Dorcas (Δορκάς), a female disciple of Joppa, “full of good works,” among which that of making clothes for the poor is specifically mentioned (Act 9:36-42). A.D. 32. While Peter was at the neighboring town of Lydda, Tabitha died, upon which the disciples at Joppa sent an urgent message to the apostle, begging him to come to them without delay. It is not quite evident from the narrative whether they looked for any exercise of miraculous power on his part, or whether they simply' wished for Christian consolation under what they regarded as the common calamity of their Church; but the miracle recently performed on AEneas (Act 9:34), and the expression in Act 9:38 (διελθεῖν ἕως ἡμῶν), lead to the former supposition. Upon his arrival Peter found the deceased already prepared for burial, and laid out in an upper chamber, where she was surrounded by the recipients and the tokens of her charity. After the example of our Savior in the house of Jairus (Mat 9:25; Mar 5:40), “Peter put them all forth,” prayed for the divine assistance, and then commanded Tabitha to arise (comp. Mar 5:41; Luk 8:54). She opened her eyes and sat up, and then, assisted by the apostle, rose from her couch. This great miracle, as we are further told, produced an extraordinary effect in Joppa, and was the occasion of many conversions there (Act 9:42). SEE PETER.

The name of “Tabitha” (טְבַיתָא) is the Aramaic form answering to the Hebrew צַבַיָּה, tsebiyâh, a “female gazelle,” the gazelle being regarded in the East, among both Jews and Arabs, as a standard of beauty indeed, the word צַבַיproperly means “beauty.” Luke gives “Dorcas” as the Greek equivalent of the name.

Similarly we find δορκάς as the Sept. rendering of צְבַיin Deu 12:15; Deu 12:22; 2 Samuel 2, 18; Pro 6:5. It has been inferred from the occurrence of the two names that Tabitha was a Hellenist (see Whitby, ad loc.). This, however; does not follow, even if we suppose that the two names were actually borne by her, as it would seem to have been the practice even of the Hebrew Jews at this period to have a Gentile name in addition to their Jewish name. But it is by no means clear from the language of Luke that Tabitha actually bore the name of Dorcas. All he tells us is that the name of Tabitha means gazelle” (δορκάς), and for the benefit of his Gentile readers he afterwards speaks of her by the Greek  equivalent. At the same time it is very possible that she may have been known by both names; and we learn from Josephus (War, 4:3, 5) that the name of Dorcas was not unknown in Palestine. Among the Greeks also, as we gather from Lucretius (4, 1154), it was a term of endearment. Other examples, of the use of the name will be found in Wettstein, ad lo., SEE DORCAS.

## Table[[@Headword:Table]]

             is the rendering in the A.V. usually of שֻׁלְחָן, shulchân (New Test. τράπεζα, likewise invariably so translated, except Luk 19:23 [“bank”]'; Act 16:34 [“meat”]), so called from being extended (שָׁלִח; comp. Homer, Od. 10:37; and see Psa 69:23), and denoting especially a table spread with food (Jdg 1:7; 1Sa 20:29; 1Sa 20:34; 1Ki 5:7; 1Ki 10:5; Job 36:16; Neh 5:17); but spoken likewise of the table of shew-bread (see below), and likewise of the lectisternia prepared before idols (Isa 45:11; see. Schumann, De Lectisferniis in Sacro Cod. [Lips. 1739]). For the “tables” of stone on which the Decalogue was engraved, see below. The word. מֵסֵב, mesâb, a divan (q.v.), is once rendered “at table” (Song of Solomon 1, 12). SEE SITTING.

Little is known as to the form of tables among the Hebrews; but, as in other Oriental nations, they were probably not high. In Exo 25:23, indeed, the table for the shew-bread is described as a cubit and a half in height; but the table of Herod's temple, as depicted on the arch of Titus at Rome, is only half a cubit high. Probably the table of the ancient Hebrews differed little from that of the modern Arabs, namely, a piece of skin or leather spread upon the ground (hence the figure of entanglement in it, Psa 69:23). In Palestine, at the present day, the general custom, even of the better classes, is to bring a polygonal stool (kursi), about fourteen inches high, into the common sitting-room for meals. Upon this is placed a tray (seniyeh) of basketwork or of metal, generally copper, on which the food is arranged. ‘These two pieces of furniture together compose the table (sûfrah). The bread lies upon the mat beneath the tray, and a cruse of water stands near by, from which all drink as they have need. On formal  occasions, this is held in the hand by a servant, who waits upon the guests. Around this stool and tray the guests gather, sitting on the floor (Thomson, Land and Book, 1, 180). SEE EATING.

Among the ancient Egyptians, the table was much the same as that of the present day in Egypt, a small stool, supporting a round tray, on which the dishes are placed (see Lane, Mod. Eg. 1, 190); but it differed from this in having its circular summit fixed on a pillar, or leg, which was often in the form of a man, generally a captive, who supported the slab upon his head, the whole being of stone or some hard wood. On this the dishes were placed together with loaves of bread, some of which were not unlike those of the present day in Egypt, flat and round, as our crumpets. Others had the form of rolls or cakes, sprinkled with seeds. The table was not generally covered with any linen, but, like the Greek table, was washed with a sponge, or napkin, after the dishes were removed, and polished by the servants, when the company had retired; though an instance sometimes occurs of a napkin spread on it, at least on those which bore offerings in honor of the dead. One or two guests generally sat at a table, though, from the mention of persons seated in rows according to rank, it has been supposed the tables were occasionally of a long shape; as may have been the case when the brethren of Joseph “sat before him, the first-born according to his birthright, and the youngest according to his youth,” Joseph eating alone at another table where “they set on for him by himself.” But even if round, they might still sit according to rank, one place being always the post of honor, even at the present day, at the round table of Egypt (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 1. 179). SEE DINE.

The tables of the ancient Assyrians, as delineated upon the monuments, were often of a highly ornamental character (Layard, Nineveh, 2, 236; Botta, Nineveh, p. 188). SEE BANQUET. For the triclinium of the Roman period, SEE ACCUBATION; SEE SUP. Other Greek words than τράπεζα above (which likewise denotes occasionally a broker's counter, SEE MONEY-CHANGER, not to mention ἀνακεῖμαι etc., often rendered ‘sit' at table), which are translated “table” in the A. V. in a different sense, are: κλίνη (Mar 7:4), a bed (as elsewhere rendered), or couch used for eating, i.e. the triclinium above noticed; and πλάξ (2Co 3:3; Heb 9:4),a tablet for  inscription; more fully πινακίδιον, a writing-table (Luk 1:63). SEE TABLE OF THE LAW.

## Table (2)[[@Headword:Table (2)]]

             (לוּחִ, luach, a tablet, whether of stone [as below], wood [“board,” Exo 27:8, etc.], or for writing on [Isa 40:8; Habakkuk 8:9; Pro 3:3]) OF THE LAW (only plur. in the phrases “tables of stone” [לֻחת אֶבֶן, Exo 24:12; Exo 31:18; or ל אֵבָנַים, Exo 34:1; Exo 34:4], and “tables of the covenant” [Deu 9:9; Deu 9:15] or “of the testimony” [Exo 31:18]), such as those that were given to Moses upon Mount Sinai, being written by the finger of God, and containing the Decalogue, or Ten Commandments of the law, as they are rehearsed in Exodus 20. Many idle questions have been started about these tables; about their matter, their form, their number, who wrote them, and what they contained. The words which intimate that the tables were written by the finger of God, some understand simply and literally; others, of the ministry of an angel; and others explain merely to signify an order of God to Moses to write them. The expression, however, in Scripture always signifies the immediate Divine agency. See Walther, De Duabus Tacbulis Lapideis (Regiom. 1679); Michaelis, De Tab. Faed. Prioribus (Vitemb. 1719).

T

able,

the name given to the supreme ecclesiastical court of the Waldensian Church (q.v.):

## Table Of (Movable) Feasts[[@Headword:Table Of (Movable) Feasts]]

             a list of movable festivals prefixed to the Book of Common Prayer for the guidance and instruction of both clergy and laity.

## Table Of Commandments[[@Headword:Table Of Commandments]]

             a representation of the two tables of stone on which the Commandments were graven, ordered by a post-Reformation canon to be placed on the east wall of the church or chancel.

## Table Of Degrees[[@Headword:Table Of Degrees]]

             a formal list of relationships, both by blood and affinity, within which degrees the Church of England authoritatively prohibits marriage. This table, usually printed at the end of the Anglican Prayer-book is ordered to be hung up in a prominent place in the nave of every church or chapel, by the authority of various visitation articles, especially those of archbishop Parker in 1563. SEE AFFINITY.

## Table Of Lessons[[@Headword:Table Of Lessons]]

             A tabular arrangement of Scripture lections for matins and evensong, daily arranged throughout the year. This table was first drawn up in 1549, altered in the revision of 1661, and again amended by Convocation in 1870.

## Table Of Prothesis[[@Headword:Table Of Prothesis]]

             SEE CREDENCE-TABLE;

## Table Of Secrets[[@Headword:Table Of Secrets]]

             a piece of paper placed at the foot of the cross on the altar, and containing the part of the service the priest is to say while turned to the altar, so that he need not turn to look on his book. This is placed upon pasteboard or thin wood, and richly framed. Migne, Encyclop. Theologique, s.v.

## Table Of Shew-Bread[[@Headword:Table Of Shew-Bread]]

             (שֻׁלְחִן הִפָּנַים, table of the faces, Num 4:7; שֻׁלְחִן הִמִּעֲרֵכֶת, table of the arrangement, 1Ch 28:16; הִשֻּׁלְחָן הִטָּהֹר, the pure table, Lev 24:6; 2Ch 13:11; Sept. ἡ τράπεζα τῆς προθέσεως), one of the pieces of furniture in the Mosaic tabernacle (Exo 25:23 sq.; Exo 37:10 sq.), in Solomon's Temple (1Ki 7:48; comp; 2Ch 29:18), in its restoration by Zerubbabel (1 Macc. 1, 22), and in Herod's reconstruction of that edifice (Josephus, War, 7:5, 5). It stood in the outer apartment or holy place, on the right hand or north side, and was made of acacia (shittim) wood, two cubits long, one broad, and one and a half high, and covered with laminate of gold. According to the Mishna (Menach. 11:5), it was ten handbreadths long and five wide; other traditions make it twelve handbreadths long and six wide. The top of the leaf of this table was encircled by a border or rim (זֵר, a crown or wreath) of gold. The frame of the table, immediately below the leaf, was encircled with a piece of wood of about four inches in breadth, around the edge of which was a rim or border (מַסְגֶּרֶת, a margin) similar to that around the leaf. A little lower down, but at equal distances from the top of  the table, there were four rings of gold fastened to the legs, through which staves covered with gold were inserted for the purpose of carrying it (Exo 25:23-28; Exo 37:10-16). The description of Josephus, which is quite minute, varies in several particulars (Ant. 3, 6,6). These rings were not found in the table which was afterwards made for the Temple, nor indeed in any of the sacred furniture, where they had previously been, except in the ark of the covenant. Twelve unleavened loaves were placed upon this table, which were sprinkled with frankincense (the Sept. adds salt; Lev 24:7). The number twelve represented the twelve tribes, and was not diminished after the defection of ten of the tribes from the worship of God in his sanctuary, because the covenant with the sons of Abraham was not formally abrogated, and because there were still many true Israelites among the apostatizing tribes. The twelve loaves were also a constant record against them, and served as a standing testimonial that their proper place was before the forsaken altar of Jehovah (see Philo, Opp. 2, 151; Clem. Alex. Strom. 6:279).

Wine also was placed upon the table of shew-bread in bowls, some larger, קְעָרוֹת, and some smaller, כִּפּנֹת; also in vessels that were covered, קְשָׂווֹת, and in cups, מְנִקַּיּוֹת, which were probably employed in pouring in and taking out the wine from the other vessels, or in making libations. Gesenius calls them “paterse libatoria;” and they appear in the A. V. as “spoons.” Some of them were perhaps for incense (בזיכי לבונה, Mishna, Yoma, 5, 1). See generally Exo 25:29-30; Exo 37:10-16; Exodus 40, 4, 24; Lev 24:5-9; Num 4:7.

The fate of the original table of shew-bread is unknown. It was probably transferred by David (if it then still existed) to his temporary sanctuary on Mt. Zion, and thence by Solomon to his sumptuous Temple, With the other articles of sacred furniture, it was carried away by the Babylonians and possibly in like manner restored after the Captivity. Antiochus Epiphanes despoiled the second Temple of this as well as of its other treasures (1 Macc. 1, 23), and hence on the Maccabaean restoration a new one was made (4, 49). According to ‘Josephus, it was reconstructed in a most elaborate and costly manner at the expense of Ptolemy Philadelphus (Ant. 12:2,9, where the description is very detailed). The same historian again describes more briefly the Herodian shew-bread table, which was carried away by the Romans (War, 7:5, 5), and was deposited by Vespasian in his newly erected Temple of Peabe at Rome (ibid. 7:5, 7). where it survived  the burning of that building under Commodus (Herodian, 1, 14), and in the middle of the 5th century, was taken by the Vandals under Genseric to Africa (Cedren. Compend. 1, 346). It is said to have been rescued by Belisarius (A.D. 520), and sent to Constantinople, whence it was finally remitted to Jerusalem (Propius, Vandal. 11:9). The only authentic representation of this interesting article extant is that upon the arch of Titus at Rome, SEE SHEW-BREAD, which was carefully delineated and described by Reland (De Spoliis Templi [Fr. ad Rh. 1716], c. 6-9) when it seems to have been in a better state of preservation than at present. See, generally, Schlichter, De Mensa Facierum (Hal. 1738; also in Ugolino, Thesaur. 10); Witsius, Miscell. Sacr. 1, 336; Carpzov, Appar7. Crit. p. 278; Bahr, Symbol. d. mos. Cultus, 1, 435; Friederich, Symbol. d. mos. Stiftshütte, p. 170: Keil, Tempel Sal. p. 109; Paine, The Tabernacle and the Temple (Bost. 1861), p. 11; Neumann, Die Stiftshütte, etc. (Leips. 1861), p. 135; Riggenbach, Die mos. Stiftshütte (Basel, 1867), p. 37; Soltau, Vessels of the Tabernacle (Lond. 1873), p. 17-28. SEE TABERNACLE; SEE TEMPLE.

## Table Of Succession[[@Headword:Table Of Succession]]

             A list of the successors of St. Peter made by Eusebius. He acknowledged that there was great difficulty in procuring information, and his account appears to have been compiled chiefly from reports or traditions. Of his fidelity he has given proof, by leaving vacancies in his conjectural list, when he had no light to guide him. These vacancies were subsequently filled up by Nicephorus, Callistus, and Simon the Metaphrast (see Elliott, Delineation of Romanism, p. 498). SEE SUCCESSION.

## Table Of The Lord[[@Headword:Table Of The Lord]]

             a phrase taken from Scripture, used to designate the holy table, or altar, of the Christian Church (1Co 10:21). In the Old Test. the words table and altar appear to have been applied indifferently to the same thing (Eze 41:22). Among other terms which have been used to designate the Lord's table, it is obvious to mention the word “altar” as having been so employed; it is a term, however, which, though it may easily be borrowed in a figurative sense from the ancient Scriptures, is neither found in the New Test. in the sense now referred to, nor has it the sanction of the Church. In the first Prayer-book of king Edward VI, published in 1549,  which may be considered as a connecting link between the Missal and our present Prayer book, the word “altar” occurs in the Communion Service at least three times: but in the service of 1552 (the second Prayer-book of Edward VI) it is in every instance struck out; and if another expression is used in place of it, that expression is The Lord's Table. This circumstance is the more worthy of remark, because wherever in the older of these books the phrase “God's Board” was adopted as descriptive of “the Lord's Table” it was allowed to remain. SEE ALTAR.

## Table, Credence[[@Headword:Table, Credence]]

             a small side-table, commonly placed on the south side of the altar, for the altar breads, cruets of wine and water, offertory dish, service-books, lavabo dish, and other things necessary for the solemn or low celebration of the holy eucharist. SEE CREDENCE-TABLE.

## Table, Holy[[@Headword:Table, Holy]]

             1. The Lord's table or altar.

2. A frontal to an altar; e.g. one given to Glastonbury in 1071, made of gold, silver, and ivory, and one at St. Alban's in the 12th century.

3. The mensa, the upper stone altar-slab.

4. Pensilis, containing the names of benefactors, registers of miracles, a list of indulgences, and the course of officiants, officiating clergy at the hours, and celebrants of masses.

## Table-tomb[[@Headword:Table-tomb]]

             a tomb shaped like a table or altar erected over a grave or place of interment. SEE TOMB.

## Table-turning[[@Headword:Table-turning]]

             SEE SPIRITUALISM.

## Tables, The Four[[@Headword:Tables, The Four]]

             During the fierce contest in Scotland between the adherents of the Church of England and the Presbyterians, several outbreaks occurred. On November 15, 1637, there was a meeting of the Privy Council, and large  numbers of Presbyterians assembled at the capital. In order to prevent any tumultuous commotion, the nobles were requested to use their influence to induce their friends to return to their homes. This was consented to on condition that a sufficient number should remain to look after their interests. It was arranged that as many of the nobility as pleased, two gentlemen from every county, one minister from every presbytery, and one burgess from every burgh, should form a general commission, representing the whole body of the Presbyterians. Still more to concentrate their efforts, a smaller number was selected, who should reside at Edinburgh, watch the progress of events, and be ready to communicate with the whole body on any emergency. This smaller committee was composed of sixteen persons- four noblemen: four gentlemen, four ministers, and four burgesses; ands from the circumstance of their sitting in four separate rooms in the parliament house, they were designated The Four Tables. A member from each of these constituted a chief table of last resort, making a supreme council of four members. See Hetherington, Hist. of Church of Scotland, 1:291.

## Tablet[[@Headword:Tablet]]

             is the inaccurate rendering in the A.V. of two Heb. words designating some kind of female ornament.

1. כִּוּמָז, kumâz (so called, according to Gesen., from the globular form; but, according to Fürst, a locket or clasp; Sept. ἐμπλόκια καὶ περιδέξια, Vulg. dextralia, in Exo 35:22; ἐμπλόκιον, muraenulae, in Num 31:50), probably drops hung like beads in a string around the neck or arm, as described by ancient authors on Arabia (Diod. Sic. 3, 44, 50; Strabo, 16:277).

2. בָּתֵּי הִנֵּפֶשִׁ, bottey hanne'phesh, houses of the soul (Isa 3:20, Sept. δακτύλιοι,Vulg. olfactoriola), i.e. perfume-bottles of essences or smelling-salts kept in lockets suspended about the person. SEE ORNAMENT.

## Tablet, Memorial[[@Headword:Tablet, Memorial]]

             A tablet placed on the floor of a church or cloister, inscribed with a legend in memory of some person deceased.

## Tablet, Mural[[@Headword:Tablet, Mural]]

             A tablet on which an inscription has been placed, affixed to the wall of a church or cloister.

## Taboo (or Tabu)[[@Headword:Taboo (or Tabu)]]

             an institution common to all the Polynesian tribes, which solemnly interdicted whatever was esteemed sacred. Hence the term was used to denote anything devoted. With persons or places that were tabooed, all intercourse was prohibited. There were tabooed or sacred days, when it was a crime to be found in a canoe. Pork, bananas, cocoa-nuts, and certain kinds of fish were tabooed to women, and it was death for them to eat these articles of food. The eating together by man and wife was also tabooed, as was the preparation of their food in the same oven. Anything of which a man made an idol, and articles of food offered to idols, were tabooed to him. There were other instances of taboo, as the ariki, or head chief, of an island, who was so sacred that his house, garments, and everything relating to him were taboo. The taboo arose from the idea that a portion of the spiritual essence of the divinity indwelling in sacred things and persons was more or less transmitted to anything else brought in contact with it.

## Tabor[[@Headword:Tabor]]

             (Heb. Tabor', תָּבוֹר, a mound), the name of three spots in Palestine, all closely related to each other, if not indeed actually identical. SEE AZNOTHITABOR; SEE CHISLOTH-TABOR.

I. MOUNT TABOR (Sept. Γαιθβώρ [v.r. Ταφώθ], ὄρος Θαβώρ, Θαβώρ, but τὸ Ι᾿ταβύριον in Jeremiah and Hosea, and in Josephus [Ant. 5, 5, 3; War, 4:1,1, etc.], who has also Α᾿ταρβύριον, as in Polybius, 5, 70,6; Vulg. Thabor), a mountain (הִר, Jdg 4:6; Jdg 4:12; Jdg 4:14, elsewhere without this epithet, Jos 19:22, Jdg 8:18; Psa 79:12; Jer 46:18 Hos 5:1), one of the most interesting and remarkable of the single mountains in Palestine. It was a Rabbinic saving (and shows the Jewish estimate of the attractions of the locality) that the Temple ought of right to have been built here, but was required by an express revelation to be erected on Mount Moriah.  1. Description. —Mount Tabor rises abruptly from the north-eastern arm of the plain of Esdraelon and stands entirely; insulated, except on the west, where a narrow ridge connects it with the hills of Nazareth. It presents to the eye, as seen from a distance, a beautiful appearance, being so symmetrical in its proportions, and rounded off like a hemisphere or the segment of a circle, yet varying somewhat as viewed from different directions, being more conical when seen from the east or west. The body of the mountain consists of the peculiar limestone of the country. It is studded with a comparatively dense forest of oaks, pistacias, and other trees and bushes, with the exception of an occasional opening on the sides and a small uneven tract on the summit. The coverts afford at present a shelter for wolves, wild boars, lynxes, and various reptiles. Its height is estimated at 1300 feet from the base, and 1865 from the sea-level (Tristram, Land of Israel, p. 498). Its ancient name, as already suggested, indicates its elevation, though it does not rise much, if at all, above some of the other summits in the vicinity. It is now called ebel et-Tu; a name which some have tried to identify with Tabor, as if it were a contraction. But Jebel et Tur means simply the “fort-hill,” and is used to designate the Mount of Olives and Gerizim, as well as Tabor. It lies about six or eight miles almost due east from Nazareth. The ascent is usually made on the west side, near the little village of Debirieh, probably the ancient Daberath (Jos 19:12), though it can be made with entire ease in other places. It requires three quarters of an hour or an hour to reach the top. The path is circuitous and at times steep, but not so-much so as to render it difficult to ride the entire way. The trees and bushes are generally so thick as to intercept the prospect; but now and then the traveler as he ascends comes to an open spot which reveals to him a magnificent view of the plain. One of the most pleasing aspects of the landscape, as seen from such points, in the season of the early harvest, is that presented in the diversified appearance of the fields. The different plots of ground exhibit various colors, according to the state of cultivation at the time. Some of them are red, where the land has been newly ploughed up, owing to the natural properties of the soil; others yellow or white, where the harvest is beginning to ripen or is already ripe; and others green being covered with grass or springing grain. As they are contiguous to each other, or intermixed, these part-colored plots present, as looked down upon from above, an appearance of gay checkered work which is singularly beautiful.  The top of Tabor consists of al irregular platform half a mile long by three quarters wide, embracing a circuit of half an hour's walk and commanding wide views of the subjacent plain from end to end. A copious dew falls here during the warm months. Travelers who have spent the night there have found their tents as wet in the morning as if they had been drenched with rain.

It is the universal judgment of those who have- stool on the spot, that the panorama spread before them as they look from Tabor includes as great a variety of objects of natural beauty and of sacred and historic interest as any one to be seen from any position in the Holy Land. O1n the east the waters of the Sea of Tiberias, not less, than fifteen miles distant, are seen glittering through the clear atmosphere in the deep bed where they repose so quietly. Though but a small portion of the surface of the lake can be distinguished, the entire outline of its basin can be traced on every side. In the same direction the eye follows the course of the Jordan for' many miles, while still farther east it rests upon a boundless perspective of hills and valleys, embracing the modern Hauran, and farther south the mountains of the ancient Gilead and Bashan. The dark line which skirts the horizon on the west is the Mediterranean the rich plains of Galilee fill up the intermediate space as far as the foot of Tabor. The ridge of Carmrel lifts its head in the north-west, though the portion which lies directly on the sea is-not distinctly visible. On the north and north-east we behold the last ranges of Lebanon as they rise into the hills about Safed, overtopped in the rear by the snow-capped Hermon, and still nearer to us the Horns of Hattin, the reputed Mount of the Beatitudes. On the south are seen, first the summits of Gilboa, which David's touching elegy on Saul and Jonathan has fixed forever in the memory of mankind, and farther onward a confused view of the mountains and valleys which occupy the central part of Palestine. Over the heads of Dûhy and Gilboa the spectator looks into the valley of the Jordan in the neighborhood of Beisan (itself not within sight), the ancient Bethshean, on whose walls the Philistines hung up the headless trunk of Saul, after their victory over Israel. Looking across a branch of the plain of Esdraelon, we behold Endor, the abode of the sorceress whom the king consulted on the night before his fatal battle. Another little village clings to the hill-side of another ridge, on which we gaze with still deeper interest. It is Nain, the village of that name in the New Test., where the Savior touched the bier and restored to life the widow's son. The Savior must have often passed at the foot of this mount in the course of his  journeys in different parts of Galilee. It is not surprising that the Hebrews looked up with so much admiration to this glorious work of the Creator's hand. The same beauty rests upon its brow today, the same' richness of verdure refreshes the eye, in contrast with' the bald aspect of so many of the adjacent mountains. The Christian traveler yields spontaneously to the impression of wonder and devotion, and appropriates as his own the language of the psalmist (Psa 89:11-12)—

“The heavens are thine, the earth also is thine; The world and the fullness thereof, thou hast founded them. The north and the south thou hast created them; Tabor and Hermon shall rejoice in thy name.”

2. History. —Tabor is not expressly mentioned in the New Test., but makes a prominent figure in' the Old. The book of Joshua (Jos 19:22) names it as the boundary between Issachar and Zebulon (see Psa 89:12). Barak, at the command of Deborah, assembled his forces on Tabor, and, on the arrival of the opportune moment, descended thence with “ten thousand men after him” into the plain, and conquered Sisera on the banks of the Kishon (Jdg 4:6-15). The brothers of Gideon, each of whom resembled the children of a king, were murdered here by Zebah and Zalmunna (8, 18, 19). Some writers, after Herder and others, think that Tabor is intended when it is said of Issachar and Zebulon in Deu 33:19, that “they shall call the people unto. the mountain; there they shall offer sacrifices of righteousness.” Stanley, who holds this view (Sinai and Palestine, p. 351), remarks that he was struck with the aspect of the open glades on the summit as specially fitted for the convocation of festive assemblies,-and could-well believe that in some remote, age it may have been a sanctuary of the northern tribes, if not of the whole nation. The prophet in Hos 5:1 reproaches the priests and royal family with having “been a snare on Mizpah and a net spread upon Tabor.” The charge against them probably is that they had set up idols and practiced heathenish rites on the high places which were usually selected for such worship. The comparison in Jer 46:18, “As Tabor is among the mountains and Carmel, by the sea,” imports apparently that those heights were proverbial for their conspicuousness, beauty, and strength.

After the close of Old-Test. history, Tabor continued to be a strong fortress. In the year B.C. 218, Antiochus the Great got possession of it by stratagem and strengthened its fortifications. The town existed on the  summit in New-Test. times; but the defenses had fallen into decay, and Josephus caused them to be rebuilt (War, 4. 1, 8).

3. Present Condition. —Dr. Robinson (Bibl. Res. 2, 353) has thus described the ruins which are to be seen at present on the summit of Tabor: “All around the top are the foundations of a thick wall built of large stones, some of which are beveled, showing that the entire wall was perhaps originally of that character. In several parts are the remains of towers and bastions. The chief remains are upon the ledge of rocks on the south of the little basin, and especially towards its eastern end; here are in indiscriminate confusion, walls and arches and foundations, apparently of dwelling- houses, as well as other buildings, some of hewn, and some of, large beveled stones. The walls and traces of a fortress are seen here, and farther west along the southern brow, of which one tall pointed arch of a Saracenic gateway is still standing, and bears the name of Bab el-Hawa, Gate of the Wind. Connected with it: are loopholes, and others are seen near by. These latter fortifications belong to the sera of the Crusades; but the large beveled stones we refer to a style of architecture not later than the times of the Romans, before which period, indeed, a town and fortress already existed on Mount Tabor. In the days of the Crusaders, too, and earlier, there were here churches and monasteries. The summit has many cisterns, now mostly dry.” The same writer found the thermometer here, 10 A.M. (June 18), at 98° Fahr., at sunrise at 64°, and at sunset at 740. The Latin Christians have now an altar here, at which their priests from Nazareth perform an annual mass. The Greeks also have a chapel, where, on certain festivals, they assemble for the celebration of religious rites. Stanley, in his Notices of Localities Visited with the Prince of Wales, remarks, “The fortress, of which the ruins crown the summit, had evidently four gateways, like those by which the great Roman camps of our own country were entered. By one of these gateways my attention was called to an Arabic inscription, said to be the only one on the mountain.” It records the building or rebuilding of “this blessed fortress” by the order of the sultan Abu-Bekr on his return from the East A.H. 607. In 1873 the monks began the construction of a convent on the north-east brow of the mountain.

4. Traditional Importance. — In the monastic ages, Tabor, in consequence partly of a belief that it was the scene of the Savior's transfiguration, was crowded with hermits. It was one of the shrines from the earliest period - which pilgrims to the Holy Land regarded as a sacred duty to honor with  their presence and their prayers. Jerome, in his Itinerary of Paula, writes, “Scandebat montem Thabor, in quo transfiguratus est Dominus; aspiciebat procul Hermon et Hermonim et campos latissimos Galilneae (Jesreel), in quibus Sisara prostratus est. Torrens Cison qui mediam planitiem dividebat, et oppidum juxta, Naim, monstrabantur.” This idea that our Savior was transfigured on Tabor prevailed extensively among the early Christians (see Robinson, Bibl. Res. 2,358 sq.), who adopted legends of this nature, and often reappears still in popular religious works. — If one might choose a place which he would deem peculiarly fitting for so sublime a transaction, there is certainly none which would so entirely satisfy our feelings in this respect as the lofty majestic, beautiful Tabor. It has been thought difficult, however, to acquiesce in the correctness of this opinion. The summit of Tabor appears to have been occupied by a town as early as the time when the Israelites took possession of the country (Jos 19:22). Indeed, such a strong position would scarcely be left unoccupied in those stormy times of Syria's history. Accordingly, as above seen, it is susceptible of proof from the Old Test., and from later history, that a fortress or town existed on Tabor from very early times down to B.C. 50 or 53; and, as Josephus says that he strengthened the fortifications of a city there, about A.D. 60, it is certain that Tabor must have been inhabited during the intervening period, that is, in the days of Christ (comp. Polybius, 5, 70, 6; Josephus, Ant. 14:6, 3; War, 2, 20, 1; 4:1. 8; Life, § 37). But as in the account of the transfiguration it is said that Jesus took his disciples “up into a high mountain apart and was transfigured before them” (Mat 17:1-2), we must understand that he brought them to the summit of the mountain, where they were alone by themselves (κατ᾿ ἰδίαν). Yet it is not probable that the whole mountain was occupied by edifices, and it is quite possible that a solitary spot might have been found amid its groves, where the scene could have taken place, unobserved. The event has, indeed, been referred by many to Mount Hermon, on the ground that our Lord's miracle immediately preceding was at Caesarea Philippi; but the interval of a whole week (“‘six days,” Mat 17:1, Mar 9:2, “eight days,” Luk 9:28) decidedly favors the idea of a considerable journey in the interval. SEE TRANSFIGURATION.

Some Church traditions have given also to Tabor the honor of being Melchizedek's hill, from which he came forth to greet Abraham, so that here is another king's dale, rivaling that at Gerizim, if tradition is to be followed. The whole legend will be found at full length in Athanasius (Opp.  2, 7 [Colon. 1686]). That father tells us that Salem, the mother of Melchizedek, ordered him to go to Tabor. He went, and remained seven years in the wood naked, till his back became like a snail's shell.

The mountain has been visited and described by multitudes, of travelers, especially (in addition to those named above) Russegger (Reis. 3, 258), Hasselquist (Voyage, p. 179), Volney ( Voyage, 2, 272), Schubert (Morgenl. 3, 175), Burckhardt (Syria,.p. 332), Stephens (Travels, 2, 317), Nugent [lord] (Lands, etc., 2, 198); see also Reland, Palaest. p. 334;' Hackett, Illustr. of Script. p. 304; Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 136; Porter, Handb. p. 401; Badeker, Palest. p. 364; Ridgaway, The Lord's Land, p. 371.

II. The PLAIN (or rather OAK) OF TABOR (תָּבוֹר אֵלוֹן; Sept. ἡ δρῦς Θαβώρ; Vulg. Quercus Thabor) is mentioned only in 1Sa 10:3 as one of the points in the homeward journey of Saul after his anointing by Samuel It was the next stage in the journey after “Rachel's sepulcher at Zelzah.” But, unfortunately, like so many of the other spots named in this interesting passage, the position of the Oak of Tabor has not yet been fixed. SEE SAUL. Ewald seems to consider it certain (gewiss) that Tabor and Deborah are merely different modes of pronouncing the same name, and he accordingly identifies the oak of Tabor with the tree under which Deborah, Rachel's nurse, was buried (Gen 35:8) and that again with the palm under which Deborah the prophetess delivered her oracles (Gesch. 1, 390; 2, 489; 3. 29), and this again with the Oak of the old Prophet near Bethel (ibid. 3, 444). But this, though most ingenious, can only be received as a conjecture, and the position on which it would land us “between Ramah and Bethel” (Jdg 4:5)— is too far from Rachel's sepulcher to fall in with the conditions of the narrative of Saul's journey, so long as we hold that to be the traditional sepulcher near Bethlehem. We can only determine that it lay somewhere between Bethlehem and Bethel, but why it received the epithet “Tabor” it is impossible to discover. Yet we see from the names Chisloth-Tabor and Aznoth-Tabor that the mountain gave adjunct titles to places at a considerable distance. SEE ZELZAH.

III. The CITY OF TABOR (Sept. Θαβώρ v.r. Θαχχεία; Vulg. Thabor) is mentioned in the lists of 1 Chronicles 6 as a city of the Merarite Levites, in the tribe of Zebulun (1Ch 6:77). The catalogue of Levitical cities in Joshua 21 does not contain any name answering to this (comp. Jos 21:34-35). But  the list of the towns of Zebulun (ch. 19) contains the name of CHISLOTH- TABOR (ver; 12). It is therefore possible either that this last name is abbreviated into Tabor by the chronicler, or (which is less likely) that by the time these later lists were compiled the Merarites had established themselves on the sacred mountain, and that the place in question is Mount Tabor.

## Tabor, Mount[[@Headword:Tabor, Mount]]

             For the latest description and plan of Jebel et-Tor, see the Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey, 1:388 sq.

## Taborites[[@Headword:Taborites]]

             a section of the Hussites, the other being known as the Calixtines. The Taborites were so called from the fortified city of Tabor, erected on a mountain, in the circle of Bechin, in Bohemia, which had been consecrated by the field-preaching of Huss. The gentle and pious mind of that martyr never could have anticipated, far less approved, the terrible revenge Which his Bohemian adherents took upon the emperor, the empire, and the clergy, in one of the most dreadful and bloody wars ever known. The Hussites commenced their vengeance after the death of king Wenceslaus, Aug. 16, 1419, by the destruction of the convents and churches, on which occasions many of the priests and monks were murdered. John Ziska, a Bohemian knight, formed a numerous, well-mounted, and disciplined army, which built Tabor, as above described, and rendered it an impregnable depot and place of defense. He was called Ziska of the Cup, because one great point for which the Hussites contended was the use of the cup by the laity in the sacrament. At his death, in 1424, the immense mass of people whom he had collected fell to pieces; but under Procopius, who succeeded Ziska as general, the Hussites again rallied, and gained decisive victories over the imperial armies in 1427 and 1431.. After this, as all parties were desirous of coming to terms of peace, the Council of Basle interposed, and a compromise was made; but hostilities again broke out in 1434, when the Taborites gained a complete victory. Owing, however, to the treachery of Sigismund, whom they had aided in ascending the throne, they were much weakened; and from this time they abstained from warfare, and maintained their disputes with the Catholics only in the deliberations of the diet and in theological controversial writings, by means of which their creed acquired a purity and completeness that made it similar in many respects to the Protestant confessions of the 16th century. Encroachments were gradually made on their religious freedom, and they continued to suffer until they gradually merged into the BOHEMIAN BRETHREN (q.). See Bezezyia, in Ludwig, Reliq. MSS. 6:142, 186; Eneas Sylvius, Hist. Bohem. epist. 130.

## Tabret[[@Headword:Tabret]]

             (a contraction of taboret, for “taboring”, SEE TABER ) is the rendering in the A. V. of the two kindred words תֹּ, tôph (Gen 31:27; 1Sa 10:5; 1Sa 18:6; Isa 5:2; Isa 24:8; Isa 30:32; Jer 31:4; Eze 28:13; elsewhere “timbrel”) and תֹּפֶתtôpheth (Job 17:6), which both mean a musical instrument of the drum kind (from תָּפ, to beat). This sort of music has always been in great request, both in classical and sacred scenes, especially on festive occasions. SEE MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS. Especially has that form of the drum known as the tambourine been in vogue, particularly for female performers. SEE TIMBREL.

## Tabrimon[[@Headword:Tabrimon]]

             (Heb. Tabrimmon, טִבְרַמֹּן, good is Rimmon; Sept. Ταβερεμά v.r. Ταβενραημά; Vulg. Tabrenon), the father of Benhadad I, king of Syria in the reign of Asa (1Ki 15:18). B.C. ante 928. The name is in honor of the Syrian god (comp. the analogous formsTobiel, Tobiah, and the Phoenician Tabaram [Gesenius, Mon. Phoen. p. 456]). SEE RIMMON.

## Tabula[[@Headword:Tabula]]

             Dei, a Latin term for the SEE TABLE OF THE LORD (q.v.).

## Tabula Clericorum[[@Headword:Tabula Clericorum]]

             the catalogue of the clergy so called by Augustine.

## Tabula Eucharistiae[[@Headword:Tabula Eucharistiae]]

             the Christian altar.

## Tabula Pacis[[@Headword:Tabula Pacis]]

             (tablet of peace), a term applied to the OSCULATORIUM SEE OSCULATORIUM (q.v.), an ornament by which the kiss of peace was given to the faithful' in mediaeval times.

## Tabunisozton[[@Headword:Tabunisozton]]

             among the Kalmucks, is a deity of the second rank, who has appeared fifty- two times in as many different forms. The principal form is that of a woman, which, in all external appearance, is entirely like that of the Kalmuck women in general. She sits with crossed legs upon an elevation, is in part unclothed, and wherever the flesh appears is painted red. Head- dress and clothing are about tantamount to each other in most Kalmuck deities; the lower part of the body is enveloped in a light robe, while the head is crowned with a towering ornament, and adorned with flowers. Tabunisozton holds in her hands a vessel of fruit, and is regarded as the goddess of earthly fruitfulness, with which her frequent reviviscence agrees.

## Tachash[[@Headword:Tachash]]

             SEE BADGER.

## Tache[[@Headword:Tache]]

             (קֶרֶם, keres; Sept. κρίκος; Vulg. circulus, fibula). The word thus rendered occurs only in the description of the structure of the tabernacle and its fittings (Exo 26:6; Exo 26:11; Exo 26:33; Exo 35:11; Exo 36:13; Exo 39:33), and has usually been thought to indicate the small hooks by which a curtain is suspended to the rings whereon it hangs, or connected vertically, as in the case of the vail of the Holy of Holies, with the loops of another curtain. The history of the English word is philologically interesting, as presenting points of contact with many different languages. The Gaelic and Breton branches of the Celtic family give tac, or tackh in the sense of a nail or hook; The latter meaning appears in the attaccare, staccare, of Italian; in the attacher, detacher, of French. On the other hand, in the tak of Dutch, and the Zacke of German, we have a word of like sound and kindred meaning. Our Anglo-Saxon taccan and English take (to seize as with a hook are probably connected with it. In later use the word has slightly altered both its form and meaning, and the tack is no longer a hook, but a small flat-headed' nail (comp. Diez, Roman. Wörterb. s v. “Tacco”).

The philological relations. of the Hebrew word are likewise interesting. It comes from the obscure root קָרִס, kards, which occurs only in Isa 46:1 (“stoopeth,” Sept. συνετρίβη; Vulg. contritus est) as a synonym of כָּרִע(“boweth down”) in the parallel hemistich, and is therefore understood by Gesenius and Fürst to signify to bend, or by Miuhlau to be round (like קָרִר). The only derivatives, besides the proper name Kiros (קרוֹס, Neh 7:47) or Keros (קֵרֹס, Ezr 2:44), are the term in question and קִרְסֹל, karsol, the ankle (occurring only in the dual, “feet,” 2Sa 22:37; Psa 18:36 [37]). Prof. Paine (author of The Tabernacle, etc.), in a private note, ingeniously traces the connection between these two objects, which a diagram will clearly illustrate.

As the loops are explicitly stated to have been in the selvage of the curtains, the “taches,” if meant as hooks to join them edgewise, would present the appearance in the annexed cut, which is substantially the  representation of those interpreters who have adopted this idea. Now, to say nothing for the present of the gap thus left in the roof, we find that these “taches,” being exactly fifty for each set of “curtains,” bear no special numerical relation to the general size of the curtains themselves, the edges so joined being in one case thirty and in the other twenty-eight cubits long; whereas all the other numbers and dimensions about the building have definite proportions to each other. Nor, if the sixth or extra breadth of the goats-hair cloth was sewed in the ordinary way like the other five, can we divine any good reason for resorting to this singular method of joining the remaining selvages.

There are other and still graver difficulties in the ordinary plan of connecting these sheets, which would immediately be revealed in the actual attempt at reconstruction, and will be anticipated by any one familiar with tent architecture.

(a.) The “vail” hung exactly under the “taches” (Exo 26:33). But as the colored sheets (which of course must have been innermost) were each twenty cubits wide and twenty-eight cubits long, if they were spread thus combined over the ridge-pole, the suture between them which these “hooks” formed could in no case have well tallied with this position: had they been stretched lengthwise of the building (as their close correspondence in length would indicate), the joint also would have been the same direction, i.e. at right angles with the line of the vail; if crosswise of the building (as both Riggenbach and Fergusson suppose), then the line of the suture and that of the “vail” could only have coincided on the supposition that the entire extra ten cubits breadth of the embroidered “curtains” was thrown outside the rear of the edifice, where it would be utterly useless and exposed to the weather. Nor could the requirements of the text cited be met by using these colored sheets singly in this manner: not longitudinally for the same reason as before; not transversely, for then their breadth would not cover both the apartments.

(b.) The goats-hair sheets, if combined by such a contrivance as an S hook, would be equally impracticable: placed longitudinally on the ridge (as their length would emphatically indicate by this second repetition of the thirty cubits), they would certainly leak intolerably at the joint, unless this were brought exactly at the peak, which the odd number of the “curtains” in this  set (11) prevents: placed transversely, even in the most favorable manner (Fergusson's), so as to break joints” with the suture in the sheets under them, they must (as a corollary from the above combination of the latter) have had their extra width (fourteen cubits) project wholly beyond the rear of the building, leaving nothing for a porch” (which Fergusson imagines).

(c.) In any case it would have been a bad arrangement to make. the suture in either set of roof canvas come exactly over so choice a piece of drapery as the “vail” was; for some drip must have been apprehended, or an embroidered lining (a delicate article with which to stop a leak) would not have been provided-to say nothing of Fergusson's idea that the sheep-skin ad fur robes may have been for the purpose of covering the joint! In short, the bare fact of leaving such a crack in the roof would have been an irremediable blunder, which it is strange that a professional architect should' make. On Riggenbach's theory of a flat roof, all the rain would inevitably have poured through this crevice directly upon the vail. Jehovah planned better than this, we may be sure. SEE TABERNACLE.

## Tachmas[[@Headword:Tachmas]]

             SEE NIGHT-HAWK.

## Tachmonite[[@Headword:Tachmonite]]

             (Heb. [without the art.] Tâcchemoni, תִּחְכְּמֹנַי; Sept. ὁ Χαναναῖος v.r. υἱὸς θεκεμανί; Vulg. sapientissimus). “The Tachmonite that sat in the seat,” chief among David's captains (2Sa 23:8), is in 1Ch 11:11 called “Jashobeam a Hachmonite,” or, as the margin gives it, “son of Hachmoni.” The Geneva version has in 2Sa 23:8, “He that sate in the seate of wisedome, being chiefe of the princes, was Adino of Ezni,” regarding “Tachmonite” as an adjective derived from

חָכָם, chakâm, “wise,” and in this derivation following Kimchi. Kennicott has shown, with much appearance of probability, that' tie words ישֵׁב בִּשֶׁבֶת, yosheb bashshibeth, “he that sat in the seat,” are a corruption of Jashobeam, the true name of the hero, and that the mistake arose from an error of the transcriber, who carelessly inserted בִּשֶּׁבֶתfrom the previous verse where it occurs. He further considers “Tâcchemoni” a corruption of the appellation in Chronicles, “son of Hachmoni,” which was the family or local name of Jashobeam. “The name here in Samuel was at first החכמני,  the article הat the beginning having been corrupted into a ת; for the word בןin Chronicles is regularly supplied in Samuel by that article” (Dissert. p. 82). Therefore he concludes “Jashobeam the Hachmonite” to have been the true reading. Josephus (Ant. 7:12, 4) calls him Ι᾿έσσαμος υἱὸς Α᾿χεμαίου, which favors Kennicott's emendsation. In these corrections Keil (Comment. ad loc.) concurs. SEE HACHMONI; SEE JASHOBEAM.

## Tackling[[@Headword:Tackling]]

             is the rendering in the A. V. — of σκευή, which occurs only in Act 27:19, meaning the spars, ropes, chains, etc., of a vessel's furniture (as in Diod. Sic. 14:79; so of household movables, Polyb. 2, 6, 6; equipage, Xenoph. Anab. 4:7, 27; Herodian, 6:4,11; warlike apparatus, Diod. Sic. 11:71). SEE SHIP.

## Tacquet, Andrew[[@Headword:Tacquet, Andrew]]

             a Jesuit of Antwerp, known for his skill in the mathematical sciences,' died in 1660. He published, among other things, a good treatise on astronomy, an edition of Euclid, etc. The prejudices of the times seem to have prevented him from more effectually defending the system of Copernicus. His collected works were published at Antwerp (1669, 1707, fol.).

## Tadmor[[@Headword:Tadmor]]

             (Heb. Tadmor, תִּדנְמֹר, prob. city of palms [see below]; Sept. Θεδμόρ v.r. Θοεδμόρ; Vulg. Palmira), a city “in the wilderness” which Solomon is said to have built (1Ch 8:4). In the nearly parallel passage (1Ki 9:18), where the phrase “in the land” is added to the description, indicating that this, like the associated cities, was within Solomon's legitimate jurisdiction, the reading “Tadmor” is adopted in tile A. V. from the Keri, or margin; the Kethib, or text, has תמר, Tamár (Sept. Θερμάθ v.r. Θαμμώρ; Vulg. Polmirai), which should probably be pointed תִּמֹּר, by contraction for תִּדנְמֹר, or imitation of the original תָּמָר, the palm-tree (see Keil, Comment. ad loc.). SEE PALM. The name would seem to indicate an abundance of date-palms anciently in that vicinity, although they are scarce in its present neglected state.

1. Classical Identification. — There is no reasonable doubt that this city is the same as the one known to the Greeks and Romans and to modern  Europe by the name, in some form or other, of Palmyra (Παλμυρά, Παλμιρά, Palmira). The identity of the two cities results from the following circumstances:

(1.) The same city is specially mentioned by Josephus (Ant. 8:6, 1) as bearing in his time the name of Tadmor among the Syrians, and Palmyra among the Greeks; and Jerome, in his Latin translation of the Old Test., translates Tadmor by Palmira (2Ch 8:4).

(2.) The modern Arabic name of Palmyra is substantially the same as the Hebrew word, being Tadmur, or Tathur.

(3.) The word Tadmor has nearly the same meaning as Palmyra, signifying probably the “City of Palms,” from Tamar, a palm; and this is confirmed by the Arabic word for Palma, a Spanish town on the Guadalquivir, which is said to be called Tadmir (see Gesenius, in his Thesaurus. p. 345).

(4.) The name Tadmor, or Tadmor, actually occurs as the name of the city Aramaic and Greek inscriptions which have been found there.

(5.) In the Chronicles, the city is mentioned as having been built by Solomon after his conquest of Hamath-Zobah, and it is named in conjunction with “all the store-cities which he built in Hamath.” This accords fully with the situation of Palmyra, SEE HAMATIT; and there is no other known city, either in the desert or not in the desert, which can lay claim to the name of Tadmor.

2. History. — As above stated, Tadmor was built by Solomon, probably with the view of securing an. interest in and command over the great caravan traffic from the East, similar to that which he had established in respect of the trade between Syria and Egypt. See this idea developed in Kitto's Pictorial Bible (not in 2Ch 8:4), where it is shown at some length that the presence of water in this small oasis must-early have made this a station for caravans coming west through the desert; and this circumstance probably dictated to Solomon the importance of founding here a garrison town, which would entitle him — in return for the protection he could give from the depredations of the Arabs, and for offering an intermediate station where the factors of the West might meet the merchants of the East to a certain regulating power, and perhaps to some dues, to which they would find it more convenient to submit than to change the line of route.. It is even possible that the Phoenicians, who took  much interest in this important trade, pointed out to Solomon the advantage which he and his subjects might derive from the regulation aid protection of it by building a fortified town in the quarter where it was exposed to the greatest danger. A most important indication in favor of these conjectures is found in the fact that all our information concerning Palmyra from heathen writers describes it as a city of merchants, who sold to the Western nations the products of India and Arabia, anti who were so enriched by the traffic that the place became proverbial for luxury and wealth and for the expensive habits of its citizens.

We do not again read of Tadmor in Scripture, nor is it likely that the Hebrews retained possession of it long after the death of Solomon. No other source acquaints us with the subsequent history of the place, till it reappears in the account of Pliny (Hist. Nat. 5, 24) as a considerable town, which, along with its territory, formed an independent state between the Roman and Parthian empires. Afterwards it was mentioned by Appian (De Bell. Civ. 5, 9), in reference to a still earlier period of time, in connection with a design of Mark Antony to let his cavalry plunder it. The inhabitants are said to have withdrawn themselves and their effects to a strong position on the Euphrates, and the cavalry entered an empty city. In the 2nd century it seems to have been beautified by the emperor. Hadrian, as may be inferred from a statement of Stephanus of Byzantium as to the name of the city having been changed to. Hadrianopolis (s.v. Παλμυρά). In the beginning of the 3rd century it became a Roman colony under Caracalla (A.D. 211-217), and received the jus Italicum. From this period the influence and wealth of Palms rapidly increased. Though nominally subject to Rome, it had a government of its own, and was ruled by its own laws. The public affairs were directed by a senate chosen by the people; and most of its public monuments were built, as the inscriptions show, by “the senate and people.” For nearly a century and a half this prosperity continued, and it was only checked at length by the pride it generated.

The story of the unfortunate Valerian is well known. Being captured by the Persians, his unworthy son did not use a single effort to release him from the hands of his conquerors. Odenathus, one of the citizens of Palmyra, revenged the wrongs of the fallen emperor, and vindicated the majesty of Rome. He marched against the Persians, took the province of Mesopotamia, and fled Sapor beneath the walls of Ctesiphon (A.D. 260). The services thus rendered to Rome were so great that Odenathus was associated in the sovereignty with Gallienus (A.D. 264). He enjoyed his  dignity but a short period, being murdered by his nephew at a banquet in the city of Emesa only three years afterwards. His reign was brief, but brilliant. Not only was Sapor conquered and Valerian revenged, but Syrian rebels and the northern barbarians, who now began their incursions into the Roman empire, felt the force of his arms.

Odenathus bequeathed his power to a worthy successor Zenobia, his widow; and the names of Zenobia and Palmyra will always be associated so long as history remains. The virtue, the wisdom, and the heroic spirit of this extraordinary woman have seldom been equaled. At first she was content with the title of regent during the minority of her son Vaballatus, but unfortunately ambition prompted her to adopt the high sounding title of “Queen of the East.” She soon added Egypt to her possessions in Syria, Asia Minor, and Mesopotamia, and ruled over it during a period of five years. In A.D. 271 the emperor Aurelian turned his arms against her, and having defeated her in a pitched battle near Antioch and in another at Emesa, he drove her back upon her desert home. He then marched his veterans across the parched plain and invested Palmyra, which capitulated after a brief struggle. Zenobia attempted to escape, but was captured on the banks of the Euphrates, and brought back to the presence of the conqueror. She was taken to Rome, and there, covered with her jewels and bound by fetters of gold, she was led along in front-of the triumphant Aurelian. Zenobia deserved a better fate. If common humanity did not prevent the Roman citizens from exulting over an honorable, though fallen, foe, the memory of her husband's victories and of his services rendered to the State might have saved her from the indignity of appearing before a mob in chains.

Aurelian took Palmyra in A.D. 272, and left in it a small garrison, but soon after his departure the people rose and massacred them. On hearing of this the emperor returned, pillaged the city, and put the inhabitants to the sword.. It was soon repaired by the orders of the conqueror, and the Temple of the Sun rebuilt; but it never recovered its former opulence. Twenty years later, under the reign of Diocletian, the walls of th3 city were rebuilt. It appears from an inscription to have assisted the emperor Alexander Severus in his wars against the Persians; and there are proofs of its having continued to be inhabited until the downfall of the Roman empire. There is a fragment of a building with a Latin inscription bearing  the name of Diocletian; and there are existing walls of the city of the age of the emperor Justinian, together with the remains of a costly aqueduct which he built. It eventually became the seat of a bishop, but never recovered any importance. When the successors of Mohammed extended their conquests beyond the confines of Arabia, Palmyra was one of the first places which became subject to the caliphs. In the year 659 a battle was here fought between the caliphs Ali and Moawiyah, and won by the former. In 744 it was still so strongly fortified that it took the caliph Merwan seven months to reduce it, the rebel Solyman having shut himself up in it.

From this period, Palmyra seems to have gradually fallen into decay. Benljamin of Tudela, who was there towards the end of the 12th century, speaks of it as “Thadmor in the desert, built by Solomon of equally large stones [with Baalbec]. This city is surrounded by a wall, and stands in the desert, far from any inhabited place. It is four days' journey from Baalath [Baalbec], and contains 2000 warlike Jews, who are at war with the Christians and with the Arabian subjects of Noureddin, and aid their neighbors the Mohammedans.” In connection with this statement, it may be remarked that the existing inscriptions of Palmyra attest the presence of Jews there in its most flourishing period, and that they, in common with its other citizens, shared in the general trade, and were even objects of public honor. One inscription intimates the erection of a statue to Julius Schalmalat, a Jew, for having at his own expense conducted a caravan to Palmyra. This was in A.D. 258, not long before the time of Zenobia, who, according to some writers, was of Jewish extraction. Irby and Mangles (Travels, p. 273) also noticed a Hebrew inscription on the architrave of the great colonnade, but give no copy of it, nor say what it expressed. The latest historical notice of Tadmor which we have been able to find is, that it was plundered in 1400 by the army of Timur Beg (Tamerlane), when 200,000 sheep were taken (Rankin, Wars of the Mongols). Abulfeda, sat the beginning of the 14th century (Descript. Arab. p. 98), speaks of Tadmor as merely a village, but celebrated for its ruins of old and magnificent edifices. These relics of ancient art and magnificence were scarcely known in Europe till towards the close of the 17th century. In the year 1678 some English merchants at Aleppo resolved to verify by actual inspection the reports concerning these ruins which existed in that place. The expedition was unfortunate, for they were plundered of everything by the Arabs, and returned with their object unaccomplished. A second expedition, in 1691, had better success; bit the accounts which were  brought back received little credit, as it seemed unlikely that a city which, according to their report, must have been so magnificent, should have been erected in the midst of deserts. When, however, in the year 1753, Robert Wood published the views and plans which had been taken with great accuracy on the spot two years before by Dawkins, the truth of the earlier accounts could no longer be doubted; and it appeared that neither Greece nor Italy could exhibit antiquities which, in point of splendor, could rival those of Palmyra. From that time it has frequently been visited by travelers, and it is now readily accessible by an excursion on camels from Damascus. Its ruins have often been described and delineated.

3. Present Remains. — Tadmor was situated between the Euphrates and Hamath, to the south-east of that city, in. a fertile tract or oasis of the desert. Palm trees are still found in the gardens around the town, “but not in such numbers as would warrant, as they once did, the imposition of the name. The present Tadmor consists of numbers of peasants mud-huts, clustered together around the relics of the great Temple of the Sun.

The ruins cover a sandy plain stretching along the bases of a range of mountains called Jebel Belaes, running nearly north and south, dividing the great desert from the desert plains extending westward towards Damascus and the north of Syria. The lower eminences of these mountains, bordering the ruins, are covered with numerous solitary square towers, the tombs of the ancient Palmyrenes, in which are found memorials similar to those of Egypt. They are seen to a great distance, and have a striking effect in this desert solitude. Beyond the valley which leads through these hills the ruined city first opens upon the view. The thousands of Corinthian columns of white marble, erect and fallen, and covering an extent of about a mile and a half, present an appearance, which travelers compare to that of a forest. The site on which the city stands is slightly elevated above the level of the surrounding desert for a circumference of about ten miles, which the Arabs believe to coincide with the extent of the ancient city, as they find ancient remains whenever they dig within this space. There are, indeed, traces of an old wall, not more than three miles in circumference; but this was probably built by Justinian, at a time when Palmyra had lost its ancient importance and become a desolate place, and when it was consequently desirable to contract its bounds, so as to include only the more valuable portion. Volney well describes the general aspect which these ruins  present: “In the space covered by these ruins we sometimes find a palace of which nothing remains but the court and walls; sometimes a temple whose peristyle is half thrown down; and now a portico, a gallery, or triumphal arch.

Here stand groups of columns, whose symmetry is destroyed by the fall of many of them; there we see them ranged in rows of such length that, similar to rows of trees, they deceive the sight, and assume the appearance of continued walls. If from this striking scene we cast our eyes upon the ground, another, almost as varied, presents itself-on all sides we behold nothing but subverted shafts; some whole, others shattered to pieces or dislocated in their joints; and on which side soever we look, the earth is strewn with vast stones, half buried; with broken entablatures, mutilated friezes, disfigured reliefs, effaced sculptures, violated tombs, and altars defiled by dust.” The colonnade and individual temples are inferior in beauty and majesty to those which may be seen elsewhere—such, for example, as the Parthenon and the remains of the temple of Jupiter at Athens; and there is evidently no one temple equal to the Temple of the Sun at Baalbec, which, as built both at about the same period of time and in the same order of architecture, suggests itself most naturally as an object of comparison. But the long lines of Corinthian columns at Palmyra, as seen at a distance, are peculiarly imposing; and in their general effect and apparent vastness, they seem to surpass all other ruins of the same kind. The examinations of travelers show that the ruins are of two kinds. The one class must have originated in very remote times, and consists of rude, unshapen hillocks of ruin and rubbish, covered with soil and herbage, such as now alone mark the site of the most ancient cities of Mesopotamia and Babylonia, and among which it would be reasonable to seek some traces of the more ancient city of Solomon. The other, to which the most gorgeous monuments belong, bears the impress of later ages. It is clear from the style of architecture that the later buildings belong to the three centuries preceding Diocletian, in which the Corinthian order of pillars was preferred to any other. All the buildings to which three columns belonged were probably erected in the 2nd and 3rd centuries of our sera. Many inscriptions are of later date; but no inscription earlier than the 2nd century seems yet to have been discovered.

The Temple of the Sun is the most remarkable and magnificent ruin of Palmyra. The court by which it was enclosed was 179 feet square, within which a double row of columns was continued all round. They were 390 in number, of which about sixty still remain standing. In the middle of the  court stood the temple, an oblong quadrangular building surrounded with columns, of which about twenty still exist, though without capitals, of which they have been plundered, probably because they were composed of metal. In the interior, at the south end, is now the humble mosque of the village. A little beyond the temple begins the great colonnade, which runs nearly from east to west; it is of great length, and very beautiful. The columns are in good proportion and excellent preservation; each shaft consisting of three courses of stone admirably jointed, with a bracket for a bust or statue interposed between the second and third. In their present naked condition, these brackets are unsightly; yet when they were surmounted by statues the effect must have been extremely grand.

The necropolis of Palmyra lies half an hour northwest of the Temple of the Sun, in the Wady el-Kebur, the ravine through which we made our approach to the city. The tombs, which are very numerous and extremely interesting, are almost all of them towers, two, three, four, and in one instance five stories high. The tomb of Jamblichus, mentioned by Wood, is now dreadfully dilapidated, its stairs crumbled away, and the floor of the fourth story entirely gone. It is five stories high, and was built in the third year of the Christian sera. That of Manaius is peculiarly interesting, and in some respects, indeed, the most curious building at Palmyra. It is in wonderful preservation, and its description will afford some idea of the others, as they are almost all built on the same plan, though far less beautiful. It is a lofty square tower, about fifteen feet in the side, lessening by three courses of stone like steps at about a third of its height. An inscription in honor of the deceased is engraved on a tablet over the doorway. The principal apartment is lined with four Coxinthian pilasters on each side, with recesses between them for mummies; each recess divided into five tiers by shelves, only one of which retains its position. The ancient Palmyrenes buried their dead in the Egyptian manner, and Wood found in one of: the tombs a mummy in all respects similar to those in the land of the: Pharaohs.

4. Authorities. — The original sources for the history of Palmyra may be seen in the Scriptores Historiae Augustae, Triginta Tyranni, vol. 14; Divus Aurelianus,. vol. 26; Eutropius, 9:10, 11, 12. In A.D. 1696; Abraham Seller published a most instructive work, entitled The Antiquities of Palmyra, containing the History of the City and its Emperors, which  contains several Greek inscriptions, with translations and explanations. Gesenius published an account of the Palmyrene inscriptions at Rome and Oxford in his Monumenta Scripturae Linguaeque Phoenicme, § 53. The best work on the ruins of Palmyra is still Robert Wood's splendid folio, entitled The Ruins of Palmyra, etc. (Lond. 1753) Very good accounts of them may also be seen in Irby and Mangles, Travels; Richter, Walfahrnten; Addison, Damascus and Palmyra. The last work contains a good history of the place; for which, see also Rosenmüller's Bibl. Geog., translated by the Rev. N. Morren; and, in particular, Cellarius, Dissert. de Inp. Palmyreno (1693). Gibbon, in ch. 11 of the Decline and Fall. hasgiven an account of Palmyra with his usual vigor and accuracy. For an interesting account of the present state of the ruins, see Porter, Handbook for Syria and' Palestine, p. 543-549; Beaufort, Egyptian Sepulchers, etc., vol. 1; and Badeker, Syria, p. 523. Besides Wood's great work, excellent views of the place have been published by Cassas in his Voyage Pittoresque de la Syrie; and later by Laborde in his Voyage en Orient. Recently photographs have been taken by various artists, and an, accurate knowledge of the remains of this renowned and remarkable place is thus made accessible to the whole world.

## Tae-Keih[[@Headword:Tae-Keih]]

             is the fundamental unity of the Chinese literati, the absolute, or, literally, the "great extreme." Beyond this, they allege, no human thought can soar. Itself incomprehensible, it girdles the whole frame of nature, animate and inanimate. From it alone, as from the fountain-head of nature issued everything that is. Creation is the periodic flowing forth of it. Tae-Keih is identical with Le, the immaterial element of the universe.

## Tafel, Johann Friedrich Immanuel[[@Headword:Tafel, Johann Friedrich Immanuel]]

             a Swedenborgian, who died at Stutgard in 1863, professor, is the author of, Religionssystem denr Neuen Kirche (Tubingen, 1832): — Geschichte unld Kritik des Skepticismus und Irrationalismus in ihrer Beziehung zur neuern Philosophie (1834): — Vergleichende Darstellung und Beurtheiliun der Lehrgegensdtze der Katholiken und Protestanten (1835): — Zur Geschichte der Neuen Kirche (1841): — Swedenborg und seine Gegner (2d ed. eod.): — Die Hauptvahrhleiten de Religion (1852): — Die Unsterblichkeit und Wiedererinnzerungskraft der Seele (1853): — Swedenborg und der Aberglaube (1856), etc. See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:506, 595. (B.P.)

## Taft, George, D.D[[@Headword:Taft, George, D.D]]

             an Episcopal minister, was born at Mendon, Mass., Aug. 27,1791, and was a graduate of Brown University, in the class of 1815. He pursued his theological studies under the direction of the Rev. Dr. Crocker, rector of St. John's Church, Providence, R. I., and was ordained a deacon by bishop Griswold, March 7, 1818, and a presbyter, Sept. 2,1819. He became rector of St. Paul's Church in Pawtucket, R. I., in October, 1820, continuing for a time to teach in a school in Providence with which he had been connected for several years. Such double service not being altogether satisfactory to his bishop, he gave a gentle hint to the parish of St. Paul's that “he had not ordained their minister to keep school;” and he thenceforth devoted himself with great zeal and success to his work as a minister of the Gospel until his death, which occurred at Pawtucket, Dec. 11,1869. His ministry was a little over fifty years in duration. (J.C.S.)

## Tagete[[@Headword:Tagete]]

             in Greek mythology, was a daughter of Atlas and Pleione, mother of Lacedoemon and Eurotas by Jupiter. She became one of the Pleiades after death. Others affirm that she was transformed into a cow by Diana, in order to escape the embraces of Jupiter. The mountain Taygetus was named after her. See Smith, Dict. of Class. Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Taggart, Samuel[[@Headword:Taggart, Samuel]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Londonderry, N.H., March 24, 1754. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1774, was licensed to preach by the  Presbytery of Boston June 1, 1776, and was ordained and installed pastor of the Church at Coleraine, Hampshire Co., Mass., Feb. 19,1777. He was a member of Congress from 1803 to 1817. He died April 25,1825. Mr. Taggart possessed a mind of great strength and vigor. He published several theological treatises, sermons, orations, political speeches, etc. (1800-19). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3, 377; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Packard, Hist. of the Churches and Ministers in Franklin County.

## Taggart, William, D.D[[@Headword:Taggart, William, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian divine, was born in 1783, educated privately, graduated at the Theological Seminary of the Associate Reformed Church, New York, in 1813; was licensed to preach by the Monongahela Associate Reformed Presbytery in the same year, and ordained by the same presbytery and installed pastor of the united congregationsῥ at Upper Wheeling and Cadiz in 1814, where he continued to labor until old age. He died Sept. 11, 1865. Dr. Taggart was a man of strong thought.” His moral and intellectual attributes were perhaps rarely, if ever, excelled.” See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 279.

## Tahan[[@Headword:Tahan]]

             (Heb. Tach'an, תִּחִן, camp [Gesenius], or graciousness [Furst]), the name of two descendants of Ephraim.

1. (Sept. Τανάχ v.r. Ταναϊv; Vulg. Thehen.) The head of one of the families of the Ephraimites at the end of the Exode (Num 26:35). B.C. ante 1618. SEE TAHANITE.

2. (Sept. Θαέν v.r. Θαάν; Vulg. Thaan.) Son of Telah and father of Laadan in the Palestinian lineage of Ephraim (1Ch 7:25). B.C. post 1618.

## Tahanite[[@Headword:Tahanite]]

             (Heb. Tachani', תִּחֲנַי, patronymic from Tahan; Sept. Ταναχί v.r. Ταναϊv; Vulg. Thehenita), the family name (Numbers , 26, 35) of the descendants of TAHAN SEE TAHAN (q.v.).

## Tahapanes[[@Headword:Tahapanes]]

             (Jer 2:16). SEE TAHPANHES.

## Taharoth[[@Headword:Taharoth]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Tahath[[@Headword:Tahath]]

             (Heb. Tdchath, תִּחִת, in pause Tachath, תָּחִת, station, i.e. beneath, as often), the name of a place and of three men.

1. (Sept. Καταάθ v.r. Θάαθ; Vulg. Thahath.) One of the stations of the Israelites in' the desert between Makheloth and Tarah (Num 33:26); situated apparently not far beyond the western edge of the Arabah nearly opposite Mount Hor. SEE EXODE. —

2. (Sept. θαάθ v.r. Καάθ; Vulg. Thahath.) A Kohathite Levite, son of Assir and father of Uriel, or Zephaniah, in the ancestry of Samuel and Heman (1Ch 6:24; 1Ch 6:37 [Heb. 9 and 22]). B.C. cir. 1585.

3. (Sept. Θαάθ v.r. Θαάδ; Vulg. Thahath.) Son of Bered, and father of Eladah, among the immediate descendants of Ephraim in Palestine (1Ch 7:20). B.C. — post 1618. Burrington (General. 1, 273) regards him as the same with Tahan (q.v.) the son of Ephraim; but against the text.

4. (Sept. Σαάθ v.r. Νομεέ; Vulg. Tahath.) Grandson of the preceding (with whom some confound him), being son of Eladah and father of Zabad (1Ch 7:20). B.C. post 1618.

## Tahitian Version[[@Headword:Tahitian Version]]

             The extensive assemblage of islands in which the Tahitian dialect is spoken includes the Society, or Leeward, and the Georgian, or Windward, Isles, with the Low Islands, and the “Paumotu,” or Dangerous Archipelago. The largest of the islands is Otaheite, or, more properly, Tahiti, where the Tahitian language, generally considered as the most perfect type of all the Polynesian dialects, remained in its primitive simplicity. To account for this, it seems as if Tahiti had been peopled before any other island of Polynesia, properly so called; that from thence, as from a center, emigrants went to settle on the islands of the surrounding archipelago as far as New Zealand, and that while the Polynesian language became more or less  modified by the mode of life called for by the nature of the soil or of the climate, it remained, as stated already, in its primitive simplicity at Tahiti. The Tahitian version was made from the English Bible, with constant reference to the sacred originals. The first portion published was the Gospel of Luke, which appeared in 1818, while in 1838 the entire Bible was published in London under the superintendence of the Rev. Henry Nott. Other editions followed, of which the most important, consisting of a revised edition of the entire Scriptures, was completed in London in 1848. In 1877 the annual report of the British and Foreign Bible Society announced that the committee were bringing out a revised edition with maps, which, according to the report in 1879, had left the press, the edition, consisting of 5000, having been edited by the Rev. A. T. Saville. Up to March 31, 1889, the sum total of-Bibles distributed, either as a whole or in parts, was 57,579. See, besides The Bible of Every Land, the annual reports of the British and Foreign Bible Society since 1860, which are the only source of information. (B. P.)

## Tahpanhes[[@Headword:Tahpanhes]]

             (Heb. Tachpanches', תִּחְפִּנְחֵס, Jeremiah 2, 16 [marg.]; 43:7, 8, 9; 44:1; 46:14), Ta-hap'anes (Heb. Tachpanes', תִּחְפֲּנֵם, 2, 16 [text]), or Tehaph'nehes (Heb. Techaphneches', תְּחִפְנְחֵס, Eze 30:18; all of Egyptian origin [see below]; Sept. Τάφνας or Τάφναι; Vulg. Taphne or Taphnis), a city of Egypt, of importance in the time of the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The name is clearly Egyptian, and closely resembles that of the Egyptian queen TAHPENES SEE TAHPENES (q.v.), which, however, throws no light upon it. The Coptic name of this place, Taphnas (Quatremere, Mem. Geog. et Hist. 1, 297, 298), is obviously derived from the Sept. form: the Gr. and Lat. forms, Δάφναι, Herod., Δάφνη, Steph. Byz., Dafno, Itin. Ant., are perhaps nearer to the Egyptian original (see Parthey, Zur Erdkunde des alten Aegyptens, p. 528). Can the name be of Greek origin? If the HANES mentioned by Isaiah (Isa 30:4) be the same as Tahpanhes, as we have suggested (s.v.), this conjecture must be dismissed. No satisfactory Egyptian etymology of this name has been suggested, Jablonski's Taphenes, “the head” or “beginning of the age” (Opusc. 1, 343), being quite untenable; nor has any Egyptian name resembling it been discovered. Dr. Brugsch (Geogr. Inschr. 1, 300, 301, Taf. lvi, No. 1728), following Mr. Heath (Exodus Papyri, p. 174), identifies the fort Tebenet with Tahpanhes; but it is doubtless the present  Tell Defenneh (described in the 4th Report of Egyptian Expl. Fund, Lond. 1888).

Tahpanhes was evidently a town of Lower Egypt near or on the eastern border. When Johanan and the other captains went into Egypt “they came to Tahpanhes” (Jer 43:7). Here Jeremiah prophesied the conquest of the country by Nebuchadnezzar (Jer 43:8-13). Ezekiel foretells a battle to be there fought apparently by the king of Babylon just mentioned (Eze 30:18). The Jews in Jeremiah's time remained here (Jer 46:1). It was an important town, being twice mentioned by the latter prophet with Noph or Memphis (Jer 2:16; Jer 46:14), as well as in the passage last cited. Here stood a house of Pharaoh. Hophra before which Jeremiah hid great stones, where the throne of Nebuchadnezzar would afterwards be set, and his pavilion spread (Jer 43:8-10). It is mentioned with “Ramesse and all the land of Gesen” in Judith 1, 9. Herodotus calls this place Daphnae of Pelusium (Δάφναι αὶ Πηλουσίαι), and relates that Psammetichus I had here a garrison against the Arabians and Syrians, as at Elephantine against the Ethiopians, and at Marea against Libya, adding that in his own time the Persians had garrisons at Daphne and Elephantine (2:30). Daphne was therefore a very important post under the twenty-sixth dynasty. According to Stephanus, it was near Pelusium (s.v.). In the Itinerary of Antoninus this town, called Dafno, is placed sixteen Roman miles to the south-west of Pelusium (ap. Parthey, Map 6 where observe that the name of Pelusium is omitted). This position seems to agree with that of Tel-Defenneh, which Sir Gardner Wilkinson supposes to mark the site of Daphnae (Modern Egypt and Thebes, 1, 447, 448). This identification favors the inland position of the site of Pelusium, if-we may trust to the distance stated in the Itinerary. SEE SIN. Sir Gardner Wilkinson (loc. cit.) thinks it was an outpost of Pelusium.

It may be observed that the Camps, τὰ Στρατόπεδα, the fixed garrison of Ionians and Carians established by Psammetichus I, may possibly have been at Daphnae.

## Tahpens[[@Headword:Tahpens]]

             (Heb. Tachpeneys', תִּחְפְּנֵיס, evidently of Egyptian origin, but uncertain in its signification, SEE TAHPANHES; Sept. Θεκεφένης v.r. Θεκεμίνα; Vulg. Taphnes), a proper name of an Egyptian queen. She was wife of the  Pharaoh who received Hadad the Edomite, and who gave him her sister in marriage (1Ki 11:18-20). B.C. cir. 1000. In the Sept. the latter is called the elder sister of Thekemina, and in the addition to ch. 12 Shishak (Susakim) is said to have given Ano, the elder sister of Thekemina his wife, to Jeroboam. It is obvious that this and the earlier statement are irreconcilable, even if the evidence from the probable repetition of an elder sister be set aside, and it is scarcely necessary to add that the name of Shishak's chief or only wife, Karaamat, does not support the Sept. addition. SEE SHISHAK.

There is therefore but one Tahpenes or Thekemina. At the time to which the narrative refers there were probably two, if not three, lines ruling in Egypt-the Tanites of the twenty-first dynasty in the lower country; the high-priest kings at Thebes, but possibly they were of the same line; and perhaps one of the last faineants of the Rameses family. To the Tanitic line, as apparently then the most powerful, and as holding the territory nearest Palestine, the Pharaoh in question, as well as the father-in-law of Solomon, probably belonged. If Manetho's list be correct, he may be conjectured to have been Psusennes. SEE PHARAOH, 9. No name that has any near resemblance to either Tahpenes or Thekemina has yet been found among those of the period (see Lepsius, Konigsbuch).

## Tahrea[[@Headword:Tahrea]]

             (Heb. Tachrie'd, תְִּחרֵעִ, cunning [Gesenius], or flight [Fürst]; Sept. Θαρά v.r. Θαράχ; Vulg. Tharaa), third named of the four sons of Micah, Jonathan's grandson (1Ch 9:41); called in the parallel passage (1ch 8:35) TAREA SEE TAREA (q.v.). B.C. post 1037. Tah'tim-Hod'shi (Heb. Tachtim' Chodshi', חָדנְשַׁי תִּחְתַּים, lit. lowlands my month; Sept. Θαβασῶν ἣ ἐστιν Ναβασαί v.r. ἐθαὼν ἀδασαί; Vulg. inferiora Hodsi), a region (אֶרֶוֹ, “land”) mentioned as one of the places visited by Joab during his census of the land of Israel, between Gilead and Dan-jaan (2Sa 24:6). Furst (Handwörterb. 1, 380) proposes to separate the “Land of the Tachtim” from “Hodshi.” and to read the latter as Haishi-the people of Harosheth (comp. Jdg 4:2). Thenius restores the text of the Sept. to read “the Land of Bashan, which is Edrei.” This in itself is feasible, although it is certainly very difficult to connect it with the Hebrew. Ewald (Gesch. 3, 207) proposes to read Hermon for Hodshi; and Gesenius (Thesaur. p. 450 a) dismisses the passage with a vix pro sano habendum. There is a district called the Ard et-Tahta, to the east-northeast of  Damascus, which recalls the old name-but there is nothing to show that any Israelite was living so far from the Holy Land in the time of David. It seems probable from the connection that the whole, is a proper name, descriptive, however, of the physical aspect of the region to which it was given. The route taken by the king's messengers was first eastward to Moab; then northward through Gilead; then from Gilead to “the land of Tahtim-Hodshi,” to Danjaan and Zidon. “The land of Tahtim-Hodshi” was thus manifestly a section of the upper valley of the Jordan, probably that now called Ard el-Hluleh, lying deep down at the western base of Hermon.

## Tailory, The[[@Headword:Tailory, The]]

             a room adjoining the wardrobe in monasteries, where a number of the lay brethren, with a vocation for that useful craft, were continually at work, making and repairing the clothes of the community. These two rooms and  the lavatory were in charge of the camerarius or chamberlain. See Hill, English Monasticism, page 20.

## Tailred of Sicily[[@Headword:Tailred of Sicily]]

             the son of Eudes, a Norman baron, and of Emma, the sister of Robert Guiscard, was one of the celebrated heroes of the first Crusade, and was born after the middle of the 11th century. Some chroniclers profess to detail the events of his early life, describing him as the most accomplished  youth of his time in athletic and military exercises, and of a wisdom far surpassing that of men of mature years, and as a partisan of his cousin Bohemond in the quarrel with their uncle Roger of Sicily. But the first authentic information respecting him is that he raised a large body of men in Apulia and Calabria, and joined Bohemond, then on his way to the first Crusade. The two cousins landed in Epirus, and first one and then the other made his submission to the Greek emperor Alexis. Tancred's exploits on the way to Syria; his quarrel with Baldwin for the possession of Tarsus, and his subsequent chivalrous forbearance to and rescue of his rival; his wondrous valor before Antioch, where he killed no fewer than 700 infidels, transmitting the heads of seventy to the pope, and receiving a corresponding number of marks of silver in return; his vigorous repulse of the first sortie by the infidels from Jerusalem; his sad and lonely vigil on the Mount of Olives; and his gallantry at the storming of the sacred city, are all detailed by the numerous chroniclers of this epoch in their usual style of extravagant laudation, but with a harmony which speaks favorably for their correct appreciation of his character. He was one of the claimants of the throne of Jerusalem, and was pacified by Godfrey (q.v.), the successful competitor, with the gift of some towns in Palestine, and the principality of Galilee or Tiberias. A brief quarrel with Baldwin, after Godfrey's death, petty combats with the infidels, and occasional wars with the other Christian princes who had settled in Syria and Palestine occupied the remainder of his life, which was brought to a close at Antioch in 1112. Besides his own principality, he governed that of Antioch, belonging to his cousin Bohemond, from 1100. The fiery and energetic, but at the same time pious, sagacious, and forbearing, chief whom the chroniclers present to us has been considerably toned down by Tasso in his Gerusalemme Liberata.

## Tairi[[@Headword:Tairi]]

             the principal deity of the Sandwich Islanders.

## Tait, Archibald Campbell, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Tait, Archibald Campbell, D.D., LL.D]]

             an English prelate, was born in Edinburgh, Scotland, December 22, 1811. He graduated from the Edinburgh High School, Edinburgh Academy, Glasgow University, and Oxford University, from the last with the highest honors. He became a public examiner of the university, and in 1842 head master at Rugby, where he remained eight years. He was appointed dean of Carlisle in 1850, where he instituted an extra. pulpit service, and gave much time to visiting and instructing the poor. In 1856 he became bishop of London, and successfully originated a scheme for adding to the Church accommodation in the metropolis, by raising in ten years a fund of five million dollars. He was translated to the archiepiscopal see of Canterbury in December 1868. He presided over the Pan-Anglican Synod in Lambeth in 1867, the Church Congress in Croydon in 1877, and the Congress of Anglican Bishops in Lambeth in 1878. He died in London, December 3, 1882. Archbishop Tait was a churchman of conservative spirit. He wrote, Dangers and Safeguards of Modern Theology: — The Word of God the Ground of Faith: — Charge to the Clergy; Some Thoughts on the Duties of the Church of England: — Letters on Education and Kindred Topics, in Sceth and British reviews. (W.P.S.)

## Taitazak or Taytazak, Joseph[[@Headword:Taitazak or Taytazak, Joseph]]

             a Spanish Jew, belonged to those 300,000 exiles who had to leave their country in 1492. With his father and brothers, he settled at Salonica, where he wrote פורת יוס, “the fruitful bough of Joseph” (after Gen 49:22), a commentary on Ecclesiastes, in a homiletico-philosophicaI style (Venice, 1599): — קצת פרוש תלים, i.e. excerpts from his commentary on the Psalms, published with Penini's work, לשוֹן הזהב, “the tongues of gold” (ibid. 1599). The MS. of his complete commentary on the Psalms is to be found in the libraries of Paris and Oxford: — לחם סתרים, “the bread of sacredness,” in allusion to Pro 9:17; a commentary on Daniel and the five Megilloth, viz. the Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther (ibid. 1608). In its present form this work only contains fragments of Taitazak's commentaries on three books, and MSS. of the entire commentaries are still extant: — באור איוב, a commentary on Job, extant: — פסקים ושו ת, i.e. questions and decisions (ibid. 1622). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 412; De Rossi, Dizionario Storico, p. 314 (Germ. transl.); Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodl. col. 1533; Kitto, Cyclop. s.v.; Finn, Sephardim, p. 413. (B. P.)

## Tajus, Samuel[[@Headword:Tajus, Samuel]]

             bishop of Saragossa, lived in the 7th century. In the year 646 he went to Rome at the command of king Chindaswinth, and with the sanction of the seventh Council of Toledo, for the sake of bringing back the long-missed Expositio in Hiobum s. Moralium, lib. 35 of Gregory I. According to tradition, he was shown in a vision the place where it was hidden. Tajus was also present at the eighth and ninth councils of Toledo. Besides an  Epistola ad Eugenium Toletanum episcopum, he also wrote Sententiarum lib. 5 (Migne, Patrol. vol. 80), containing extracts from Gregory's work on

(a) God, creation, creature, government of the world; (b) incarnation, Church, Church government; (c) moral life, virtues; (d) sins and vices; (e) sinners, prince of this world, Antichrist, judgment, condemnation.

Wherever Gregory failed him, he supplied his work from Augustine's writings. The work is preceded by a Praefatio ad Quiricum Barcinonensem Episcopum, to whom the work is dedicated, together with the Responsio Quirici. See Regensburger Conversations Lexikon, s.v.; Theologisches Universal- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Talapoins[[@Headword:Talapoins]]

             priests or friars of the Siamese and other Indian nations. They reside in monasteries under the superintendence of a superior, whom they call a Sanerat. Celibacy is obligatory upon them, and a breach of chastity in the case of any one of them is punished with death. They perform penance for such of the people as pay them for it; are very hospitable to strangers, and strict in their rules of chastity. There are also female Talapoins, who live according to rules similar to those of the men. The residences of the Talapoins are much superior to those of the priests in Ceylon and Burmah, having richly carved entrances and ornamental roofs.

## Talbot, Joseph Cruikshank, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Talbot, Joseph Cruikshank, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal bishop, was born at Alexandria, Virginia, September 5, 1816. He studied at the Alexandria Academy; in 1835 removed to Kentucky, and engaged in mercantile pursuits; in 1843 became a candidate for clerical orders, in 1846 was ordained deacon, and in 1848 presbyter; was in charge of St. John's Church, Louisville, seven years, and in 1853 became rector of Christ Church, Indianapolis; in 1859 was elected assistant  bishop of Indiana, and in 1872 became bishop of the diocese. He died January 16, 1883.

## Talbot, Peter[[@Headword:Talbot, Peter]]

             a Roman Catholic divine, was the son of sir William Talbot, and was born in the county of Dublin in 1620. He entered the society of Jesuits in Portugal in 1635; and after studying philosophy and divinity, went into holy orders at Rome, whence he returned to Portugal, and afterwards to Antwerp, where he read lectures on moral theology. He is supposed to be the person who, in 1656, reconciled Charles II, then at Cologne, to the popish religion; and Charles is reported to have sent him to Madrid to inform the court of Spain of his conversion. Sent to England in the interest of the Romish Church, he paid court to Cromwell, whose funeral he attended as a mourner. In 1669 pope Clement IX dispensed with his vows as Jesuit, and advanced him to the titular archbishopric of Dublin. He immediately began to persecute those, of his order who had signified their  loyalty to the king, quarreled with Plunket, the titular primate; and when the popish plot was discovered in England in 1678, he was imprisoned in Dublin Castle on suspicion of being concerned in it, and died there in 1680. He was a man of ability and learning, but vain, ambitious, and turbulent. Among his publications are, De Natura- Fidei et. ficeresis, Tractatus de Religione: — A Treatise of Religion and Government (1670, 4to): — Letters to the Roman Catholics in Ireland (Paris, 1674, 4to). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Talbot, Richard[[@Headword:Talbot, Richard]]

             an Irish prelate, was collated to the precentorship of Hereford in 1407, and in 1416 was elected to the primacy of Armagh. In 1417 he was consecrated archbishop of the see of Dublin. In 1423 he was lord justice, and subsequently lord chancellor of Ireland, and in 1424 had a grant for all his services of all the estates of Matthew St. John, deceased. He was at the same time constituted justice and guardian of the peace in the county of Dublin. In 1426 he reduced the proxies that were formerly paid by the prior and convent of the Holy Trinity to the archbishops of Dublin, from five marks to two and a half, which concession pope Eugenius afterwards confirmed. He was again constituted lord chancellor in 1428. In 1432 he established a chantry in St. Michael's Church, which, from being a chapel,  he constituted parochial, arid likewise founded the chantry of St. Anne in St. Audeon's Church, for the maintenance of six priests to pray for the king, the founder, and, their successors. In 1443 he was elected archbishop of Armagh, but refused the dignity. In 1445 he was a fourth time lord deputy of Ireland, and in 1447 was appointed deputy to the earl of Ormond, viceroy of Ireland. He died August 15, 1449. See D'Alton, Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin, page 153.

## Talbot, Robert, D.D[[@Headword:Talbot, Robert, D.D]]

             an English divine and antiquarian, was born at Thorp, Northamptonshire, and was admitted to New College, Oxford, in 1525. He left the university in 1530; in 1541 was made prebendary of Wells; and treasurer of the cathedral church of Norwich, April 9, 1547, which position he retained until his death, Aug. 27, 1558. He was a diligent searcher into the antiquities of his country, and his collections proved of great service to Leland, Bale, Caius, Camden, and others. He also furnished archbishop Parker with many Saxon books. He was the first Englishman who illustrated Antoninus's Itinerary with various readings and notes, but his notes reach only to the sixth journey. Talbot, Samson, D.D., a Baptist minister, was born near Urbana, O., June 28, 1828, and was a graduate bf Granville College, now Denison University. O., in 1852, and of Newton Theological Institute in 1855. He was ordained in 1856, and was pastor of the Baptist Church in Dayton, O., eight years, 1856-64, and was then appointed president of Denison University, which position he held until his death, which occurred at Newton Center, Mass., June 29, 1873. President Talbot was an accomplished scholar, a profound thinker, and bade fair to stand in the very front rank of scholars in this country. (J.C.S.)

## Talbot, William, D.D[[@Headword:Talbot, William, D.D]]

             an English prelate, was born at Stourton Castle in 1659, and in 1674 entered as a gentleman commoner of Oriel College, Oxford. After graduation he entered holy orders, and in the reign of king James II preached and acted with great zeal against popery. In April, 1691, he was nominated to the deanery of Worcester, and Sept. 24, 1699, was advanced to the bishopric of Oxford. He was translated to the bishopric of Sarum, April 23, 1715; and in September, 1722, was translated to that of Durham, of which county he was made lord-lieutenant and custos rotulorum. He  died Oct. 10,1730. There are in print two speeches of his in the House of Lords, and a volume of Sermons (8vo).

## Talent[[@Headword:Talent]]

             representing the Greek τάλαντον, Lat. talentum, is the rendering of the Heb. and Chald. kikkar, כַּכָּר, a circle, the coin being no doubt of that form. It was the largest weight among the Hebrews, being used for metals, whether gold (1Ki 9:14; 1Ki 10:10, etc.), silver (2Ki 5:22), lead (Zec 5:7), bronze (Exo 38:29), or iron (1Ch 29:7). A hill sufficient for the site of a city was sold for two talents of silver (1Ki 16:24); and for 1000 talents of silver the friendship of the Assyrian king was purchased (2Ki 15:19); another Assyrian king laid the kingdom of Judah under a tribute of 300 talents of silver and 30 of gold (2Ki 18:14); a similar tribute imposed by an Egyptian king consisted of 100 talents of silver and one talent of gold (23, 33); the crown of an Ammonitish king weighed one talent of gold (2Sa 12:30). The sacred utensils of the Tabernacle and the Temple amounted to many talents of silver and gold (Exo 25:39; Exo 38:24-25; Exo 38:27; 1Ki 9:14, etc.). But there must be some error in the numbers at 1 Chronicles 29 (see Kitto, Pict. Bible, note ad loc.). SEE NUMBER. In the post-exilian period, likewise, talents were a mode of estimation (1Ma 11:28; 1Ma 13:16; 1Ma 13:19; 1Ma 15:31; 2 Maccabees 3, 4, 8, etc.). In the New Test. the talent only occurs in a parable (Mat 25:15 sq.), and as an estimate of a stone's weight (Rev 16:21). From Exo 38:25-26, it appears that one talent was equivalent to 3000 shekels of the sanctuary (Schmidt, Biblathem. p. 183; Bockh, Metrol. Unters. p. 55). SEE SHEKEL. As the mina (q.v.) consisted of 50 sacred shekels, it followsῥ that the talent was equal to 60 mine, just as the Attic talent had 60 minae. SEE METROLOGY.

TALENT figuratively signifies any gift or opportunity God gives to men for the promotion of his glory. “Everything almost,” says Mr. Scott, “that we are, or possess, or meet with, may be considered as a talent; for a good or a bad use may be made of every natural endowment, or providential appointment, or they may remain unoccupied through inactivity and selfishness. Time, health, vigor of body, and the power of exertion and enduring fatigue — the natural and acquired abilities of the mind, skill in any lawful art or science, and the capacity for close mental application-the gift of speech, and that of speaking with fluency and propriety, and in a  convincing, attractive, or persuasive manner — wealth, influence, or authority — a man's situation in the Church, the community, or relative life-and the various occurrences which make way for him to attempt anything of a beneficial tendency; these, and many others that can scarcely be enumerated, are talents which the consistent Christian will improve to the glory of God and the benefit of mankind. Nay, this improvement procures an increase of talents, and gives a man Ian accession of influence and an accumulating power of doing good; because it tends to establish his reputation for prudence, piety, integrity, sincerity, and disinterested benevolence: it gradually forms him to an habitual readiness to engage in beneficent designs, and to conduct them in a gentle, unobtrusive, and unassuming manner, it disposes others to regard him with increasing confidence and affection, and to approach him with satisfaction; and it procures for him the countenance of many persons whose assistance he can employ in accomplishing his own salutary purposes.”

## Talionis, Lex[[@Headword:Talionis, Lex]]

             (law of retaliation). This was a Roman law to the effect “That if any one called another man's credit, or fortune, or life, or blood into question in judgment, and could not make out the crime alleged against him, he should suffer the same penalty that he intended to bring upon the other.” Although the ecclesiastical law could not inflict the punishment of retaliation for false witness against any man's life, yet such false testimony was early reputed by the Church as the highest species both of calumny and murder, and consequently brought such witnesses under all the ecclesiastical penalties due to those crimes. Bingham, Christ. Antiq. bk. 16:ch. 10:§ 9.

## Talismans[[@Headword:Talismans]]

             were used by the Chaldaean magicians to prevent the attacks of evil spirits, injury from wicked sorcery, poison, etc. We give the following translation of part of the seventeenth formula on the tablet found in the library of the royal palace at Nineveh: "Two double bands of white cloth upon the bed on the platform as a talisman if he binds on the (right) hand, two double bands of black cloth if he binds on the left hand:" The possessor of this talisman was assured that all evil spirits and other ills would leave him, never to return. These talismans were of different kinds. First of all there were those which consisted' of bands. of cloth, covered with certain written formulae, and were fastened to the furniture or the garments, like the phylacteries of the Jews. There were also AMULETS SEE AMULETS (q.v.). Vessels, containing food and drink for the gods and genii, were placed in the apartments as protecting talismans. The daemons were represented by figures of such hideous forms that it was believed that they were only to be shown their own image to cause them to flee away. In the museum of the Louvre is a bronze statuette of Assyrian workmanship, a figure of a horrible daemon in an upright position, with the body of a dog, the feet of an eagle, the claws of a lions the tail of a scorpion, the head of a skeleton but half decayed, and adorned with goat's horns, the eyes still remaining, and, lastly, four great expanded wings. See Lenormant, Chaldaean Magic, page 850; Volbeding, Index Programmatum, page 160; Thomson, Land and Book, 1:140, 217; comp. SEE CHARM.

## Talith[[@Headword:Talith]]

             SEE FRINGE.

## Talitha Cumi[[@Headword:Talitha Cumi]]

             (ταλιθὰ κοῦμι; Aram. קוּמַי טְלַיתָא, telitha Mimi), two Syriac words (Mar 5:41) signifying “Damsel, arise.” The word טליתא occurs in the Chald. paraphrase of Pro 9:3, where it signifies a girl; and Lightfoot (Horae Heb. Mark 5, 41) gives an instance of its use in the same sense by a rabbinical writer. Gesenius (Thesaur. p. 550) derives it from the Hebrew טלה, a lamb. The word קומיis both Hebrew and Syriac (2 p. fem. imperative, Kal, and Peal), signifying stand, arise. As might be  expected, the last clause of this verse, after Cumi, is not found in the Syriac version. Jerome (Ep. 57 ad Pammachium, Opp. 1, 308 [ed. Vallars]) records that Mark was blamed for a false translation on account of the insertion of the words “I say unto thee;” but Jerome points to this as an instance of the superiority of a free over a literal translation, inasmuch as the words inserted serve to show the emphasis of our Lord's manner in giving this command on his own personal authority.

## Tall Brothers[[@Headword:Tall Brothers]]

             an epithet (from their stature) of four Nitrian monks, named Dioscurus, Ammonins, Eusebius, and Euthymius, who were reluctantly induced by Theophilus, the patriarch of Alexandria, to leave the desert and receive ordination. They were so disgusted during the troubles of the time. of Chrysostomr. that they returned once more to their solitude, and although  condemned and denounced, A.D. 401, and even personally attacked by Theophilus, they persisted in remaining there.

## Tallents, Francis[[@Headword:Tallents, Francis]]

             an eminent Nonconformist divine, was born at Palsley, near Chesterfield, England, November, 1619, and was educated at the public-schools of Mansfield and Newark. He entered Peterhouse, Cambridge, but being chosen subtutor to the sons of the earl of Suffolk, removed to Magdalen College, of which he afterwards became fellow senior fellow, and president. In 1648 he-was ordained at London in the Presbyterian form, and in 1652 became minister of St. Mary's, Shrewsbury. At the Restoration, not wishing to be re-ordained, he was ejected, and in 1673 returned to Shrewsbury, and became pastor of a Dissenting congregation there. He died April 11, 1708, and was buried in St. Mary's, Shrewsburv. He published, View of Universal History to 1700 (Lond. 1700, fol.): — Short History of Schism (1705, 8vo): — Considerations on S. Garscome's Answer. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Talleyrand (De Perigord) Alexandre Angelique[[@Headword:Talleyrand (De Perigord) Alexandre Angelique]]

             a noted French prelate, was born in Paris,. Oct. 16, 1736, and after a course of education at the College de la Fleche, the Seminary of St. Sulpice, and under the direction of abbé Bourlier, became one of the almoners of the king, later vicar-general of Verdun, and (in 1762) abbot of Gard (diocese of Amiens). Having been chosen coadjutor of the archbishop of Rheims, he was consecrated at Rome, Sept. 26, 1766, under the title of archbishop of Troyanople impartibus. He succeeded to the archbishopric of Rheims Oct. 27, 1777, and was very active in improving his diocese, as well as in public and ecclesiastical functions, sharing the varied fortunes of the Church and State during the stormy period of the French Revolution. After having been a refugee at Aix-la-Chapelle, Brussels, and other places, he was recalled in 1803, and on July 28 was made cardinal, and on Aug. 8  following bishop of Paris, where he died, Oct. 20, 1821. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Talleyrand (De Perigord), Elie[[@Headword:Talleyrand (De Perigord), Elie]]

             a French prelate, was born at Perigueux in 1301, and was educated for the priesthood at the school of St. Front in that town. He became successively archdeacon of Perigueux, dean of Richmond (diocese of York), abbot of Chancelas, and (Oct. 10, 1324) bishop of Limoges, although he' was not consecrated because of his youth; and in 1328 he was translated to the see of Auxerre, though he continued to reside at Oudan, engaged in literary studies. He was created cardinal May 22, 1331, and thenceforth became active in public affairs, in which he experienced many remarkable adventures. He died at Avignon, Jan. 17, 1364, leaving a vast fortune. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Tallis, Thomas[[@Headword:Tallis, Thomas]]

             a celebrated English musician, flourished about the middle of the 16th century. Under queen Elizabeth he became gentleman of the royal chapel and organist. Although he was a diligent collector of musical antiquities, and a careful peruser of the works of other men, his compositions are so truly original that he may justly be said to be the father of the cathedral style. Notwithstanding his supposed attachment to the Romish religion, it seems that Tallis accommodated himself and his studies to the alterations introduced at the Reformation. With this view, he set to music those parts of the English liturgy which at that time were deemed most proper to be sung, viz. the two morning services-the one comprehending the Venite a Exultemus, Te Deum, and Benedictus; and the other, which is part of the communion office, consisting of the Kyrie Eleison, Nicene Creed, and Sanctus; as also the evening service, containing the Magnificat and Nunc Dimittis. He also set musical notes to the preces and responses, and composed that litany which for its excellence is sung on solemn services in all places where the choral service is performed. The services of Tallis contain also chants for the Venite Exultemus and the Creed of St. Athanasius, two of which are published in Dr. Boyce's Cathedral Music; vol. 1. Besides the offices above mentioned, constituting what are now termed the morning, communion, and evening services, in four parts, with the preces, responses, and litany. Tallis composed many anthems. He died Nov. 23, 1585, and was buried in the parish church of Greenwich, in Kent.

## Talmage, Samuel Kennedy, D.D[[@Headword:Talmage, Samuel Kennedy, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian divine, was born at Somerville, N. J., Dec. 11, 1798. He graduated at the College of New Jersey in 1820; taught in an academy for two years; was tutor in the College of New Jersey for three years, employing his leisure hours in studying theology privately; was licensed and ordained an evangelist in 1825 by the Newton Presbytery; labored as a missionary at Hamburg and other points in Edgefield District, S. C., for one year; in 1827 was a colleague with the Rev. S. S. Davis, D.D., in supplying the First Presbyterian Church at Augusta, Ga.; in 1828 became pastor of the Augusta Church; in 1836 was elected professor of languages in Oglethorpe University, which chair he held until 1840, when he was elected president of the institution, where he continued to labor until 1862, when his health failed. He died Sept. 2, 1865; Dr. Talmage was an able minister, a fine scholar, and a successful instructor. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 363.

## Talmai[[@Headword:Talmai]]

             (Heb. Talmay', תִּלְמִי, furrowed [Gesenius ] or bold [Fuirst, who comp. Θολομαῖος, Josephus, A nt. 14:8,1; Βαρ-θολομαῖος, Mat 10:3]; Sept. Θολμαί, Θολμί, Θελαμείν, Θολομαϊv, etc.; Vulg. Tholmai or Tholomai'), the name of two men.

1. Last named of the three gigantic” sons of Anak” in Hebron (Num 13:22), who were expelled by Ca leb (Jos 15:14) and slain by the Judahites (Judges 1, 10). B.C. 1618. It has been thought that these people are depicted on the Egyptian monuments as a tall, light complexioned race. In the hieroglyphic inscription they are named Tanmahu, which may be the Egyptian rendering of the Hebrew word Talmai, allowing for the interchange of the liquid I for n, so constant in all languages. The figure is from a picture on a wall of the tomb of Aimenepthah I, supposed to represent a man of the tribe of Talmai, one of the sons of Anak (Burton, Excerpta Hieroiqsphica).

2. Son of Ammihud and king of Geshur (2 Samuel 3, 3; 2Sa 13:37; 1Ch 3:2). B.C. 1045. His daughter Maachah was one of the wives of David and mother of Absalom. He was probably a petty chieftain  dependent on David, and his wild retreat in Bashan afforded a shelter to his grandson after the assassination of Amnon. SEE DAVID.

## Talmon[[@Headword:Talmon]]

             (Heb. Talmonn'; טִלְמוֹן, oppressor; Sept. Τελμών and Τελαμίν v..r. Τελμάν, Τολμών, Τελαμείν; Vulg. Telmon), the head of a family of door-keepers in the Temple, “the porters for the camps of the sons of Levi” (1Ch 9:17 Neh 11:19). B.C. 1013. Some of his descendants returned with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:42; Neh 7:45), and were employed in their hereditary office in the days of Nehemiah and Ezra (Neh 12:25), for the proper names in this passage must be considered as the names of families.

## Talmud[[@Headword:Talmud]]

             (תִּלְמוּד, talmud, doctrine; from לָמִד, “to teach”). :The Talmud-, “that wonderful monument of human industry, human wisdom,. and human folly” (Milman), is the work- which embodies the canonical and civil laws of the Jews. It consists of a Mishna (q.v.). as text, and a voluminous collection of commentaries and illustrations, called in the more modern Hebrew Horaa, and in Aramaic Gemara, “the complement” or “completion,” from גְּמִר, “to make perfect.” Thence the men who delivered these decisive commentaries are called Gemarists, sometimes Horaim, but more commonly Amoraim.

1. History and Composition. —The Jews divided their law into the written and unwritten. The former contained the Pentateuch, πεντάτευχος, חמישה, חומשי, תורה, or the תורה שבכתב, verbum Dei scriptum, ἔγγραφος; the latter was handed down orally, the תורה שבעל פה, παράδοσις, verbum Dei non scriptum, ἄγραφος. Some Jews have assigned the same antiquity to both, alleging that Moses received them ῥon Mount Sinai, and that Joshua received the oral law from Moses, who transmitted it to the seventy elders; and these again transmitted it to the men of the Great Synagogue, the last of whom was Simon the Just (q.v.). From the men of the Great Synagogue it came into the possession of the rabbins till Judah the Holy (q. v), who embodied in the celebrated code, of traditional Jaw, or Mishna, all the authorized interpretations of the Mosaic law, the traditions and decisions of the learned, and the precedents of the courts or schools; or, as Moses Maimonides (q.v.) states, in his preface to  the Mishna (Seder. Zeraim), “From Moses our teacher to our holy rabbi no one has united in a single body of doctrine what was publicly taught as the oral law; but an every generation the chief of the tribunal, or the prophet of his day, made memoranda of what he had heard from his predecessors and instructors, and communicated it orally to the people. In like manner, each individual committed to writing for his own use, and according to the degree of his ability, the oral laws and the information he had received respecting the interpretation of the Bible, with the various decisions that had been pronounced in every age and sanctified by the authority of the great tribunal. Such was the form of proceeding until our rabbi the holy, who first collected all the traditions, the judgments, the sentences, and the expositions of the law, heard by Moses our master, and taught in each generation.” There is, no doubt, some truth in this as to a few elementary principles of Hebrew usage and practice, both civil and religious; but the whole of the unwritten law cannot have this primordial majesty, for, without referring to the trivial and foolish character of many of its appointments, we know that Midrashim, or explanations and amplifications of Biblical topics, were of gradual growth.

Their commencement dates prior to the chronicle writer, because he refers to works of that nature (2Ch 13:22; 2Ch 24:27). The system of interpretation which they exemplify and embody existed in the age of the so called Sopherim, or scribes, who took the place of the prophets. — The men of the Great Synagogue promoted at. It prevailed from the Asmonsean period till that of Hadrian, i.e. about 300 years. The Midrash was naturally simple at first, but it soon grew more comprehensive and complicated under a variety of influences, of which controversy was not the least powerful. When secret meanings, hidden wisdom, deep knowledge, were sought in the letter of Scripture, the Midrashim shaped themselves accordingly, and a distinction in their contents could be made. Thus they have been divided into the Halakah, הלכה, “the rule,” and Hagadâh, הגדה, “what is said.” Legal prescriptions formed the Halakah, free interpretations the Hagadah. The one, as a rule of conduct, must be attended to; the other merely passed for something said. The one was permanent and proceeded from authoritative sources, from schools, the teachers of the law, etc.; the other was the product of individual minds, consisting of ideas which had often no other object than of being expressed at the moment. The oldest collection of Halakoth that is, the oldest Mishna-proceeded from the school of Hillel. Rabbi Akiba, who was slain in the Hadrianic war, is said to have composed Mishnic regulations. The school of R. Simon ben-Gamaliel (q.v.), A.D.  166, who was a descendant of Hillel, collected and sifted the existing materials of the oral law. The present Mishna proceeded from the hands of R. Judah the Holy (q.v.), son and successor of R. Simon ben-Gamaliel. The title of Judah's work is simply Mishnah, משנה, δευτέρωσις (from שנה, “to repeat”), “repetition,” like the Arabic Mathani (Koran, 15:87; 39:34), that is, either (considering the divine law as twofold, written and traditional) the second branch of the twofold law, or else the law given in a second form, as an explicative and practical development of it (comp. Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 4:419).

The work itself is composed of the following elements:

1. Pure Mishnah (משנה), the elucidation of the fundamental text of the Mosaic laws, and their application to an endless variety of particular cases and circumstances not mentioned in them.

2. Haldkâh (הלכה), the usages and customs of Judaism, as sanctioned and confirmed by time and general acquiescence.

3. Dibrey Chakalnim (דברי חכמים), law principles of the wise men or sages, i.e. the ancient, and at that time the more recent, teachers, to whose decisions the people's respect for them gave a greater or less weight.

4. Maassiyath (מעשיות), practical facts, conclusions arrived at by the course of events.

5. Gezirôth (גזירות), extemporaneous decisions demanded by emergencies.

6. Tekanôth (תקנות), modifications of usages to meet existing circumstances; and

7. Kelalîm (כללים), universal principles, under which a multitude of particular cases may be provided for.

According to Maimonides, there were five classes into which the traditional law is divided, viz.:

1. Pirushm (פירושים), “interpretations” given to Moses by God, the authority of'which has never been disputed (מחלוקת בהם בשום פנים אין).

2. Halakâh le-Mosheh mis-Sindy (הלכה למשה מסיני), “precepts delivered to Moses on Mount Sinai,” a distinction which gained the applause of all the classical rabbins, because it belongs to the class of undisputed decisions.

3. Those which have admitted of discussion, and the value and weight of which have been mainly determined by an extensive consent among the authorities.

4. Gezarâth (גזרות), “decisions” which have been made by the wise men regarding some of the written laws, and which decisions are designed to insure more fully the observance of such laws (or to make a fence about the law, כדי לעשות סיג לתורה).

5. Tekanâth (תקנות), “experimental suggestions,” referring to things recommended or enjoined by particular masters, which though they may not possess the stringent force of laws, nevertheless exert a great influence in the formation of social and religious habits and usages.

In constructing his work, Jehudah, or Judah, arranged these manifold materials under six general classes, called Sedarzim (סדרים), or orders. The first is called Zeraim (זרעים), or “seeds,” and treats of agricultural laws; the second, Moed (מועד), or “festivals,” or “solemnity,” treats of the Sabbath and the annual festivals and holydays, the duties of their observance, and the various enactments and prohibitions thereunto pertaining; the third, Nashizm (נשים), or “women,” treats of the intercourse between the sexes, of husband and wife, the duties of a brother-in-law towards his widowed and childless sister-in-law, the right of untying the shoe (Deu 25:5), of dowry and marriage settlements, of espousals, divorces, and of all the laws to these subjects respectively appertaining; the fourth, Nezikin (נזיקין, or “injuries,” treats of the laws of property (movable as well as immovable) and of commerce; the tithe, Kodashim (קדשים), or “consecrations,” treats of sacrifices and their laws; the sixth, Taharôth [or rather Tohoroth (טהרות), or “purifications,” treats ‘of the laws of pureness, legal cleanness, and that both positively and negatively. The initial letters of these titles combined, for the sake of memory, give the technical word Zemàn nekêt (זמן נקט), “a time accepted.”  The regulations thus generally classified are further arranged under a multitude of subsidiary topics, each Seder, or order, being divided into a number of tracts or treatises, called Massiktoth (מסכתות), and these were again subdivided into Perakîm (פרקים), chapters. The latter again are divided or broken up into paragraphs. Altogether there are 63 Massiktoth, with 525 chapters and 4187 paragraphs, in the Mishna. The whole is called Shas (ש ס), after the initials of סדרי ששה, i.e. the six orders. Since a general analysis of the contents of the Mishna has already been given under the art. MISHNA SEE MISHNA (q.v.), we must refer the reader to it, while a more minute analysis will be given farther on.

R. Judah's Mishna, however, did not contain all Midrashim. Many others existed, which are contained in part in the Siphra on Leviticus, Siphre on Numbers and Deuteronomy, Mechilta on Exodus, SEE MIDRASH, the Mishnas made by individual teachers for the use of their pupils, with the addition to the official Mishna collected by R. Chiya and his contemporaries. All the Halakoth of this sort, which were extra-Mishnaic, were called Boraithas. (ברייתות; Heb. חיצונות) or Tosiphtas (תוספתות). As has been stated, R. Judah the Holy collected the great mass of traditions in the work called Mishna; but even this copious work could not satisfy, for the length of time, the zeal of the rabbins for the law, for all casuistry is endless in its details. There were a great multitude of all kinds of possibilities which were treated in the Mishna, and yet, again, each single sentence left open divers possibilities, divers doubts, and considerations not yet finished. Thus it was an inner necessity of the matter that the text of the Mishna should again become the point of learned discussion. Partly by means of logic (that is, Rabbinical), partly with the help of the traditional matter, which had not yet been included in the Mishna, all open questions were now discussed. This task was carried out by the Amoraim, or Gemarical doctors, whose very singular illustrations, opinions, and doctrines were subsequently to form the Gemaras, i.e. the Palestinian and Babylonian: a body of men charged with being the most learned and elaborate triflers that ever brought discredit upon the republic of letters—

“For mystic learning, wondrous able In magic, talisman, and cabal Deep-sighted in intelligences Ideas, atoms, influences.”

 With unexampled assiduity did they seek after or invent obscurities and ambiguities, which continually furnished pretexts for new expositions and illustrations, the art of clouding texts in themselves clear having proved ever less difficult than that of elucidating passages the words or the sense of which might be really involved in obscurity.

“Hence comment after comment, spun as fine As bloated spiders draw the flimsy line!”

The two main schools where this casuistic treatment of the Mishnic text was exercised were that at Tiberias, in Palestine, and that at Sora (q.v.), in Babylonia, whither Abba Areka, called “Rab” (q.v.), a pupil of R. Judah, had brought the Mishna. In these and other schools (as Nahardea, Sipporis, Pumbaditha [q.v.], and Jabne or Jamnia), the thread of casuistry was twisted over and over again, and the matter-of traditions of the law thus took greater and greater dimensions. Abandoning the Scripture' text, to illustrate and to explain which the doctors and wise men of the schools had hitherto labored, successive generations of Genzarici now devoted& their whole attention to the exposition of the text of the Mishna; and the industry and cavillation were such that expositions, illustrations, and commentaries multiplied with amazing rapidity and to so portentous a degree that they eventually swelled into a monstrous chaotic mass, which was dignified by the name of Gemara, גְמָרָא (supplement or complement), and this, together with the Mishna, was called “Talmud.” Notwithstanding the uncertain paternity of this incongruous body of opinions, there were not wanting those who gave a preference to the Gemara over the Mishna, and even over the “written law.” It was said by some that the ‘‘written law” was like water, the Mishna like wine, and the Gemara like hippocras, or spiced wine. The “words of the scribes,” said those supporters of the Gemara, are lovely above the “words of the law,” for the words of the law” are weighty and light, but the “words of the scribes” are all weighty.

It was by R. Jochanan, rector of the Academy of Tiberias, that the minor chaos of comments and facetiae began to be collected; and these, being added to the Mishna, were termed the Palestinian Talmud, or Talmud Jeushali, i.e. Jerusalem Talmud. This Talmud, which was completed at Tiberias about A.D. 350, only contains four orders, viz., Zeraim, Môed, Nashuim, and Nezikin, together with the treatise Niddah and some other fragmentary portions. From the schools of Babylonia, also, a similar collection was in after-times made; but, as, upon the desolation of  Palestine, the study of the law was chiefly prosecuted in Babylon, the college there were far more numerous, and far more ingenious and prolific were the imaginations of the Babylonian professors. To collect and methodize all the disputations, interpretations, elucidations, commentaries, and conceits of the Babylonian Gemarici was consequently a labor neither of one man nor of a single age. The first attempt was made (A.D. 367) by R. Ashi, elected at the age of fourteen to be rector of the school of Soras (q.v.), a teacher described as eminently pious and learned. R. Ashe labored during sixty years upon the rank, unwieldy work, and, after arranging thirty-five books, died in 427, leaving the completion to his successors. For 100 years longer did rabbi after rabbi, with undiminished zeal, successively continue this un-profitable application, until at length, after the lapse of 123 years (about A.D. 550), rabbi Abina, the sixth in succession to Ashb, gave the finishing stroke to this second Talmud. Denominated, from the name of the province in which it was first compiled, the Babylonian Talmud, this second Talmud is as unmanageable to the student on account of its style and composition as on account of its prodigious bulk. Composed in a dialect neither Chaldaic nor Hebrew, but a barbarous commixture of both of these and of other dialects, jumbled together in defiance of all the rules of composition or of grammar, it affords a second specimen of a Babylonian confusion of languages.

“It was a parti-colored dress

Of patched and piebald languages,

Which made some think, when it did gabble,

They'd heard three laborers of Babel,

Or Cerberus himself pronounce

A leash of languages at once.”

Abounding, moreover, in fantastic trifles and Rabbinical reveries, it must appear almost incredible that any sane man could exhibit such acumen and such ardor in the invention of those unintelligible comments, in those nice scrupulosities, and those ludicrous chimeras which, the rabbins have solemnly published to the world, and of which we will speak further on.

II. Form and Style. — In general, the Gemara takes the shape of scholastic discussions, more or less prolonged, on the consecutive portions of the Mishna. On a cursory view, it is true, these discussions have the air of a desultory and confused wrangle; but, when studied more carefully, they resolve themselves into a system governed by a methodology of its own. “Non vero sterilis in Mishnicam commentarius Gemara est; quae illius tantuim modo verba explicet. Sed prolixas in ear instituit disputationes,  queestiones proponendas et ad eas respondendo dubia movendo, eaque solvendo, excipiendo et replicando” (Wahner, Antiq. Hebr. 1, 339).

The language of the Talmud is partly Hebrew and partly Aramaic. The best Hebrew of the work is in the text of the Mishna, that in the Gemara being largely debased with exotic words of various tongues, such as Latin, Greek, Arabic, Coptic, and Persian (comp. A. Brull, Fremdsprachliche Redensarten in den Talmuden und Midrashim [Leips. 1869]), barbarous spelling, and uncouth grammatical, or rather ungrammatical, forms. The same remark will apply to the Aramaic portions, which, in general, are those containing popular narrative, or legendary illustration, while the law principles and the discussions relating to them are embodied in Hebrew. Many forms of the Talmudic dialect are so peculiar as to tender a grammar adapted to the work itself greatly to be desired. Ordinary Hebrew grammar will not take a man through a page of it. SEE RABBINICAL DIALECT.

In style the Mishna is remarkable for its extreme conciseness, and the Gemara is written upon the same model, though not so frequently obscure. The prevailing principle of the composition seems to have been the employment of the fewest words, thus rendering the work a constant brachylogy. A phrase becomes a focus of many thoughts, a solitary word an anagram, a cipher for a whole subject of reflection. To employ an appropriate expression of Delitzsch,” What Jean Paul says of the style of Haman applies exactly to that of the Talmud: “It is a firmament of telescopic stars, containing many a cluster of light which no unaided eye has ever resolved” (Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie [Leips. 1836], p. 31). But without regard to grammatical and linguistic difficulties and numberless abbreviations which crowd the pages of the Talmud, there are a number of so-called termini technici, which were current only in the Rabbinical schools, but have been incorporated in the Gemara, like joints and ligaments in its organization, so as to make the knowledge of them indispensable to the student. Such termini were—

1. The explication, or פירוש, which is introduced by the formulae מאי כ,ִ “What is this?” מאי קאמר, “What does he say?” במאי איקמינן, “How is this to bte understood?” במאי עסקינן, “What is the matter here?” מאן דכר שמה, “Who could think of such a thing?” היכי דמי, “How have we to interpret this?”

2. The question, or שאלה. If a question is offered by one school to another, it is introduced by the formula איבעיא להו, “They propose to them;” if from several persons to one, the formula is בעו מיניה, “They ask of him;” or if the demand is made of one person to another, it is בעא מיניה, “I ask of him.”

3. The response, or תשובה, which may Consist either in strong reasons ( פשטאor תירווֹ) or in strong objections ( פירכאor קושיא), is introduced by the formula מנא לן, “Whence have you this?” or מאי הוי עלה, “You wish to know the decision in this case.”

4. Tosiphta, or תוספתא, an appendix to the Mishna. We have seen that R. Chiya, or, as some have it, R. Nehemya under his direction, composed a work of this descripttt6n in Palestine, the substance of which is diffused in citations throughout the Talmud. They are indicated by the sign-word Tana, תאנא, “He teaches,” or Vetanialey, ותני עלי, “It is taught.hereupon,” prefixed to the sentence.

5. Boraztha, or ברייתא, another kind of supplement to the Mishna. Such are the books Siphra, Siphre, and Mechiltha, mentioned above. When a citation is adduced from a Boraitha in the Talmud, it is introduced by one of these forms: Tanu rabbandn, תנו רבנן, ‘“Our rabbins have taught;” Tani chada, תני חדא, “A certain (rabbi) has taught,” etc.

6. The suspense, or תיקו, is used when a case cannot be decided either pro or con, and thus this formula is used, which according to some contains the initials of יתרוֹ קושיות ואיבעיות תשבי, i.e. “the Tishbite (viz., Elijah, at his coming) will explain all objections and inquiries.” Others, however, pretend that it is an abbreviation of תיקנם, “It remains in state quo.”

7. The objection, or קושיא, a question not of a fixed Halakah, which is irrefragable, but of some position of the Amoraim or perhaps Tanaim, which is lawfully debatable, and is introduced by the formulae תא שמע, “Come and hear;” שמע מינה, “Hear of this;” אי הכי, “If so;” אלמא, “Therefore;” מחלוקת בזה, “There is a controversy in this case;” במאי קא מיפלגי, “What is the ground of the controversy?” סלקא דעת,ִ “Thon couldst suppose.”

8. The refutation, or תיובתא, is used in order to uphold the authority of the Bible (מן הפסוק) against a Tanaite, and to oppose the authority of a Tanaite against that of one of the Amolraim, and is introduced by the formula תיובתא, תיובתא, “This objection is truly of great weight.”

9. The contradiction, or רמיה, an objection thrown against a sentiment or opinion by the allegation of a contrary authority, and is introduced by the formula ורמינהי, “But I oppose this.”

10. The argumentation, or התקפתא, “an assailing or seizing upon,” is a kind of objection in use only among the later Amoraim, and is introduced by ר פלוני מתקי לה, “Rabbi N. objects to this.” If this objection is not refuted, it takes the value of Halakah.

11. The solution, or פירוק, is the explanatory answer to the objection (see supra 7).

12. The infirmation, or שנוי, “disowning or shifting off,” when a sage, sorely pressed in debate, shifts off his thesis upon another, introducing this by the formula מני הא, “But whose is this sentence.”

13. The appui, or סיוע, “support,” is a corroborative evidence for a doctrine or principle, introduced by the formula לימא מסייע ליה, “It can be said,” “There is support for it.”

14. The necessity, or הצרכה, This term is used in order to justify a sentence or a word, or even a single letter, which seems superfluous in the Bible or in the Mishna, and is introduced by the formula הא זו למה לי, “What is this for?” To which is answered, צריכא, “It is absolutely necessary.”

15. The accord, or שוטה, “series,” a catena or line of Talmudic teachers, cited against a given proposition.

16. Sugia, סוגיא, means the proper nature of a thing. By this word the Gemara refers to itself with regard to its own properties and characteristics.

17. Hilkatha, הלכתא, is the ultimate conclusion on a matter debated, henceforth constituting a rule of conduct. Much of the Gemara consists of  discussions by which they are verified, confirmed, and designated. When the advocates of two opposing theses have brought the debate to an issue, they say, “The Halacta is with such a one” הלכתא כן וכן.

18. Maasah, or מעשה, factum, the establishment of a Halacta by cases of actual experience or practice.

19. Shematetha, שמעתתא, “to hear,” describes a judgment or principle which, being founded on Holy Writ, or being of self-evident authority, must be hearkened to as incontestable.

20. Horaah, הוראה, “demonstration,” doctrine, legitimate and authoritative.

21. Hagadah, הגדה, “a saying,” incident related, anecdote or legend employed in the way of elucidation. Hagadah is not law, but it serves to illustrate law.

III. Literary and Moral Character of the Book. Since the Gemara is in general only a more complete development of the Mishna, it also comprises all the primary elements of the Mishna mentioned above, which are, however, intermixed with an endless variety of Hagadoth, i.e. anecdotes and illustrations, historical and legendary, poetical allegories, charming parables, with epithalamiums, etc., and thus making the Talmud contain all and everything, or as Buxtorf (in Praefat. Lex. Chald. et Talmud.) says:

“Sunt enim in Talmud adhuc multa quoque Theologica sana, quamvis plulrimis inutilibus corticibus, ut Majemon, licubi loquitur, involuta. Sunt inu eo) multa fida antiquiatis Judaicee collapsse veluti rudela et-vestigia, ad convincendam posterorum Judseorum perfidiam, ad illustraudam utriusque Testamenti historiam, ad recte explicandos ritsus, leges, consuetudines populi Hebraei prisci, plurimum conducentia. Sunt in eo multa Juridica, Medica, Physica, Ethica, Politica, Astronomica et aliarum scientiarum praeclara documenta, quae istius gentis et temporis historiam mirifice commendantlt. Sullti eoa illustria ex antiquitate proverbia, insignes sententise, acuta apophthegmata, scite prudenterque dicta innumera, quse lectorem vel meliorem, vel sapientiorem, vel doctiorem reddere possutlt, et ceu rutilantes gemmse non minus Hebrseam linguam exornant, quam omn.es Latii et Grseciea flosculi  suas linguas condecorant. Sunt in eo multae vocum myriades, quae vel voces in Scripturse Sacrae usu raras illustrant, et native explicant,vel totins linguae Hebraicse et Chaldaese usum insigniter complent et perficiuut, qui alioqui in defectn maximno mutilus et mancls jaceret.”

In order to illustrate this, we will give a few specimens of such Hagadoth for the benefit of the reader:

God is represented as praying. R. Jochaana says, in the name of R. Josi, How is it proved that the Holy One, blessed be he, does pray? From Isa 56:7, “I will bring them to my holy mountain and make them joyful in my house of prayer.” Mark, it is not said, their prayer, but my prayer; therefore it is conclusively proved that he prays. And what does he pray? R. Zutra, the son of Tobia, said, in the name of Rav, the following is the divine prayer: “May it please me that my mercies shall prevail over mine anger, that the bowels of my compassion may be extended, that I may mercifully deal with my children and keep justice in abeyance.” In corroboration of this, the following story is given. It is told by R. Ismael, the son of Elisha. Once I went into the Holy of Holies for the purpose of burning incense, and I saw Acathriel Jah, the Lord, sitting upon the high and exalted throne. And he said to me, Ismael, my son, bless me! and I addressed to him the above prayer, and he shook his head (Berakoth, p. 7, Colossians 1).

But if God prays, then he must, also put on phylacteries. Even upon this point the rabbins do not leave us in ignorance. Where is it proved that God puts on phylacteries? In Isa 62:8, where we read, “The Lord hath sworn by his right hand, and by the arm of his strength.” By the term right hand is meant the law, as it is written, “From his right hand went a fiery law for them” (Deu 33:2); and by the term arm of his strength is meant phylacteries, as it is written, “The Lord will give strength to his people,” etc. (Berakoth, p. 6, Colossians 1). Moreover, God has actually shown his phylacteries to Moses. It is written, “And I will take away mine hands, and thou shalt see my back parts” (Exo 33:23). R. Chana, the son of Bisna, says, in the name of R. Shimeon Chasida, “From this passage we learn' that the Holy One, blessed be he, has shown to Moses the tie of the phylacteries, which lies on the back part of his head” (Berakoth, p. 7, Colossians 1).  If God prays, then, in the language of the rabbins, he is conscious of some personal feeling. They are not silent on this point. For example, the school of Ishmael have taught that peace is a very important matter, and that for its sake even God prevaricated. For it is written in Genesis 18 :first that Sarah said, “My Lord is old;” but afterwards it is written she said, “And I am old” (Yebamoth, p. 65, Colossians 2; see as 7 Baba Metsia, p. 87, Colossians 1).

God is represented as needing a sacrifice to atone for himself. R. Shimeon, the son of Pazi, asked, It is written, “And God made two great lights;” and again, the greater light and the lesser light; how does this agree? Ans. The moon said to the Holy One, blessed be he-Lord of the universe, is it possible for two kings to use one crown?

He said to her, Go and make thyself smaller. She said to him again, Lord of the universe, because I spoke to thee reasonably, should I make myself smaller? He said, in order to comfort her, Go and rule day and night. She said to him, What advantage will this be to me? Of what use is a candle in the middle of the day? He replied, Go and let Israel number the days of the year by thee. She said, It is impossible even for the sun that the calendar should be reckoned after him only, for it is written, “Let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days and years?” He said to her, Go, and the righteous will be called by thy name; such as Jacob the little, Samuel the little, David the little, etc. But when God saw that the moon was not quite comforted with these promises, he said, Bring ye a sacrifice to atone for me, because I lessened the size of the moon. And this corresponds with the saying of R. Shimeou, the son of Lakish: Why is the monthly sacrifice distinguished from others, inasmuch as it is written concerning it, “And one kid of the goats for a sin-offering unto the Lord?” (Num 28:15). Because God said, This kid shall be an atonement for that I have lessened the size of the moon (Chulin, p. 60, Colossians 2). Raba barbar Chana, in telling a long story, says, “I heard a Bath-kol crying, Woe to me that I have sworn! And now since I have sworn, who will absolve me from my oath? (Baba Bathra, p. 74, Colossians 1).

Occupation of God. On one occasion Abyathon found Elijah, and asked him. What does the Holy One, blessed be he, do? He answered, He is studying the case of the concubine of Gibea. [We do not give this excerpt in full.] And what is his opinion, about it? He says that Abyathon, my Son, is right; and Jonathan, my son, is also right. Is there, their, a doubt in  heaven about it? No, not in-the least, rejoined Elijah; but both opinions are the words of the living God (Götting p. 6, Colossians 2).

Rabba, the son of Shila, met Elijah, and asked him, “What does; the Holy One, blessed be he, do?” Elijah replied, “He recites the lessons he hears from the lips of all the rabbins, with the exception of rabbi Meir. But why does he not want to learn from rabbi Meir?” Elijah answered, “Because rabbi Meir learned from one with the name of Acher.” Rabba said, “But rabbi Meir found a pomegranate, and has eaten the inside, but thrown away the husks of it, i.e. he only learned from Acher, but did not practice his deeds.” Elijah answered, “Now God says, Meir, my son” (Chagigah, p. 15, Colossians 2).

R. Abhu says, If there had not been a passage of Scripture for it, it would be impossible to make such a statement; but it is written, “In the same day shall the Lord shave with a razor that is hired, namely, by them beyond. the river, by the king of Assyria, the head, and the hair of the feet: and it shall also consume the beard” (Isa 7:20).God appeared to Sennacherib in the form of an old man. Sennacherib said to him, If thou shouldst go to the kings of the east and the west, whose children I have taken away and killed, what wouldst thou say to them? He answered, I would say to them that this man, i.e. Sennacherib, sits also in fear. Sennacherib said, What then shall I do? God said, Go and disguise thyself, that they should not recognize thee. How shall I disguise myself? God said, Go and bring me a razor, and I will shave thee. Sennacherib replied, From where shall I bring thee a razor?' God said, Go to that house, and bring it me. He went there and found one. Then angels came, and appeared to, him in the form of men; and were grinding olive-seeds. He said to them, Give me a razor. They replied, Crush one measure of olive-seeds, and we will give the razor. He did so and they gave it to him. Before he returned to God it became dark. God said to him, Bring a light. And he brought coals of fire to make a light and while he was blowing them, the, flame took hold of his beard; and thus God shaved his head and beard (Sanhedrin, p. 96, Colossians 1).

The schools of Hillel and of Shammai were disputing for three years about a certain point in the law; each side maintained that it was infallibly right. At last a Bath-kol came down from heaven and said, The opinions of both are the words of the living God, but the law is as the school of Hillel (Erubin, p. 13, Colossians 2).  R. Joshua, the son of Levi, says, When Moses came down from the presence of God, Satan appeared before him and said, Lord of the universe, where is the law? God replied, I have given it to the earth. He went to the earth and asked, Where is the law? The earth answered, God understandeth the way thereof (Job 28:23). He went to the sea and asked, Where is the law? The sea, said, It is not in me. He went to the depth, and asked the same question. The depth said, It is not in me; Destruction and death said, We have heard the fame thereof with our ears (ibid.). So he returned to God and said, Lord of the universe, I have searched for it all over the earth, and have not found it. God said to him, Go to the son of Amram. He came to Moses, and said to him, The law which God gave thee, where is it? Moses replied to Satan, Who am I, that God should give me a law! Thereupon of God said to Moses, Art thou a liar? Moses answered, “Lord of the universe, thou hast a precious treasure, which is thy daily delight, and should I claim it for my own advantage? God said to him, Because thou didst think little of thyself, the law shall be called after thy name. As it is written, “Remember ye the law of Moses my servant”(Mal 4:4). Rabbi Joshua continues to narrate: When Moses went up to heaven, he found God occupied in twisting wreaths for the letters- (of the law). And he called, Moses! is there no peace in thy city? i.e. that thou didst not salute me with a salaam? Moses answered, Is it customary that a servant should salute his master? God said, Thou oughtest to have helped me; i.e. thou shouldst have wished me success in my work. Immediately Moses said to him, “And now, I beseech thee, let the power of my Lord is great, according as thou hast spoken” (Num 14:17) (Sabbath, p. 89, Colossians 1).

These are only a few of the many examples which crowd the pages of the Talmud. That these stories are extravagant, and often, when taken literally, absurd, no one can deny. But they must be merely regarded as to their meaning and intention. Much has been said against the Talmud on account of the preposterous character of some of these legends. But we should give the Hebrew literati the benefit of their own explanations. They tell us that in the Talmud the Hagadah has no absolute authority, nor any value except in the way of elucidation. It often-but not always-enwraps a philosophic meaning under the veil of allegory, mythic folk-lore, ethical story, Oriental romance, parable, and aphorism and fable. They deny that the authors of these fancy pieces intended either to add to the law of God or to detract from it by them, but only to explain and enforce it in terms best suited to  the popular capacity. They caution us against receiving these things according to the letter, and admonish us to understand them-according to their spiritual or moral import. “Beware,” says Maimonides, “that you take not the words of the wise men literally, for this would be degrading to the sacred doctrine, and sometimes contradict it. Seek rather the hidden sense; and if you cannot find the kernel, let the shell alone, and confess, ‘I cannot understand this.'” But the impartial reader must at once admit that these suggestions are merely the after-thoughts of tender apologists, for some of these stories have no hidden sense at all, but must be taken literally, because meant so, as the following will prove.

In the treatise Gittin, fol. 69, Colossians 1, we read the following prescription: “For the bleeding at the nose, let a man be brought who is a priest, and whose name is Levi, and let him write the word Levi backwards. If this cannot be done, get a layman, and let him write the following words backwards: ‘Ana pipi Shila bar Sumki;' or let him write these words: ‘Taam dli bemi keseph, taam li bemi paggan.' Or let him take a root of grass, and the cord of an old bed, and paper and saffron and the red part of the inside of a palm-tree, and let him burn them together; and let him take some wool and twist two threads, and let him dip them in vinegar, and then roll them in the ashes and put them into his nose. Or let him look out for a small stream of: water that flows from east to west, and let him go and stand with one leg on each side of it, and let him take with his right hand some mud from under his left foot, and with his left hand from under his right foot, and let him twist two threads of wool, and dip them in the mud, and put them into his nostrils. Or let him be placed under a spout, and let water be brought and poured upon him, and let them say, ‘As this water ceases to flow, so let the blood of M., the son of the woman N., also cease.” A commentary on this wisdom or folly is superfluous. That this direction to stop a bleeding at the nose is not a rare case in the Talmud, the following mode of treatment for the scratch, or bite of a mad dog will prove. In the treatise Yoma, fol. 83, Colossians 1, we read: “The rabbins have handed down the tradition that there are five things to be observed of a mad dog; his mouth is open, his saliva flows, his ears hang down, his tail is between his legs, and he goes by the sides of the ways. Some say, also, that he barks, but his voice is not heard. What is the cause of his madness? Ray says it proceeds from this, that the witches are making their sport with him. Samuel says it is an evil spirit that rests upon him. What is the difference? The difference is this, that in the latter case he is to be killed by some missile weapon. The tradition agrees with Samuel, for it says in killing him no other mode is to be used but the casting of some  missile weapon. If a mad dog scratch any one, he is in danger; but if he bite him he will die. In case of scratch there is danger; what, then, is the remedy? Let the man cast off his clothes and run away. Rab Huna, the son of Rab Joshua, was once scratched in the street by one of them; he immediately cast off his clothes and ran away. He also says, I fulfilled in myself these words: ‘Wisdom -gives life to them that have it' (Ecc 6:12). In case of a bite the man will die; what, then, is the remedy? Abai says he must take the skin of a male adder and write upon it these words I, M., the son of the woman N., upon the skin of a male adder, I write against thee, Kanti, Kanti, Klirus.

Some say, ‘Kandi, Kandi, Klurus, Jah, Jah, Lord of hosts, Amen, Amen, Selah.' Let him also cast off his clothes and bury them in the graveyard for twelve months of the year; then let him take them up and burn them in an oven, and let him scatter the ashes at the parting of the roads. But during these twelve months of the year, when he drinks water, let him drink out of nothing but a brass tube, lest he should see the phantom-form of the daemon and be endangered. This was tried by Abba the son of Martha, who is the same as Abba the son of Manjumi. His mother made a golden tube for him.”

In the face of such extravagancies, we are not surprised at the following statement made by a modern Jewish writer, H. Hurwitz, in an essay preceding his Hebrew Tales (Lond. 1826), p. 34 sq.

“The Talmud contains many things which every enlightened Jew must sincerely wish had either never appeared there, or should, at least, long ago have been expunged from its pages... Some of these sayings are objectionable per se; others are, indeed, susceptible of explanations, but without them are calculated to produce false and erroneous impressions. Of the former description are all those extravagancies relating to the extent of Paradise, the dimensions of Gehinnom, the size of Leviathan, and the shor habor, the freaks of Ashmbdai, etc., idle tales borrowed most probably from the Parthians and Arabians, to whom the Jews were subject before the promulgation of the Talmud. How these objectionable passages came at all to be inserted, can only be accounted for from the great reverence with which the Israelites of those days used to regard their wise men, and which made them look upon every word and expression that dropped from the mouth of their instructors as so  many precious sayings well worthy of being preserved. These they wrote down for their own private information, together with more important matters, and when, in aftertimes, these writings were collected in order to be embodied in one entire work, the collectors, either from want of proper discrimination or from some pious motive, suffered them to remain, and thus they were handed down to posterity. That the wiser portion of the nation never approved of them is well known. Nay, that some of the Talmudists themselves regard them with no favorable eye is plain from the bitter terms in which they spoke against them [for example, Jehoshua ben Levi, who exclaims: “He who writes them down will have no portion in the world to come; he who explains them will be scorched”]... I admit, also, that there are many and various contradictions in the Talmud, and, indeed, it would be a miracle if there were none. For the work contains not the opinions of only a few individuals living in the same society, under precisely similar circumstances, but of hundreds, nay, thousands, of learned men of various talents, living in a long series of ages, in different countries, and under the most diversified conditions... To believe that its multifarious contents are all dictates of unerring wisdom is as extravagant as to suppose that all it contains is founded in error. Like all other productions of unaided humanity, it is not free from mistakes and prejudices, to remind us that the writers were fallible men, and that unqualified admiration must, be reserved for the works of divine inspiration, which we ought to study, the better to adore and obey the all-perfect Author. But while I should be among the first to protest against any confusion of the Talmudic rills with the ever-flowing stream of Holy Writ, I do not hesitate to avow my doubts whether there exists any uninspired work of equal antiquity that contains more interesting, more various and valuable information than that of the still-existing remains of the ancient Hebrew sages.”

But while we admire the candor of this Jewish writer, we must confess that not all of his coreligionists act on the same principle, as the sequel will prove. An article in the Quarterly Review for October, 1867, with the heading “What is the Talmud?” has taken the world by surprise. Such a panegyric the Talmud most likely never had. Written so learnedly, and in a style so attractive, about a subject utterly unknown to the world at large,  the stir it has created is not to be wondered at, and the more: so because this article contained sentences which could not have emanated from a Jew. But the writer was a Jew, Mr. E. Deutsch (since deceased), and what Isaac said to Jacob, “The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau,” must be applied to the author of “What is the Talmud?” We cannot pass over this article by merely alluding to it; it deserves our full attention, on account of the mischief it has already wrought, and must work, in the minds of those who are not able to correct the erroneous statements contained in it.

The writer accuses (p. 4 of the American reprint, contained in the Literary Remains [N. Y. 1874]) the investigators of the Talmud of mistaking the grimy stone caricatures over our cathedrals for the gleaming statues of the saints within. But, entering into the cathedrals of the Talmud and beholding these saints, we hear, in the treatise Aboda Sara, fol. 17, Colossians 1, of rabbi Elieser, שלא הניח זונה אחת בעולם שלא בא עליה (we dare not translate this sentence into English, but we give it in Latin: “Non erat meretrix in terra quacum non fornicatus esset”). When rabbi Nachman (we read Tr. Yona, fol. 12, Colossians 2) went to Shanuzib, he proclaimed רב כי מקלע לתרשיש מכריז מאן הויא ליומא (this also we dare not translate into English, but we give it in Latin: “Rab quum Tarsum intraret proclamabat quam vellet luxorem in diem”). Of rabbi Abuha we read (Tr. Berakoth, fol. 44, cl. 1) that he was such a strong eater that a fly could not rest upon his forehead; and (ibid.) of rabbi Ami and rabbi Assi that they ate so much that the hair fell from their heads; and of rabbi Simeon, the son of Lakesh, that he ate so much that he lost his senses. In Tr. Baba Metsia, fol. 84, Colossians 1, we read that rabbi Ismael, the son of rabbi Jose, and rabbi Eleazar, the son of rabbi Simeon, were so corpulent that when they stood face to face a pair of oxen could pass under them without touching them. Of the honesty of rabbi Samuel and rabbi Cahauna we read a nice story in Tr. Baba Kamma, fol. 113, Colossians 2, which we had better pass over, for enough has been said of some of the Talmudical saints.

The writer in the Quarterly is astonished at the fact that the Talmud has so often been burned. But it is an old saying, “Habent sua fata libelli.” The followers of the Arabian prophet burned the great library at Alexandria, and they still do the same with every book which they believe is written against their religion. The Jews have burned and excommunicated the books of their own great Maimonides (q.v.), and considered him a heretic.  They have burned, and still burn, the Hebrew Old Test. because of the Latin headings and crosses, to say nothing of the New Test. The Roman Catholics burn the Protestant Bible. Why should the Talmud have escaped? Besides, ignorance and fanaticism, in all ages and countries, have burned the books which they supposed were against their system. This was especially the case with the Talmud, A.D. 1240, when a conference was held in Paris between Nicolaus Donin and some Jewish rabbins concerning certain blasphemies contained in the Talmud and written against Jesus and Mary. R. Jechiel, the most prominent of the Jewish rabbins at that conference, would not admit that the Jesus spoken of in the Talmud was Jesus of Nazareth, but another Jesus, a discovery which was copied by later writers. But modern Jews acknowledge the failure of this argument, for, says Dr. Levin, in his prize-essay Die Religions disputation des R. Jechiel von Paris, etc., published in Gratz's Monatsschrift (1869), p. 193, “We must regard the attempt of R. Jechiel to ascertain that there were two by the name of Jesus as unfortunate, original as the idea may be.” The result of this conference was that the Talmud in wagon-loads was burned at Paris in 1242. This was the first attack.

When, however, the writer in the Quarterly states that Justinian in A.D. 553 already honored the Talmud by a special interdictory novella (146 Περὶ ῾Εβραίων), we must regard such a statement as erroneous and superficial, for, as Dr. Gratz, in his Gesch. der Juden, 5, 392, shows, this novella has no reference to the Talmud at all (comp. also vol. 7 [1873],p. 441 sq.). In our days, such accusations against the Talmud as that preferred by Donin were impossible, because all these offensive passages have been removed not so much by the hands of the censor, as by the Jews themselves, as the following document or circular letter, addressed by a council of elders, convened in Poland in the Jewish year 5391 (i.e. A.D. 1631), to their coreligionists, which at the same time contains the clue why in later editions of the Talmud certain passages are wanting, will show. The circular runs thus in the translation of Ch. Leslie (in A Short and Easy Method with the Jews3 p. 2 sq. [Lond. 1812], where the original Hebrew is also found): “Great peace to our beloved brethren of the house of Israel. “Having received information that many Christians have applied themselves with great care to acquire the knowledge of the language in which our books are written, we therefore enjoin you, under the penalty of the great ban (to be inflicted upon such of you as shall transgress this our statute), that you do not, in any new  edition either of the Mishna or Gemara, publish anything relative to Jesus of Nazareth; and you take special care not to write anything concerning him, either good or bad, so that neither ourselves nor our religion may be exposed to any injury. For we know what those men of Belial, the Munirim, have done to us, when they became Christians and how their representations against ns have obtained credit. Therefore, let this make you cautious. If you should not pay strict attention to this our letter, but act contrary thereto, and continue to publish our books in the same manner as before, you may occasion, both to ns and yourselves, greater afflictions than we have hitherto experienced, and be the means of our being compelled to embrace the Christian religion, as we were formerly; and thus our latter troubles might be worse than the former. For these reasons we command you that, if you publish any new edition of those books, let the places relating to Jesus the Nazarene be left in blank, and fill up the space with a circle like this, O. But the rabbins and teachers of children will know how to instruct the youth by word of mouth. Then Christians will no longer have anything to show against us upon this subject, and we may expect deliverance from the afflictions we have formerly labored under, and reasonably hope to live in peace.”

The writer in the Quarterly, while loudly praising the humane spirit which, as he tells us, pervades the “system and institutions set forth in the Talmud,” endeavors at the same time to apologize for those parts of the Talmud which contain, as he admits (p. 12), “gross offences against modern taste,” by telling us that, when compared with other ancient systems of jurisprudence, “the Talmud will then stand out rather favorably than otherwise.” It is not necessary to say much on this painful and disgusting part of the subject; but we will say this, that it is one thing to point to the existence of mire, that we may warn the unwary, and another to wallow with delight in it. We heartily wish that some of the rabbins who wrote the Talmud had been content with discharging that which may be considered a duty, and not laid themselves open to the charge justly brought against them, of doing injury to the morals and minds of those who study their writings, by their unnecessary and improper statements and details, of which the treatise Nidda, which we have here especially in view, and which treats of the “‘menstruating woman,” is so full.

When, in 1843, Messrs. De Sola and Raphall published a translation of a portion of the  Mishna, they excused the omission of this treatise by saying, in the preface to their work, “The treatise Nidda, not being suited to the refined notions of the English reader, has not been printed.” They did well and wisely to omit it in the list of portions selected for translation. It may be said, But this treatise, bad as it is, is only a commentary on some portions of the laws of Moses. To this we may reply, it was manifestly necessary that Infinite Wisdom should solemnly prohibit many atrocities then prevalent among the heathen nations. In order to prohibit them, they must of necessity be mentioned. No doubt, the proper feeling which leads us to turn with disgust from the very thought of the crimes thus forbidden is very much owing to those very laws which were given that the children of Israel should be distinguished from other nations, and thus, being ceremonially clean, should be fit to enter the tabernacle of God. But is there any proper excuse for writing or printing one hundred and seventy-eight folio pages in order to define all the forms in which imagination can suggest that only one of these crimes could be committed. Let us, as the, subject is so important, for a moment consider a parallel case. Murder is forbidden. This law is of inexpressible importance. It is impossible to dwell too largely on the enormity of this crime, or to speak too earnestly of the necessity of watching against anger, hatred, cruelty, and every possible form in which we can in any way participate in the guilt of this dreadful sin. Just so we cannot say too much about the necessity of personal purity and holiness, for God will be “sanctified in them that draw near him.” But what would we say of a man who should write a large volume merely to describe all the various modes in which a ‘murder can be carried out, and the symptoms of decay and dissolution which would follow the deed?

On page 26 of the article alluded to we are told: “There are many more vital points of contact between the New Test. and the Talmud than divines yet seem fully to realize, for such terms as ‘redemption,' ‘baptism,' grace,” ‘faith,' salvation,' ‘regeneration,' ‘Son of man,' Son of God,' kingdom of heaven,' were not, as we are apt to think invented by Christianity, but were household words of Talmudical Judaism, to which Christianity gave a higher and purer meaning.” It requires, however, a very slender acquaintance with the Bible to enable any one to reply to this statement that many of these terms were familiar to the Jews long before the Talmud was in existence, for they are found in the Old Test. And not only so, but the New Test. itself is a much older book than the Talmud. Our author tells us that the Mishna was compiled about A.D. 200. The Gemara is of still  later date. It-seems strange, indeed, that it did not occur to the learned author that it is impossible to suppose that the New Test. had no influence upon the rabbins, who rejected its authority. Unquestionably the reasonings of Paul and the writings of the other apostles greatly affected the whole tone of thought and manner of expression which prevailed among those who, nevertheless, refused to acknowledge their own Messiah. This is a common mistake among even learned Jews. Because some parts of the Talmud are unquestionably very ancient, they speak of the whole as a work of very great antiquity. They cannot altogether divest themselves of the fabulous notion that God gave the oral as well as the written law to Moses himself. Thus they habitually claim for the Talmud, as to antiquity, a degree of respect to which it is by no means entitled.

The most serious error, however, and that against which we must most distinctly protest, is this. We are told that “the Pentateuch remains in all cases the background and latent source of the Mishna” (p. 17). And again, “Either the scriptural verse forms the terminus a quo, or the terminus ad quem. It is either the starting-point for a discussion which ends in the production of some new enactment or one never before investigated is traced back to the divine source by an outward ‘hint,' however insignificant” (p. 19). Now, although this is literally true as to many of the civil laws contained in the Pentateuch, it is by no means a correct representation of the actual state of the case as to the religious principles which form the substance and the foundation of the laws of Moses. If those men who wrote the Talmud really understood and followed out the teaching of Moses, why do they almost entirely ignore the teaching of the other prophets?' It is astonishing to see how very little mention is made in the Jerusalem Talmud and in the 5894 pages of the Babylonian Talmud of a great part of the Old Test.; and a perusal of the book called ספר תולדת אהרן, compiled by R. Aaron Pisaurensis, or Pesaro (q.v.), which contains an index of all the passages of Holy Writ quoted in the Talmud, will make good our assertion. Passing over some minor points, such as on astronomy or mathematics or the science of interpretation of dreams (a filthy specimen of the latter is especially given in Tr. Berakoth, fol. 57, Colossians 1), we will only touch another point, the Talmudical praise of women. Thus, we read on p. 56, among other moral sayings, “Love your wife like yourself, honor her more than yourself.”

Without arguing the question from what we know of the position of Jewish females in the countries where the Talmud is studied and its precepts obeyed — a position which proves the very contrary to the  saying alluded to-it is well known to every student of the Talmud that the doctors of the Talmud in general do not hold in high estimation the female sex. They put them in the category with slaves and children. Again and again we read, “Women, slaves, and children are exempted.” “You shall teach the law to your sons, and not to your daughters.” “He who teaches his daughter the law is like as if he teaches her to sin.” “The mind of woman is weak.” “The world cannot exist without males and females, but blessed is he whose children are sons; woe to him whose children are daughters.” We also remember the teaching of the Talmudical sages, that a man may consider his wife like a piece of butcher's meat. We also remember that in the morning prayer the husband thanks God “that he hath not made him a woman.” As to the precept which the writer in the Quarterly Review quotes as one of the moral sayings of the Talmud, we must believe him on his word, or search over the 2947 pages of that stupendous work, since the writer has thought proper to conceal the treatise and the page of the Talmud from which he has translated the above sentence. We are inclined to believe that the reviewer had the following passage (Tr. Sanhedrin, fol. 76, Colossians 2) before him: “Rabbi Judah has said that Rab has said, He who marries his daughter to an old man, and he who gives a wife to his son when too young, and he who returns to the Goi (Gentile) the things the Gentile has lost, concerning him the Scripture says. In order to add drunkenness to thirst, the Lord will not forgive him” (Deu 29:18-19). They replied, He who loves his wife like himself, and he who honors her more than himself, and he who directs his sons and daughters in the right way, and gives them into marriage at the proper ages, concerning him the Scripture says, ‘And thou shalt know that thy tabernacle shall be in peace; and thou shalt visit thy habitation, and shalt not sin' (Job 5, 24).” This, however, is not a command, but optional according to the Talmud and the following, as given in Tr. Yebamoth, fol. 62, Colossians 2 :

“Rabbi Tanchuma said that rabbi Hanilai had said, Every man who is without a wife is without joy, without blessing, without goodness. Without joy because it is written, ‘Thou shalt rejoice, thou and thine household' (Deat. 14:26); without a blessing, for it is written, ‘That he may cause the blessing to rest in thine house' (Eze 44:30); without goodness, for it is written, ‘It is not good that the man should be alone.' In the west they add that the man who is without a wife is also without a law and with it a wall.  Without a law, for it is written Is not my help in me? and is wisdom driven quite from me?' (Job 6:13); without a wall, because it is written ‘A woman shall compass a man' (Jer 31:22). Rabba, the son of Olah, says, also without peace, as it is written, And thou shalt know that thy tabernacle shall be in peace, and shalt visit thy habitation, and shalt not sin. He who loves his wife like himself, and he who honors her more than himself, and he who directs his sons and his daughters in the right way, and gives them into marriage at the proper ages, concerning him the Scripture says, ‘And thou shalt know that thy tabernacle shall be in peace, and thou shalt visit thy habitation, and shalt not sin.”

We venture to think that these are the passages of the Talmud which the reviewer has picked out. We must, however, be allowed to observe that it is not the imperative, “Love your wife,” but the participle with the article, “He who loves.” It will be seen that we have not translated the whole paragraph; we dare not. We will leave that to the reviewer and his admirers, for what we have left out, and much of the following, belongs to the defiled and defiling portions of the work, in which the Talmud is so rich. From another, such foul page (Sanhedrin, fol. 22, col. —1) the reviewer has copied,” He who forsakes the love of his youth, God's altar weeps for him.” “He who sees his wife die before him has, as it were, been present at the destruction of the sanctuary itself. Around him the world grows dark.” The sentences are badly rendered; and, even if they were not, seeing in what connection they stand and through what a quagmire the reviewer was obliged to wade to fish them out, they are worthless. Another such moral saying runs thus: “When the thief has no opportunity for stealing, he considers himself an honest man.” Who of the Talmudical sages has said this? The Talmud relates that when Abishag the Shunammite was brought to king David she said to him, “Marry me;” the king replied, “It is not lawful for me to marry you.” As a reproach to the king, the Talmud makes the Shunammite say, חסריה לגנבא נפש לשלמא נקיט(Sanhedrin, ibid.), which the reviewer translated as above. After all, it would be strange, indeed, if we could not gather from a work of 2947 pages some good sayings and sentences. But, unless the whole work be translated, it will never be known what the Talmud really is. For instance, in one of the treatises of the Talmud called Challah we find, almost verbatim, what our Lord says in Mat 5:28; and yet that portion of the Talmud is written in language so obscene and immoral that it would be  difficult to meet its equal among the most licentious publications of ancient or modern times. We challenge any admirer of the Talmud to translate the treatise and publish it, and then every one will be able to give the right reply to the query so often raised by the reviewer, “What is the Talmud?”

The article in question thus concludes: “When the masters of the law entered and left the academy, they used to offer up a short but fervent prayer; a prayer of thanks that they had been able to carry out their' task thus far, and a prayer, further, that no evil might-rise at their hands, that they might not have fallen into error, that they might not declare pure that which was impure, and impure that which was pure” (p. 58). Against this we offset the following:

“The wise men have informed us that when the teacher entered the house of learning, he said, ‘May it please thee, O Lord my God, that. I may not be the cause of any offence, nor err in anything as regards the Halakah, that my companions may rejoice over me, and that I may not say of things unclean they are clean, and things clean that they are unclean, and that my companions may not err in anything as regards the Halakah, and that I may rejoice over them.' And when the teacher left the house of learning he said, ‘I thank thee, my God, that thou hast given me my portion among those who sit in the house of learning and not among those who sit at the corners of the streets. For I rise up early, and they rise up early; I rise up early to occupy myself in things concerning the law, they rise up early to occupy themselves in things which are useless. I work and they work; I work and receive a reward, they work and receive no reward. I run and they run; I run to everlasting life, and they run to the pit of destruction.'” Is not this prayer like that of the Pharisee in the gospel? (Luk 18:11.) After having touched upon the most vital points of the Talmud-which, as we believe, has been done sine ira et studio, but in accordance with the old saying, Amicus Plato, amicus Aristoteles, sed magis amica veritas—we will now subjoin some of the opinions on the Talmud by different authors. D'Israeli, in his Genius of Judaism (p. 88), says:

“The Mishna, at first considered as the perfection of human skill and industry, at length was discovered to be a vast, indigested heap of contradictory decisions. It was a supplement of the law of Moses  which itself required a supplement. Composed in curt, unconnected sentences, such as would occur in conversation, designed to be got by rote by the students from the lips of their oracles, the whole was at length declared to be not even intelligible, and served only to perplex or terrify the scrupulous Hebrew. Such is the nature of traditions when they are fairly brought together and submitted to the eye.

“The Mishna now only served as a text (the law of Moses being slightly regarded) to call forth interminable expositions. The very sons of the founder of the Mishna set the example by pretending that they understood what their father meant. The work once begun, it was found difficult to get rid of the workmen. The sons of the Holy were succeeded by a long line of other rulers of their divinity schools, under the title, aptly descriptive, of the Amoraim, or dictators. These were the founders of the new despotism; afterwards, wanderers in the labyrinth they had themselves constructed, roved the Seburatim, or opinionists, no longer dictating, but inferring, opinions by keen speculations. As in the decline of empire mere florid titles delight, rose the Geonim, or sublime doctors, till at length, in the dissolution of this dynasty of theologians, they sank into the familiar, titular honor of Rabbi, or master.

“The Jews had incurred the solemn reproach in the days of Jesus of having annihilated the word of God by the load of their traditions. The calamity became more fearful when, two centuries after, they received the fatal gift of their collected traditions, called Mishna, and still more fatal when, in the lapse of three subsequent centuries, the epoch of the final compilation, was produced the commentary graced with the title of the Gemara, ‘completeness,' or ‘perfection.' It was imagined that the human intellect had here touched its meridian. The national mind was completely rabbinized. It became uniform, stable, and peculiar.

“The Talmud, or the Doctrinal, as the whole is called, was the work of nearly five hundred years. Here, then, we find a prodigious mass of contradictory opinions, an infinite number of casuistical cases, a logic of scholastic theology, some recondite wisdom, and much rambling dotage; many puerile tales and Oriental fancies; ethics and  sophisms, reasonings and unreasonings, subtle solutions, and maxims, and riddles; nothing in human life seems to have happened which these doctors have not perplexed or provided against, for their observations are as minute as Swift exhausted in his Directions to Servants. The children of Israel, always children, were delighted as their Talmud increased its volume and their hardships. The Gemara was a kind of a third law to elucidate the Mishna, which was a second law, and which had thrown the first law, the law of Moses, into obscurity.”

Dr. Isaac Da Costa, in his Israel and the Gentiles (N. Y. 1855, p. 116); says:

“The Talmud is a most curious monument, raised with astonishing labor, yet made up of puerilities. Like the present position of the Jew, away from his country, far from his Messiah, and in disobedience to his God, the Talmud itself is a chaos in which the most opposite elements are found in juxtaposition. It is a book which seems in some parts entirely devoid of common sense and in others filled with deep meaning, abounding with absurd subtleties and legal finesse, full of foolish tales and wild imaginations; but also containing aphorisms and parables which, except in their lack of the simple and sublime character of the Holy Writ, resemble in a degree the parables and sentences of the New Test. The Talmud is an immense heap of rubbish, at the bottom of which a few bright pearls of Eastern wisdom are to be found. No book has ever expressed more faithfully the spirit of its authors. This we notice the more when comparing the Talmud with the Bible, that Book of books, given to, and by means of, the Israel of God; the Talmud, the book composed by Israel without their God, in the time of their dispersion, their misery, and their degeneracy.”

Dr. Milman, in his History of the Jews (3, 13), says:

“The reader, at each successive extract from this extraordinary compilation (i.e. the Talmud), hesitates whether to admire the vein of profound allegorical truth and the pleasing moral apologue, to smile at the monstrous extravagance, or to shudder at the daring blasphemy. The influence of the Talmud on European superstitions, opinions, and even literature remains to be traced. To the Jew the Talmud became the magic circle within which the national mind  patiently labored for ages in performing the bidding of the ancient and mighty enchanters who drew the sacred line beyond which it might not venture to pass.”

Mr. Farrar, in his Life of Christ (2, 485), says:

“Anything more utterly unhistorical than the Talmud cannot be conceived. It is probable that no human writings ever confounded names, dates, and facts with a more absolute indifference. The genius of the Jews is the reverse of what, in these days, we should call historical....”

Some excellent maxims even some close parallels to the utterances of Christ may be quoted, of course, from the Talmud, where they lie imbedded like pearls in ‘a sea' of obscurity and mud. It seems to me indispensable and a matter which every one can now verify for himself-that these are amazingly few, considering the vast bulk of national literature from which they are drawn. And, after all, who shall prove to us that these sayings were always uttered by the rabbins to whom they were attributed? Who will supply us with the faintest approach to a proof that (when not founded on the Old Test.) they were not directly or indirectly due toChristian influence or Christian thought?' ‘Prof. Delitzsch,' in his lectures on Jiidisches Handwerkerleben zur Zeit-Jesu. (3rd ed. Erlangen, 1879, p; 35), says:

“Those who have not in some degree accomplished the extremely difficult task of reading this work for themselves will hardly be able to form a clear idea of this polynomial colossus. It is a vast debating club, in which there hum confusedly the myriad voices of at least five centuries. As we all know by experience, a law, though very minutely and exactly defined, may yet be susceptible of various interpretations, and question on question is sure to arise when it comes to be applied to the ever varying circumstances of actual life. Suppose, then, you have about ten thousand legal definitions all relating to Jewish life and classified under different heads, and add to these ten thousand definitions about five hundred doctors and lawyers, ‘belonging' mostly to Palestine or Babylonia, who make these definitions, one after the other, the subject of examination and debate, and who, with hair-splitting acuteness, exhaust not only every possible sense the words will bear, but every possible practical occurrence arising out of them. Suppose that these fine  spun threads of these legal disquisitions frequently lose themselves in digressions, and that, when one has waded through a long tract of this sandy desert, one lights, here and there, on some green oasis consisting of stories and sayings of universal interest. This done, you will have some tolerable idea of this enormous and, in its way, unique code of laws, in comparison with which, in point of comprehensiveness, the law-books of all other nations are but Lilliputian, and, when compared with the hum of its kaleidoscopic Babel, they resemble, indeed, calm and studious retreats.”

Mr. Alexander, in his book on The Jews: their Past, Present, and Future (Lond. 1870), p. 80 sq., says:

The Talmud, as it now stands, is almost the whole literature of the Jews during a thousand years. Commentator followed upon commentator, till at last the whole became an immense bulk, the original Babylonian Talmud alone consisting of 2947 folio pages. Out of such a literature it is easy to make quotations which may throw an odium over the whole. But fancy, if the productions of a thousand years of English literature, say from the History of the Venerable Bede to Milton's Paradise Lost, “were thrown together into a number of uniform folios, and judged in like manner; if, because some superstitious monk should write silly ‘Lives of Saints,' therefore, the works of John Bunyan should also be considered worthless. The absurdity is too obvious to require another word. Such, however, is the continual treatment the Talmud receives, both at the hands of its friends and of its enemies. Both will find it easy to quote in behalf of their preconceived notions; but the earnest student will rather try to weigh the matter impartially, retain the good he can find even in the Talmud, and reject what will not stand the test of God's Word.”

In conclusion, while we acknowledge the fact that this great encyclopedia of Hebrew wisdom teems with error, and that in almost every department in science, in natural history, in chronology, genealogy, logic, and morals, falsehood and mistake are mixed up with truth upon its pages, we nevertheless confess that, notwithstanding, with all its imperfections, it is a useful book, an attestation of the past, a criterions of progress already attained, and a prophecy of the future. “It is a witness, too, of the length of folly to which the mind of man may drift when he disdains the wisdom of  God as revealed in the Gospel; and in these respects it will always have a claim on the attention of the wise. When Talmudism, as a religious system, shall, in a generation or two, have passed away, the Talmud itself will be still resorted to as a treasury of things amazing and things profitable; a deep cavern of antiquity, where he who carries the necessary torch will not fail to find, amid whole labyrinths of the rubbish of times gone by, those inestimable lessons that will be true for all times to come, and gems of ethical and poetic thought which retain their brightness forever” (Etheridge, Introduction to Jewish Literature).

IV. Contents. — The six Sedarim, or orders, of which the Mishna is composed are also found in the Talmud, and the following is an analysis of the contents of each tractate of the six orders:

(I.) סדר זרעים, Seder Zeraim (Seeds). This Seder contains the following eleven tractates:

1. ברכות, Berakoth, or the treatise of blessings, and speaks in nine chapters of the daily prayers and thanksgivings, etc.

a. מאימתי(so called from the first word of the chapter) treats of the time when the Shema is to be said in the morning and evening, of the position of the body at prayers, and the benedictions to be said ‘respectively (5 sections).

b. הוה קוראspeaks of the sections and order of the Shema, of how the voice is to be used in saying the prayer, and of the occasions which exempt from prayer” (8 sections).

c. מי שמתוpoints out such as are exempted from prayer (6 sections).

d. תפלת השחרtreats of the time during which prayers may be said, whether the Shemoneh Esreh (q.v.) are to be said in an abbreviated manner, of prayer as an opus operatumn, of praying in dangerous places, and of the additional prayer (7 sections).

e. אין עומדיןrefers to the outer and inner position at prayer; of prayer for rain; of the prayer on Sabbath evening; of the minister of the congregation; and mistakes in prayer (5 sections).

f. כיצד מברכיןrecites the different blessings to be said for fruits of the tree and the earth, wine and bread ; for wine before and after meals;' of the sitting and lying at the table; of blessings for the main meals and water (8 sections).

g. שלשה שאכלוexpatiates on blessings pronounced conjointly; with whom a union for such a purpose may be entered upon; the form of prayer to be used in accordance with the number of persons, of different companies (5 sections).

h. שבין אלו דבריםshows the differences between the schools of Hillel and Shammai concerning the washing of hands and the blessing at meals (8 sections).

i. הרואהnames the prayer to be said at beholding signs and wonders, at the building of a new house; and treats of prayers offered in vain, of prayers at the leaving and going into a city; of the praising of God for the good as well as for the evil; how to approach the Temple mountain; of the using of the name of God at salutations (5 sections).

2. פאה, Peah, or the corner of the field, treats, in eight chapters, of the field corners, gleanings, etc., to be left to the poor, etc.:

a. אלו דברים, of the measure of the Peah, where, of what, and how large it must be given, and how long the fruit is exempted from tithe (6 sections).

b. ואלו מפסיקין, how fields and trees as to the Peah may be separated from each other (8 sections).

c. מלבנות, how large a field must be of which Peah must be given (8 sections).

d. הפאה, how the Peah must be given (11 sections).

e. גדיש, what belongs to the poor, and on the bunch left through forgetfulness (8 sections).

f. שמאי בית, what may be regarded as a bunch left through forgetfulness, and what not (11 sections).

g. כלזית, the same concerning olive-trees; on the right of the poor in the vineyard (8 sections).

h. מאימתי כל, how long the right of the poor lasts; what constitutes the poor, and who is not entitled to the right of the poor (9 sections).

3. דמאי, Demai, or doubtful, treats, in seven chapters, of fruits about which some doubts may be raised whether tithes should be paid for them or not, viz—

a. הקלין, which fruits are exempted from the rights of Demai; how the Demai tithe differs from other tithes, and as to the rights of Demai fruits (4 sections).

b. ואלו דברים מתעשרין, who may be regarded a strict Israelite, and to whom the performance of the Demai law belongs at buying and selling.

c. מאכילין, who may receive Demai for eating, and that nothing should be given away untithed (6 sections).

d. הלוקח, how a man may be believed concerning the tithes (7 sections).

e. הלוקח מן, how the tithe is to be given from Demai (11 sections).

f. רֶַטתנֶוin company, and of the fruits in Syria (12 sections).

g. המזמין, how to act with such as are not believed concerning the tithes; how to separate the tithes in diverse cases; and what must be taken into account when tithed and untithed fruits are mixed up (8 sections).

4. כלאים, Kilayim, or mixtures, treats, in nine chapters, of the prohibited mingling of fruit and grain crops on the same field, etc., viz.

a. החטים, which kinds of fruits, trees, and animals are. Kilayim, and how to graft and plant (9 sections).

b. כל סאה, what to do when two kinds of seed are mixed, or in case of sowing another kind on a field already sown, or in case of making beds of different corn in one field (11 sections).

c. ערוגה, of beds, their division: of cabbage and its distance (7 sections).

d and e. כרםand קרחת, of vineyards and their Kilayim (9 and 8 sections).

f. איזהו, of the rights of a vine raised on an espalier (9 sections).

g. המברי,ִ of the layering of vines, spreading of vines, etc. (8 sections).

h. כלאי, in how far Kilayim are forbidden among—animals, in yoking together as well as in copulating, and what to do with bastards and some other animals (6 sections).

i. אין אסור, of Kilayim in garments, especially of the mixture of wool and flax; of clothing-merchants and tailors; of felt and woven letters, etc. (10 sections).

5. שביעית, Shebiith, or the Sabbatical year, in ten chapters:

a. עד אימתי חורשין בשדה האילן, of fields with trees, and how long they may be cultivated in the sixth year (8 sections).

b. ע א ח בשדה הלבן, of open fields, and what may be done in them till the beginning of the seventh year (10 sections).

c. מאימתי מוציאין, of manuring the field: of breaking stones an d pulling down walls (10 sections).

d. בראשונה, of cutting and pruning trees; from what time on it is permitted to eat of the fruits of the seventh year which have grown by themselves (10 sections).

e. בנות שוח, concerning the white fig and summer-onions; which farm utensils cannot be sold and lent (9 sections).

f. שלוש ארצות, of the difference of countries concerning the seventh year, and what fruits cannot be taken outside of the country (6 sections).

g. כלל גדול, what things are subject to the right of the seventh year (7 sections).

h. כלל גדול, what use may be made of fruits which have grown by themselves; what must be observed at their sale and the proceeds thereof; how they-are to be gathered (11 sections).

i. הפיגם, of the fruits which may be bought, and of storing away the preserved- fruits (9 sections).

j. שביעית, of the remittance of debts (9 sections).

6. תרומות, Terumoth, or oblations, relates, in eleven chapters, to the heave-offering:

a. חמשה, what persons can give the Terumoth, and of which fruits; and of giving the Terumoth not according to number; measure, and weight (10 sections).

b. אין תורמין, the Terumoth cannot be given from the pure for the impure; of distinguishing whether something was done purposely or by mistake; and that one kind of fruit can supply the Terumoth of another (6 sections).

c. התורם, in which cases the Terumoth must be given a second time; how to determine the Terumah; of the Terumah of a Gentile (9 sections).

d and e. סאהand המפריש, of the quantity of the large Terumah; in which cases common fruit becomes not medumma (i.e. is to be given entirely as Terumah), in spite of having been mixed with Terumah (13 and 9 sections).

f. האוכל, of the restitution of the Terumah, when a person has eaten thereof by mistake (5 sections).

g. האוכל, when a person eats thereof with intention (7 sections).

h. האישה, of the care that a Terumah get neither unclean nor poisoned (12 sections).

i. הזורע, what is to be done in case Terumah has been sown (7 sections).

j. בצל, how common fruits by the mere taste can become Terumah fruit (12 sections).

k. אין נותנין, how the oil of a Terumah cannot be burned, when the priest cannot enjoy its light (10 sections).

7. מעשרות, Maseroth, or tithes, due to the Levites, in five chapters:

a. כלל אמרו, of the kinds of fruits subject to tithes, and from what time on they are due (8 sections).

b. היה עובר, of exceptions (8 sections).

c. המעביר, where fruits become tithable (10 sections).

d. הכובש, of preserving, picking out, and other cases exempted from tithes (6 sections).

e. העוקר, of removing of plants; of buying and selling; of wine and seed that cannot be tithed (8 sections).

8. מעשר שני, Maas-esheni, or second tithe, which the Levites had to pay: out of their tenth to the priests, in five chapters:

a. מעשר שני, that this tenth cannot be disposed of in any way (7 sections).

b. מעשר שני ניתן, only things necessary for eating, drinking, and anointing: can be bought for the money of the tenth; what to do when tenth-money and common money are mixed together, or when tenth- money must be exchanged- (10 sections).

c. לא יאמר, fruits of the second tenth, when once in Jerusalem, cannot be taken out again (13 sections).

d. המולי,ִ what must be observed at the price of the tenth, and how money and that which is found must be regarded (12 sections).

e. כרם רבעי, of a vineyard in its fourth year, the fruits of which are equally regarded as the fruits of the second tenth; and how the biur, or taking-away of the tenth, is performed in a solemn manner according to Deu 26:13 sq. (15 sections).

9. חלה, Challah, or dough, refers to the cake which the women were required to bring of kneaded dough to the priest, in four chapters:

a. חמשה דברים, which fruits are subject to Challah (9 sections).

b. and c. פירותand איכלין, of special cases which need a more precise definition concerning Challah, and of the quantity of meal and its Challah (8 and 10 sections).

d. שתי נשים, of counting together of different fruits, and the different rights of countries concerning Challah (11 sections).

10. ערלה, Orlah, lit. foreskin, of the forbidden fruits of the trees in Palestine during the first three years of their growth, in three chapters:

a. הנוטע, which trees are subject to the law of Orlah and which not (9 sections).

b. התרומה, what to do in case of fruits of Orlah or Kilayim being mixed with other fruits; of the law concerning leaven, spices, and meat; what to do in case of holy and unholy, or Chollin, having been mixed up (17 sections).

c. בגד, how the same law also concerns colors for dyeing purposes, and the fire used for cooking; and what is to be observed concerning the difference of countries (9 sections).

11. בכורים, Bikkurin, or first-fruits, in four chapters:

a. יש מביאין, who is not entitled to offer the first-fruits, or who can offer them without observing the formula prescribed (Deu 26:3); of what and when they are to be offered or repaid (11 sections).

b. התרומה והבכורים, of the difference of the first-fruits of the Terumah and the second tenth, especially of the pomegranate at the Feast of Tabernacles; of blood of men and of the animal Coi (probably a bastard of buck and roe), which must be distinguished from all animals (11 sections).

c. מפרישין כיצד, of the ceremonies to be observed at bringing the first- fruits to Jerusalem, and their rights (12 sections).

d. אנדרוגינוס, of the hermaphrodite (5 sections). (This chapter is Boraitha, or addition to the second chapter, and is wanting where only the Mishna is printed.)

(II.) סדר מועד, Seder Môëd (Festive Solemnity). This Seder, one of the most interesting, consists of twelve tractates:

12. שבת, Shabbath, containing twenty-four chapters, treats of the laws relating to the Sabbath, with respect to lights and oil used on that day, ovens in which articles of food were warmed on the Sabbath, and the dress  of men and women used on the same day. It also enumerates thirty-nine kinds of work, by each of which, separately, the guilt of Sabbath-breaking may be incurred, viz.:

1, to sow;

2, to plough;

3, to mow;

4, to gather into sheaves;

5, to thresh;

6, to winnow;

7, to sort corn;

8, to grind;

9, to sieve;

10, to knead;

11, to bake;

12, to shear wool;

13, to wash wool;

14, to card;

15, to dye;

16, to spin;

17, to warp;

18, to shoot two threads;

19, to weave two threads;

20, to cut and tie two threads;

21, to tie;

22, too unite;

23, to sew two stitches;

24, to tear two threads with intent to sew;

25, to catch game;

26, to slaughter;

27, to skin;

28, to salt a hide;

29, to singe;

30, to tan;

31, to cut up a skin;

32, to write two letters;

33, to erase two( letters with intent to write;

34, to build;

35, to demolish;

36, to extinguish fire;

37, to kindle fire;

38, to strike with. a hammer;

39, to carry out of one property into another. It treats of the differences between the schools of Hillell and Shammai, etc., viz.

a. יציאות השבת, of removals on the Sabbath day; work to be avoided; discussion between tile schools of Hillel and Shanmmai as to what constitutes work: work allowed (11 sections).

b. מדליקין במה, of the lighting of a lamp; eve of the Sabbath (7 sections).

c. כירה, of different ovens, and preparing and warming the meat on Sabbath; of pails for retention of the dripping oil or sparks of the lamps (6 sections).

d. במה טומנין, of things to cover up pots to retain the heat, and of things not to cover up the pots (2 sections).

e. במה בהמה, with what a beast is led forth or covered, especially a camel (4 sections).

f. במה אשה, with what women and men may go out or not go out on the Sabbath of various styles; of pinning the veil; of ribbons, etc. (10 sections).

g. כלל גדול, of how many sin-offerings a man may be responsible for under certain circumstances for ignorantly trespassing against the Sabbath; the thirty-nine kinds of forbidden work; rule and measure for things the carrying of which makes liable to a sin-offering (4 sections).

h. המוציא יין, of the measure of fluids; of cords, bulrushes paper, and all possible portable things (7 sections).

i. אר ע, of things the carrying of which makes unclean, and of the measure of the portable things on the Sabbath day (7 sections).

j. המצניע, of different kinds of portable things; of carrying living or dead men, and of many other things (6 sections).

k. הזורק, of throwing over the street, ditch, and rock, river and land; of the distance how far it can be thrown, and the presumable error (6. sections).

l. הבונה, of building, hammering, planing, boring, ploughing, gathering wood, pruning, picking up, writing (6 sections).

m. רבי אליעזר, of weaving, sewing, cutting, washing, beating, catching game, etc. (7 sections).

n. שמונה, of catching game; of making salt-water; of forbidden medicines, toothache and pains in the loins.

o. אלו קשרים, of tying and untying of knots; of folding garments, and making the beds (3 sections).

p. כל כתבי, of saving things out of a conflagration; of extinguishing and covering, etc. (8 sections).

q. כל הכלים, of vessels which may be moved on the Sabbath 5 sections).

r. מפנין, what things may be moved for making room; of hens, calves, asses; of leading the child; of an animal that calves; a woman that is to be delivered, and of a child (3 sections).

s. רבי אליעזר, of circumcision on the Sabbath, and what belongs to it (6 sections).

t. תולין ר אליעזר אומר, of straining the wine; of fodder; of cleansing the crib; of straw on the beds and clothes-press (5 sections).

u. נוטל, of things permitted to be carried; of cleaning a pillow; the table, of picking up the crumbs; and of sponges (3 sections).

v. חבית, of casks, cisterns, bathing-clothes, salves, etc.; of emetics; of setting a limb or a rupture (6 sections).

w. שואל אדם, of borrowing; of counting from a book, drawing lots, hiring laborers; of waiting at the end of a Sabbath-way; of mourning-pipes, coffin, and grave which a heathen has dug; what may be done to the dead (5 sections).

x. מי שהחשי,ִ of one who is overtaken by the dusk on the road; of feeding the animals; of pumpkins and carrion; of several things permitted on the Sabbath (5 sections).

13. ערובין, Erubin, or mingling, in ten chapters, deals with those ceremonies by which the Sabbath boundary was extended; “mingling” a whole town into one fictitious yard, so that carrying within it should not be unlawful:

a. מבוי, concerning the entry to an alley (10 sections).

b. עושין פסין,concerning enclosures (6 sections).

c. מערבין בכל, concerning a holyday or a Friday (9 sections).

d. מי שהוציאוהו, concerning the stepping beyond the Sabbath limit (11 sections).

e. כיצד מערבין, concerning the enlarging the bounds of a city (9 sections).

f. and g. חלון,etc., הדר, concerning the neighborhood (10 and 11 sections).

h. כיצד משתתפין, concerning what may be done in a yard (11 sections).

i. כל גגות, concerning roofs, etc. (4 sections).

j. המוצה תפילין, concerning some different Sabbath laws (15 sections).

14. פסחים, Pesachim, in ten chapters, treats of the paschal festival and things- connected with its celebration:

a andb. כל שעהand אור לארבעה, of searching for leaven; how to put it away; of the Easter-cake, and the herbs for the bitter herbs (7 and 8 sections).

c. אלו עוברין, of the care to avoid leaven (8 sections),

d. מקום שנהגו, of the works on the day before Easter, and what kinds of work are permitted (9 sections).

e. תמיד נשחט, when and: how to kill the paschal lamb; of cleaning and skinning the same, and how it becomes disallowed (10 sections).

f. אלו דברים בפסח, how the Passover abrogates the command against work on the Sabbath; of the offering of festival sacrifices; of a sacrifice having been changed with another (6 sections).

g. ביצד צולין, .of roasting: the lamb; how it becomes unclean; what to do with the remaining parts (13 sections).

h. האשה בזמן, what persons are allowed to eat it and what are not; of companies (8 sections),

i. מי שהיא, of the second Easter; of' the Easter in Egypt, and of divers cases when paschal lambs have been exchanged (11 sections).

j. פסחי ערבי, of the order at the Easter-meal after the four cups of wine which are necessary for it (9 sections).

15. שקלים, Shekalim, or shekels, in eight chapters, contains laws relating to the half-shekel which was paid for the support of public worship:

a. באחד באדר, how the money-changers take their seat at the money- tables, on the 15th of Adar, where the people exchange their money (7 sections).

b. מּצרפין, of changing, and of coins used ins former times; of the remaining money (5 sections).

c. בשלשה פרקי, how the paid shekels may be taken again from the treasury (4 sections).

d. התרומה, how they are to be spent, and what to do with the balance (9' sections),

e. אלו הן הממינין, of the offices in the sanctuary, and of the seals (6 sections).

f. שלשה עשר, how often the number thirteen occurred in the sanctuary(6 sections).

g. מעות שנמצאו, of money and other things which are found, when it is doubtful to whom they belong (7 sections).

h. כל הרוקיו, of other dubious things; resolution that the shekel and firstlings have ceased with the Temple (8 sections).

16. יומא, Yoma, or the Day of Atonement, in eight chapters:

a. שבעת ימים, of the preparations of the highpriest (8 sections),

b. בראשונה, of casting lots, and of the offerings (7 sections).

c. אמר להם, of the beginning of the Day of Atonement; of bathing, washing, and dressing the high-priest, and of presenting the bullocks and goats. (11 sections).

d. טר בקלפי, of casting the lots upon the goats, and the confession (6 sections),

e. הוציאו לו, what was to be done in the Holy of Holies (7 sections).

f. שני שעירי, of sending forth the goat (8 sections).

g. בא לו, what the high-priest was meanwhile to do, and until the end of his service at night (5 sections).

h. הכפורי יום, of the privileges of fasting; how man is forgiven, and how he is not forgiven (9 sections).

17. סוכה, Sukkah, or the Feast of Tabernacles, in five chapters:

a. סוכה שהיא, of the size and covering of the Sukkah (11 sections).

b. הישן,l how often meals should be eaten in it; exemptions (9 sections).

c. לולב, of the palm-branches, myrtle-boughs, willows, Citrons; what constitutes their fitness, and what not; how to tie and stake them (15 sections).

d. לולב וערבה, how many days these ceremonies last; of the pouring-out of the water (10 sections).

e. החליל, of the rejoicings; how to divide the offerings and shew-bread on this festival among the orders of the priests (8 sections).

18. יום טוב, Yom Tob, i.e. good day, or, as it is generally called, ביצה, Betzah, i.e. the egg, from the word with which it commences, containing five chapters:

a. שנולדה ביצה, whether an egg laid on the festival may be eaten thereon. On this question the schools of Shalnmai and Hillel are divided; the former decide in the affirmative, the latter in the negative (10 sections),

b. יום טוב, or ערוב תבשילין, i.e. of connecting the meals on the Sabbath and other subsequent holydays. Maimonides gives the following account, which will enable the reader to understand this expression: “The rabbins, in order to prevent cooking or preparation of food on the festival for the following working-days, have prohibited it even for the Sabbath immediately following. They are ordered, however, that some article of food should be prepared on the day before the festival, to which more may be cooked, in addition, on the festival; which has-been ordered with the intention of reminding the general mass that it is not lawful to prepare any food on the festival which is not eaten thereon. It is called ערוב, or mixture, because it mixes or combines the preparation of food necessary for the festival with that required form the family's use on the Sabbath” (Hilchoth omn Tob, ch. 6.)”

c. אין עדין, of catching and killing animals; how to buy the necessary things, without mentioning the money (S sections).

d. המביא, of carrying, especially wood not required for burning (7 sections).

e. משילין, enumeration and precise definition of classes of things which cannot be done on a feast day, still less on a Sabbath day (7 sections).

19. ראש השנה, Rosh Hash-shanah, or New-year, in four chapters:

a. ארבעה ראשי שנים, of the four New-years (9 sections).

b. אם אינן, of examining witnesses who witnessed the new moon, and of announcing it on the top of the mountains by fire (9 sections).  c. ראוהו, of announcing the new moon and new year with cornets (8 sections).

d. יום טוב של, what to do in case the New year falls on the Sabbath, and of the order of service on the New-year (9 sections).

20. תענית, Taanith, or fasting, in four chapters:

a. מאימי, of prayer for rain, and proclamations of fasting in case the rain does not come in due season (7 sections).

b. סדר תעניות, of the ceremonies and prayers on the great fast-days (10 sections).

c. סדר תעניות אלו, of other occasions of fasting; of not blowing alarms; when to cease fasting, in-case it rains (9 sections).

d. פרקי בשלשה, of the twenty-four stations or delegates; their fastings, lessons ; of bringing wood for the altar; of the 17th of Tammuz and of the 9th and 15th of Ab (8 sections). The Mishna tells us the following concerning these dates: “On the 17th of Tammuz the stone tables were broken and: the daily offering ceased, and the city was broken up, and Apostemus (i.e. Antiochus Epiphaales) burned the law, and he set up an image in the Temple. On the 9th of Ab it was proclaimed to our fathers that they should not enter the land, and the house was ruined for the first and second time, and Bither was taken, and the city was ploughed up.” Rabban Simon, the son of Gamaliel, said, “There were no holydays in Israel like the 15th of Ab, or like the Day of Atonement, because in them the daughters of Jerusalem promenaded in white garments, borrowed, that no one might be ashamed of her poverty. All these garments must be baptized. And the daughters of Jerusalem promenaded and danced in the vineyards. And what did they say? Look here, young man, and see whom you choose; look out for beauty, look for family. ‘Favor is deceitful, and beauty is vain; but a woman that feareth the Lord, she shall be praised;' and it is said, ‘Give her of the fruit of her hands, and let her own works praise her in the gates' (Pro 31:30-31). And it is also said: ‘Go forth, O ye daughters of Zion, and behold king Solomon with the crown wherewith his mother crowned him in the day of his espousals, and in the day of the gladness of his heart” Son 3:11).

21. מגילה, Megillah, or the roll of the book of Esther, in four chapters:

a. מגילה, of the days on which the Megillah is read (11 sections). The Gemara, on the fourth section of this Mishna (fol. 7, Colossians 2), tells us that the Jews are directed to get so drunk on the Feast of Purim that they cannot discern the difference “between” “Blessed be Mordecai and cursed be Haman” and “Cursed be Mordecai and blessed be Haman.” On the same page we read, “Rabba and rabbi Zira made their Purim entertainment together. When Rabba got drunk, he arose and killed rabbi Zira. On the following day he prayed for mercy, and restored him to life. The following year Rabba proposed to him again to make their Purim entertainment together; but he answered, “Miracles don't happen every day.”

b. הקורא, how to read the Megillah; what can only be done by day, and what can be done by night (6 sections).

c. בני העיר, of the sale of holy things;' of the lessons for the Sabbath during the month of Adar, and for other festivals (6 sections).

d. הקורא את המגילה עומד, of the persons required for the lessons; how many verses each person may read; who must be silenced in public prayer; of the passages which at the public reading are to be omitted, or at least not to be interpreted (10 sections). For these passages; see the following article, SEE TALMUD, THE, IN THE TIME OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

22. מועד קטון, M5ed Eaton, or small holyday, in three chapters, treats of the half-holydays between the first and the last day of the Passover, and of the Feast of Tabernacles:

a. משקין, of working in the field; of graves, and of making coffins; and what pertains to a building (10 sections).

b. מי שהפ,ִ of the work done on fruits: what may be carried and bought (5 sections).

c. ואלו מגלחין, of shaving, washing, writing, and mourning (9 sections).

23. חגיגה, Chagigah, or feasting, in three chapters, speaks of the voluntary sacrifices-other than the paschal lamb offered by individual Jews on the great feasts:  a. חייבין הכל, of the persons who. are obliged to appear at the feasts (8 sections).

b. אין דורשין, of sundry ordinances having no direct connection with the subject indicated by the title of the treatise: thus the first section of this second chapter opens with “Men must not lecture on matters of incest (or adultery) before three persons, nor on matters of the creation before two, nor on the chariot before one, unless he be wise and intelligent by his own knowledge,” etc.; of laying-on of hands (7 sections).

c. חומר בקדש, in how far the rules for holy things are more weighty than for the heave-offering; in how far certain persons may be credited; how the vessels of the sanctuary were cleaned again after the feast (8 sections).

(III.) סדר נשים, Seder Nashim (Women). This Seder is composed of seven treatises, viz.

24. יבמות, Yebamoth, enters into the minutest details as to the peculiar Jewish precept of yibbûm, or the obligation of marrying the childless widow of a brother, with the alternative disgrace of the performance of the chalitsdh, or removal of the shoe of the recalcitrant, referred to in the book of Ruth. It contains sixteen chapters, in 123 sections.

a. The opening section of this treatise will give a good idea of the subject treated there. “Fifteen women free their rival wives and their rival's rivals from the chalitsah and yibbûm ad infinitum, viz. his daughter (the dead brother's wife being the daughter of a surviving brother), son's daughter, or daughter's daughter; his wife's daughter, wife's son's daughter, or wife's daughter's daughter; his mother-in-law, mother of his mother-in- law, the mother of his father-in-law; his maternal sister, his mother's sister, or his wife's sister; the widow of his maternal brother, or the widow of a brother who was not alive at the same time with him, and his daughter-in- law. All these free their rival wives and their rival's rivals from the chalitsah and yibbûm. If, however, any of these had died, or refused her consent, or had been divorced, or is unfit for procreation, their rivals may be married by yibbûm; yet refusal of consent or unfitness [to procreate] cannot be applied in respect to his mother-in-law, or the mother of his father-in-law.” This Mishna is called חמש עשרה נשים(4 sections).  b. כצד אשת, of cases where a brother was born after the married brother's death; of cases where a brother is to be freed either according to the command or for the sacredness of the person; of the equal right of brothers and sons; of betrothing to persons who cannot be distinguished from each other; of wives who cannot be married (10 sections).

c. ארבעה אחין, of hypothetical cases e.g. when brothers married sisters, etc. (10 sections).

d. החול, of the sister-in-law who was found to be pregnant; when she gets the heritage; of her marriage contract; of her relatives; how long she must wait; what constitutes a mamzer, i.e. an illegitimate child; that the sister of the deceased wife may be married (13 sections).

e. רבן גמליאל, of the rights of a marriage contract and divorce (6 sections).

f. הבא על, whom the high-priest cannot marry; what constitutes a barren woman, or a prostitute; of the duty of begetting children (6 sections).

g. אלמנה, who is entitled, under these circumstances, to eat of the heave- offering or not (6 sections).

h. הערל, of one that is wounded in the stones, and of one that has his privy member cut off; of the Ammonites and Moabites; of the hermaphrodite, etc. (6 sections).

i. יש מותרון, of women, or brothers-in-law, who, on account of their relationship, can neither marry nor be married, and of the prohibited degrees (6 sections).

j. שהל ִהאשה, of false news that one or the other died; of the carnal intercourse of one who is not yet marriageable (9 sections).

k. נושאין, of violated women, proselytes, and interchanged children (7 sections ).

l. המצות, of the ceremonies of the chalitsah (6 sections),

m. ב ש אומרים, and

n. חרש, of the refusal of one who is not of age to marry a man; of the right of deaf persons (13 and 4 sections).

o. האשה שה לכה, and

p. בעלה האשה שהל,ִ how-the evidence that one is dead receives credence, and its validity as to the right of the wife marrying again; and the Levirate (q.v.) (10 and 7 sections). Several portions of this treatise are so offensive to all feelings of delicacy that they have been left untranslated by the English translators, and are either printed in Hebrew or represented by asterisks alone.

25. כתובות, Kethuboth, in thirteen chapters, contains the laws relating to marriage contracts:

a. בתולה, of such as are regarded as virgins, and of the sum promised by the bridegroom to the bride (10 sections).

b. האשה, whether a person may testify of himself, and of the credibility of the witnesses (10 sections).

c. אלו נערות, of the penalty for violating a virgin (9 sections).

d. נערה, to whom the fine belongs; of the rights of a father over his daughter; of a husband over his wife; what the husband owes the wife; of the heritage of sons and daughters (12 sections).

e. א עלפי, of the addition to the kethubah or the sum stipulated in the marriage contract); of the duties belonging to the wife; of conjugal duties; to how much a wife is entitled for her living (9 sections).

f. מציאת, what the wife owes to her husband, and what belongs to him; of assigning against the sum which the wife has brought in, and of the dowry of a daughter (7 sections).

g. המדיר, of the vows of a woman, and of the defects which cause a divorce (10 sections);

h. האשה שנפלו, of the rights of the husband to the property which fell to his wife during her marriage, and vice versa (S sections).

i. הכותב, of the privileges at the meeting of creditors, and before whom the wife has to swear that she has received nothing of her kethubah (9 sections),

j. מי שהיה נשויof cases where a man has more than one wife (6 sections).

k. אלמנה ניזונת, of the rights of widows, and of the sale of the kethubah which is invested in immovable property (6 sections).

l. הנושא את האשה, of the right of a daughter of a former husband, and of the right of a widow to remain in her husband's house (4 sections).

m. שני דייני, different opinions of two judges of Jerusalem; how a wife may not be taken from, one place to another.; of the privileges in living in the land of Israel and at Jerusalem; as to the money in which the kethubah must be paid (11 sections).

26. נדרים, Nedarim, or vows, in eleven chapters:

a. כל כנויי, of the expressions for vows, since a person is obliged to keep them, even if the words were wrongly and not correctly pronounced (4 sections).

b. ואלו מותרין, what words do not constitute a vow; how they are to be distinguished from an oath; what restrictions and ambiguities may occur (5 sections).

c. ארבעה נדרים, of four kinds of vows which are regarded as void; of the vows made to robbers, publicans, etc. (11 sections).

d. אין בין המודר, and

e. השותפין שנדרי, of the case where a person has consented to derive no advantage from another or to be to him of no use, and how one can make something prohibited to the other (8 and 6 sections).

f. הנודר מן המבושל, and

g. הנודר מן הירק, of different kinds of eatables, in case they have been renounced, etc. (10 and 9 sections).

h. קונס יין, concerning the time over which the vow extends (7 sections).

i. רבי אליעזר, of diverse causes for which a vow may be made (9 sections).

j. נערה, who has the right of making the vow of a wife' or daughter void (8 sections),

k. ואלו נדרים, what, vows can be made void by the husband or father, and what in case of ignorance or error.(12 sections).

27. נזיר, Nazir, in nine chapters, relating to vows of abstinence:

a. כל כנויי נזירות, of the form in which such a vow can be made; of the difference of Samson's' vow of abstinence from others (7 sections).

b. נזיר הריני, what vows are binding and what not (10 sections).

c. מי שאמר, of the time of shaving (7 sections).

d. שאמר מי, of the remission and removing the same (7 sections)

e. בית שמאי, what is to be done in cases of error, and other dubious cases (7 sections).

f. אסורין שלשה, of things prohibited to a Nazarite (11 sections).

g. כהן גדול, for what uncleanness he must shave himself (4 sections).

h. שני נזירים, of some doubtful cases (2 sections).

i. העכום, of the power which, in divers cases, leads to the supposition that he is unclean; whether Samuel was a Nazarite (5 sections).

28. סוטה, Sotah, or the erring woman, in nine chapters:

a. המקנא, what constitutes an erring woman; who must drink the bitter water; how she is to be presented in public, etc. (9 sections).

b. היה מביא, of writing the curses, and the ceremonies connected with it (6 sections).

c. נוטל היה, of the offering of the sotah, and the fate of the woman found guilty (8 sections).

d. ארוסה, where the bitter water is not to be used (5 sections).

e. כשם שהמים, that the bitter water should also be taken by the adulterer (5 sections).

f. מי שקינא, of the required testimony (4 sections).

g. אלו נאמרין, of formulas to be spoken in the holy tongue, and of such not to be spoken in that tongue (8 sections).,

h. משוח, of the address of the priest anointed as king (7 sections).

i. עגלה, of killing the heifer for expiation of an uncertain murder; of different things which have been abolished, and what will be at the time of the Messiah (11 sections). The last sections of this Mishna are very interesting because they foretell the signs of the approaching Messiah, and wind up with the following remarkable words: “In the time of the Messiah the people will be impudent and be given to drinking; public-houses will flourish and the vine will be dear; none will care for punishment, and the learned will be driven from one place to the other, and no one will have compassion on them; the wisdom of the scribes will be stinking; fear of God will be despised; truth will be oppressed, and the wise will become less. The young men will shame the old, the old will rise against the young; the son will despise the father; the daughter will rise against the mother, the daughter-in-law against the mother-in-law, and a man's foes shall be they of his own household. The face of that generation is as the face of a dog; the son shall not reverence the father!”

29. גטין, Gittin, or divorce bills, in nine chapters, treats of divorce, and the writing given to the wife on that occasion; how it must be written, etc.

a. המביא גט, of sending a divorce, and what must be observed in case the husband sends one to his wife (6 sections).

b. ממדינת המביא גט, when, how, and on what it must be written (7 sections).

c. כל גט, that it must be written in the name of the wife (8 sections).

d. השולה גט, sundry enactments, made for the better existence of the world (9 sections).

e. הנזיקין, enactments for the sake of peace (9 sections).

f. האומר, sundry cases of the bill of divorce (7 sections).

g. מי שאחוו, of additional conditions (9 sections).

h. הזורק גט, of throwing the divorce bill, its different effects; what constitutes a bald bill of divorce (i.e. one which according to the Mishna has more folds than subscribing witnesses) (10 sections).

i. המגרש, of the signature of witnesses, and of the cause that constitutes a divorce, of which the school of Shammai says, “No man may divorce his wife, unless he find in her scandalous behavior, for it is said (Deu 24:1), Because he found in her some uncleanness; but the school of Hillel says, ‘Even if she spoiled his food, because it is said some uncleanness.' Akiba says, Even if he found one handsomer than she, for it is said, if it happen that she found no favor in his eyes.'

30. קדושין, Kiddushin, or betrothals, in four chapters:

a. האשה נקנית, of the different ways in which a wife is acquired, and how she regains her liberty; of the difference of prayers which are incumbent upon the man and wife, in and outside of the land of Israel (10 sections).

b. מקדש האיש, of valid and invalid betrothals (10 sections).

c. האומר לחברו, of betrothals made under certain conditions; of children of different marriages (13 sections).

d. עשרה יוחסין, of the different kinds of families which may intermarry and which cannot; of the evidence of a known or unknown lineage; rules according to which a man ought not to be in a secluded place alone with women; counsels as to the trade or profession in which an Israelite should bring up his son; occupations which an unmarried man should not follow, on account of the great facilities they offer for unchaste practices. It also states that all ass-drivers are wicked, camel-drivers are honest, sailors are pious, physicians are destined for hell, and butchers are company for Amalek (14 sections).

(IV.) סדר נזיקין, Seder Nezikin (Damages). This Seder contains ten tractates:

31. בבא קמא, Baba Kamma, or the first gate, so called because in the East law is often administered in the gateway of a city. It treats, in ten chapters, of damages:

a. ארבעה אבות, of four kinds of damages, restitution and its amount (4 sections).

b. כיצד הרגל, how an animal can cause damage, and of the owner who is obliged to make restitution (6 sections).

c. המניח, of damage caused by men; of goring oxen (11 sections).

d. and e. שור, continuation, and of damage caused by al open pit <9 and 7 sections).

f. הכונס, of damage caused by negligent feeding of cattle and by fire (6 sections).

g. מרובה, of restitution, when it is double, twofold or fivefold (7. sections).

h. החובל, of restitution for hurting or wounding (7 sections).

i. הגוזל, what to do, in case some change happens with something robbed; of the fifth part above the usual restitution, in case of perjury (12 sections).

j. הגוזל ומאכיל, of sundry cases, applicable to the restitution of stolen goods (10 sections).

32. בבא מציעה, Baba Metsiah, or the middle gate, in ten chapters, treats of claims resulting from trusts:

a. אוחזין שנים, and

b. אלו מציאות, what to do with goods which were found (8 and 11 sections).

c. המפקיד, of deposits (12 sections).

d. הזהב, of buying, and different kinds of cheating (12 sections).  e. איזהו, of different kinds of usury and overtaxing (11 sections).

f. השוכר, of the rights of hiring (8 sections).

g. השוכר את הפועלי, of the rights of laborers concerning their eating, and what they may eat of the eatables they work on; of the four kinds of keeping, and what is meant by ones, i.e. casus fortuitus (11 sections).

h. השואל, continuation, and again of hiring (9 sections).

i. המקבל, of the rights among farmers; of wages, and taking a pledge (13 sections).

j. הבית, of diverse cases when something belonging to two has fallen in; of the rights of public places (6 sections).

33. בבא בתרא, Baba Bathra, or the last gate, in ten chapters, treats of the partition of immovables, laws of tenantry, joint occupation, and rights of common:

a. השותפין, of the partition of such things as are in common; what each has to contribute, and how one can be obliged to make a partition (6 sections).

b. לא יחפור, of divers kinds of servitude; what and how far something must be removed from the neighbor's premises for different causes (14 sections).

c. חזקת, of superannuation of things, and its rights (12 sections).

d. המוכר את הבית, what: is sold along with the sale (9 sections).

e. את הספינה המוכר, continuation) and how a sale may be made void (11 sections).

f. המוכר פירות, for what a person must be good; of the required size of different places and the right of passing through (8 sections).

g. האומר, of becoming security for a sold acre and of other things pertaining to it (4 sections).

h. יש נוחלין, of inheritances (8 sections).  i. מי שמת, of the division of property (10 sections).

j. גט פשוט, what is required in order to make a contract legal (8 sections).

34. סנהדרין, Sanhedrin, or courts of justice, in eleven chapters:

a. דוני ממונות, of the difference of the three tribunals of, α, at least three persons; β, the small Sanhedrin of twenty-three persons; and, γ, the great Sanhedrini of seventy-one persons (6 sections).

b. כהן גדול, of the privileges of the high-priest and king (5 sections).

c. ממונות דיני, of appointing judges; unfitness for being judge and witness; of hearing the witnesses and publishing the sentence (8 sections).

d. אחד, of judgments in money and judgments in souls; a description how they sat in judgment (5 sections).

e. היו בודקין, again of examining witnesses, and what must be observed in capital, punishments (5 sections).

f. נגמר, of stoning in special (6 sections).

g. ארבע מיתות, of the other capital punishments; those that were to be stoned (11 sections).

h. בן סורר, of stubborn sons and their punishments, with, so many restrictions, however, that this case hardly could ever have occurred (7 sections).

i. ואלו הן, of criminals who were burned or beheaded (6 sections).

j. כל ישראל, of those who have part in the world to come, viz. “all Israel” (6 sections). But the following have no share: he who says that the resurrection of the dead is not found in the law, or that there is no revealed law from heaven, and the Epicurean. Besides, there are excluded from the world to come, Jeroboam, Ahab, Manasseh, Balaam, Doeg, Ahitophel, and Gehazi. So, likewise, the generation of the Deluge; that of the Dispersion (Gen 11:8): the men of Sodom, the spies, the generation of the wilderness, the congregation of Korah, and the men of a city given to idolatry. In the Gemara a good deal is spoken, of the Messiah.

k. אלו הן הנחנקין, of those that are strangled, especially rebellious elders and their punishment (6 sections).

35. מכות, Makkoth, or stripes, in three chapters, treats of corporal punishments:

a. כיצד העדים, in what cases false witnesses are inflicted with the stripes, and of the mode of procedure against false witnesses in general' (10 sections).

b. אלו הן, of unintentional murders, and the cities of refuge (8 sections).

c. ואלו הן, of criminals deserving the stripes; how they should be inflicted; why forty save one (?); of stopping in case the delinquent is regarded as too weak; that such as have suffered this penalty are free from the punishment of extermination; of the reward of those who keep the law; why so many laws were given to Israel (16 sections).

36. שבועות, Shebuoth, or oaths, in eight chapters:

a. שבועות שתי, of different kinds wherein a person is conscious or unconscious of having touched anything unclean (because it is treated under the head of oaths, Lev 5:2); of the atonement through sacrifices; what sins were atoned by the different kinds of sacrifices (7 sections).

b. ידיעות, how far the sanctity of the court of the Temple reaches (5 sections).

c. שבועות, of forswearing, its kinds and degrees (11 sections).

d. שבועת העדות, of the oath of witnesses; of blasphemy and cursing (13 sections).

e. שבועות הפקדון, of the oath mentioned in Lev 6:3, and of the perjurer (5 sections).

f. שבועת הדיינין, of the oath demanded by the court, when it must be taken or not, and what ought to be testified (7 sections).

g. כל הנשבעין, of such oaths as are for the benefit of him that swears (8 sections).

h. ארבעה שומרין, of the different watchmen who must be security for goods; how far it goes; in what cases they must replace it or swear; what in case they lied (6 sections).

37. עדיות, Edayoth, or testimonies, in eight chapters. It is so called because it consists of laws which tried and trustworthy teachers attested to have been adopted by the elder teachers, in Sanhedrim assembled:

a. שמאי, enactments in which the other sages deviate from the schools of Shammai and Hillel, or wherein the school of Hillel is followed, or wherein the school of Hillel has given way to that of Shamnmai (14 sections).

b. רבי חנינא, enactments of different rabbins, especially of R. Ishmael and R. Akiba on mostly unimportant things (10 sections).

c. טמאין כל המאּ, enactments of R. Dosa on divers defilements (12 sections).

d. אלו דברים, laws in which the school of Shammai is more lenient than that of Hillel (12 sections).

e. רבי יהודה, laws which R. Akiba would not take back (7 sections).

f. רבי יהודה בן, of different kinds of defilement on which disputes have taken place with R. Eliezer (3 sections). g and

h. העיד ר יהושע; of some minor points which cannot be brought under one common nomenclature; at the end we read that Elijah the Prophet will finally determine all disputed points of the sages and will bring peace (9 and 7 sections).

38. עבודה זרה, Abodah Zarah, or idolatry, in five chapters. This treatise is wanting in the Basle edition of 1578, because severe reflections upon Jesus Christ and his followers were found therein by the censor:

a. לפני אידיהן, what must be observed concerning idolatrous feasts, and of things not to be sold to idolaters (9 sections).

b. מעמידין אין, of divers forbidden occasions which tend towards a near relation with idolaters; of the use that can be made of their goods, especially eatables (7 sections).

c. כל הצלמים, of idols, temples, altars, and groves (10 sections).

d. רבי ישמעאל, of what belongs to an idol, and of desecrating an idol; prohibition of wine of libation, and of every wine which was only touched by a heathen, because even the slightest libation could have made it sacrificial wine (12 sections).

e. השוכר, continuation of things with which wine could have been mixed and; how to cleanse utensils bought of a heathen for eating purposes (12 sections).

39. אבות, Aboth, or פרקי אבות, Pirkey Aboth, contains the ethical maxims of the fathers of the Mishna. It is impossible to give an analysis of the six chapters, because they all contain maxims without any chronological order. This treatise speaks of the oral law, its transmission, names of the “receivers,” and contains maxims, apothegms, and the wisdom of the wise. The first chapter has 18, the second 16, the third 18, the fourth 22, the fifth 23, and the sixth 10 sections. A more detailed account of it has been given in the art. PIKEABOTH SEE PIKEABOTH (q.v.).

40. הוריות, Horayoth, or decisions, in three chapters, treats of the manner of pronouncing sentences and other matters relating to judges and their functions, but which, though erroneous, still were observed, and for which a sin-offering was to be brought according to Lev 4:13 :

a. הורו, in what cases and under what circumstances such offerings were to be brought by the congregation or not (5 sections).

b. הורה כהן, of the sin-offering of an anointed priest and prince (7 sections).

c. כהן משיח, who is meant by an anointed priest and prince; of the difference between an anointed priest and one only invested with the priesthood: of the prerogatives of a high-priest before a common priest; of the male sex before the female; finally, of the order of precedence among those who profess the Jewish religion, that a learned precedes an unlearned (8 sections).

(V.) סדר קדשים, Seder Kodashim (Consecrations). This Seder contains eleven tractates:

41. זבחים, Zebachim, or sacrifices, in nineteen chapters:

a. כל הזבהים, in how far-every sacrifice must be regarded with the intention that it shall be such a sacrifice (4 sections).

b. כל הזבחים שקבל, and

c. כל הפסולין, how it becomes unfit or an abomination (5 and 6 sections).

d. בית שמאי, of sprinkling the blood (6 sections).

e. איזהו מקומן, of the difference between the most holy sacrifices and those of less holiness (8 sections)

f. קדשי קדשי, of the place of the altar where every sacrifice has to be offered (7 sections).

g. חטאת העו, of the sacrifice of birds (6 sections).

h. כל הזבחים שנתערבו, Of cases where something of the sanctified has been enmixed with the other parts (12 sections).

i. המזבח, how the altar sanctifies the offered part (7 sections).

j. כל התדיר, of the order in which sacrifices must be brought; which precedes the other (5 sections).

k. חטאת דם, of washing the dress, etc., on which the blood of a sin- offering has come (5 sections).

l. טבול יום, to whom the skins belong and where they go (6 sections).

m. השוחט, of divers trespasses, when trespass has been committed unconsciously during the sacrificial service (8 sections).

n. פרת חטאת, of the different places of sacrificial service during different periods (Gilgal, Shiloh, Nolih, Gibeon, Jerusalem), and of the difference between the altar and the heights (10 sections).

42. מנחות, Menachoth, or meat-offerings, in eighteen chapters:

a. כל המנחות, of taking a handful; what corresponds in sacrifices to the act of sacrificing, when it becomes unfit or an abomination (4 sections).

b. and c. הקומ, and d. התכלת, according to the different kinds of meat- offerings (5, 7, and 5 sections).

e. באות כל המנחות, and

f. אלו מנחות, of these different kinds and their treatment (9 and 7 sections).

g. התודה, of the thank-offering and of the Nazarite's offering (6 sections).

h. כל קרבנות, whence the necessary good things were taken (7 sections).

i. שתי מדות, of the measures in the sanctuary; of the drink-offerings and the laying-on of hands (9 sections).

j. רבי ישמעאל, of the wave-loaf (9 sections).

k. שתי הלחם, of the Pentecostal and shewbreads (9 sections).

l. המנחות, of changes in the offering (5 sections).

m. הרי עלי, of indefinite vows; of the Onias temple in Egypt; a correct exposition of the words “a sweet savor” (11 sections).

43. חולין, Cholin, or unconsecrated things, in seventeen chapters:

a. הכל שיחטין, who may slaughter; wherewith and where it can be slaughtered (7 sections).

b. השוחט אחד, of cutting through the windpipe and (esophagus, in front or at the side, and how the slaughtering becomes unfit (10 sections).

c. אלו טריפות, what animals are no more kashdr, i.e. lawful, but trephsh, i.e. unlawful: the signs of clean fowls, grasshoppers, and fishes (7 sections).

d. בהמה המקשה, enactments concerning an animal fetus (7 sections).

e. אותו ואת בנו, of the prohibition against slaughtering an animal and the young on the same day (5 sections).

f. כיסוי הדם, the precept of covering the blood of wild animals and fowl (7 sections).

g. גיד הנשה, the precept concerning the prohibition of eating the sinew which shrank (6 sections).

h. כל הבשר, the prohibition to boil any kind of flesh in milk (6 sections).

i. חעור והרוטב, pollution communicated by a carcass or trephah (5 sections).

j. הזרוע, of the oblations due to the priest from the slaughtered animal (4 sections).

k. ראשית הגז, of the firstlings of the fleece (2 sections).

l. שלוח הקו, the precept of letting the parent bird, found in the nest, fly away (5 sections).

44. בכורות, Bekoroth, or first-born, in nine chapters:

a. הלוקח עובר, of the redemption of the first-born of an ass; how to redeem it (7 sections)

b. פרתו הלוקח עובר, when the first-born of an animal is not to be given; of some defects of a sanctified animal; of sundry dubious cases as to what Constitutes the first-born (9 sections).

c. הלוקח בהמה, of the sign of the birth of the first-born; of the wool of a first-born (4 sections).

d. כמה עד, how long the first-born must be raised up before it is given to the priest; what must be paid for the inspection (10 sections).

e. כל פסולי,

f. על אלו מומין, and

g. מומין אלו, of the defects which make a first-born unfit for sacrifice or service in the sanctuary (6,12, and 7 sections).

h. יש בכור, of the rights of the first-born concerning a heritage; in what cases he forfeits such a right or the priest forfeits the right on the first-born, and of what property he has to receive his heritage (10 sections).

i. מעשר בהמה, concerning the tithe of the herd; of what, when, and how the tithe has to be given; what to do in dubious cases (8 sections).

45. ערכין, Erakin, or estimates, in nine chapters:

a. הכל מעריכין, who has to make this estimate and on what (4 sections).

b. אין בערכין, what constitutes herein the minimum and maximum (6 sections).

c. יש בערכין, how such a valuation may be more difficult to the one than to the other (5 sections).

d. השג יד, how the valuation has to be made according to the means, age, etc. (4 sections).

e. האומר משקלי, valuation according to weight, and how the treasurer takes a forfeit (6 sections).

f. שום היתומים, of proclaiming and redeeming (5 sections).

g. אין מקדישין, and

h. המקדיש, of the banished (5 and . sections).

i. המוכר את שדהו, of redeeming a sold field; of houses in a city surrounded with a wall (Leviticus 20:29); of the privilege of the houses and cities of the Levites (8 sections).

46. תמורה, Temunarah, or exchanges (Lev 27:10; Lev 27:33), in seven chapters, treats of the way exchanges are to be effected between sacred things:

a. הכל ממירין, to what persons and things this right may be applied or not (6 sections).

b. יש בקרבנות, of the difference between the sacrifice of an individual and a congregation (3 sections).

c. אלו קדשים, of the exchange of the young of a sacred animal (5 sections).

d. ולד חטאת, of sin-offerings which were starved, or which were lost and found again (4 sections).

e. כיצד מערימין, of the means to cheat the priest out of the first-born ; how young and old can be sanctified at the same time or separately (6 sections).

f. כל האסורין, what is prohibited to be brought upon the altar (5 sections).

g. יש בקדשי, of the different rights of things sanctified for the altar and for the Temple; what may be buried or burned of the sanctified (6 sections).

47. כריתות, Kerithoth, or cutting off, in seven chapters, treats of offenders being cut off from the Lord, provided the offences were wantonly committed; but if inadvertently committed, entail the obligation to bring sin-offerings:

a. שלשים ושש, of the sacrifice of a woman in childbed, after the birth is certain or uncertain (2 sections).

b. ארבעה מחוסרי, and c. אמרוֹ לו אכלת, of cases where one or more sin-offerings were to be brought (6 and 10 sections).

d. ספק אכל, of a doubtful sin-offering (3 sections).

e. אכל דם שחיטה, of eating blood and divers doubtful eatings, and what they cause (8 sections).f. המביא אשם, of cases where the secret sin became known; of the efficacy of the day of expiation; of shekels which were used separately and for other purposes (9 sections).

48. מעילה, Meailah, or trespass (Num 5:6; Num 5:8), in six chapters, treats of things partaking of the name of sacrilege:

a. קדשי קדשים, what sacrifice causes a trespass (4 sections).

b. חטאת העו, from what time it is possible according to the nature of the sanctified (9 sections).

c. ולד הטאת, of things which were given from such trespass (8 sections).

d. קדשי מזבח, how far the addition of different things takes place (6 sections).

e. ההקדשהנהנה מן, in how far the wear and tear, by spoiling something of it, or the use thereof, is to be considered (5 sections).

f. השליח שעשה, in how far a man may trespass by means of a third person (6 sections).

49. תמיד, Tamid, or daily sacrifices, in seven chapters, treats of the morning and evening offerings:

a. מקומות בשִלִשִה, of the night-watch and of the arrival of the captain, when the gate was opened and the priests went in (4 sections).

b. ראוהו אחיו, of the first work, how the altar was cleared from the ashes, the fagots were brought and the great and the small fire were arranged; the former for the members and the coals of the sacrifices, the latter for the coals of the incense (5 sections).

c. אמר להם הממונה, allotting services for the offering of the lamb; of finding out whether “it brightens;” of fetching the lamb and the vessels; of the lamb-chamber, opening the Temple and cleansing the inner altar and candlestick (9 sections).

d. לא היו כופתין, of slaughtering and sprinkling the blood; of skinning, cutting, and dividing the parts (3 sections).

e. אמר להם המונה, of the morning prayer of the priests; of offering the incense (6 sections).

f. עולי החלו, again of cleansing the inner altar and the candlestick; of putting on the coals and of lighting the incense (3 sections).

g. בזמן שכהן, of the entering of the high priest and of the other, priests; of the blessing of the priests; when, the high-priest offered the sacrifices; of the chant which the Levites intoned in the sanctuary (4 sections).

50. מדות, Middoth, or measurements, in five chapters, treats of the measurements of the Temple, its different parts and courts:

a. בשלשה מקומות, of the nightwatches in the Temple, the gates and chambers (9 sections).

b. הר הבית, the mountain of the Temple, its walls and courts (6 sections).

c. המזבח, of the altar and the other space of the inner court to the hall of the Temple (8 sections).

d. פתחו, computation of the measures of the Temple (7 sections).

e. כל העזרה, of the measure of the court and its chambers (4 sections). This tractate has no Gemara or commentary.

51. קנים, Kinnim, or bird's-nests, in three chapters, treats of the mistakes about doves and beasts brought; into the Temple for sacrifice:

a. חטאת העו, how the blood of these birds was sprinkled in different manner that of the sacrifice above the altar, that of the trespass offering below the red line which stretched around the altar (4 sections).

b. קן סתומה, of the so-called indefinite nest (5 sections);

c. במה דברים, of possible mistakes of the priests and the offering women (6 sections).

(VI.) סדר טהרות, Seder Taharoth (Purifications). This order has twelve tractates.

52. כלים, Kelim, or vessels, in, thirty chapters, treats of those which convey uncleanness (Lev 11:33):

a. הטומאות אבות, of the main kinds of uncleanness according to their ten degrees, as well as of other ten degrees of un-cleanness as well as of holiness (9 sections).

b. כלי ע,

c. שיעור כלי, and

d. החרס, of earthen vessels, which are the least capable of uncleanness, but which become clean as soon as they break wholly or partly (8, 8, and 4 sections).

e. תנור,

f. םהעושה

g. הקלתות,

h.תנרו שחצצו, and

i. מחט, of the divers kinds of ovens made of earth (11, 4, 6,11, and S sections).

j. אלו כלים, of vessels which by cover and binding are protected against uncleanness (8 sections).

k. כלי מתכות,

l. טבעת אדם,

m. הסיי, and

n. כלי מתכות כמה, of metal vessels which become unclean, and how they get clean (9, 8, 8, and 8 sections).

o. כלי ע,

p. כל כלי ע, and

q. כל כליבעלי, of vessels of wood, skin, leather, bone, glass, and the size of the hole whereby they become clean; also of the size of things used as a measure (6, 8, and 17 sections).

r. השיד, and

s. המפרק, of beds (9 and 10 sections).

t. הכרים, of things which become unclean by sitting thereon (7 sections).

u. הנוגע, of things fastened to a loom, plough; etc. (3 sections).

v. השלחן, of tables and chairs (10 sections).

w. הכדור, of things which become unclean by riding thereon (5 sections).

x. שלשה תריסין, of a great many things by which three modes of uncleanness take place (17 sections).

y. כל הכלים, of the outside and inside of vessels, the handle and the different duties belonging to them (9 sections).

z. סנדל, of vessels which have straps (9 sections).

aa. הבגד מטמא, and

bb. שלש על, how large something must be in order to become unclean; also, that something which is three inches long and wide may be called a dress (12 and 10 sections).

cc. נומי, of cords on different things (8 sections). dd. כלי זכוכית, of vessels of glass which are fiat or a receptacle (4 sections).

53. אהלות, Ohaloth, or tents (Num 19:14), in twenty-two chapters, treats of tents and houses retaining uncleanness, etc.

a. שנים טמאים, of the different modes and degrees of uncleanness over a dead body; of the difference of uncleanness in men and vessels; of the measure of the limbs of a dead body, or carcass, and of the number of the members of man (8 sections).

b. אלו מטמאין, what be comes unclean in a tent through a corpse, and what only by touching and carrying (7 sections).

c. כל המטמאין, of adding together divers kinds of cleanness; what is not unclean in a dead body (teeth, hair and nails, provided they are no more on the corpse); of the size of openings whereby uncleanness can be propagated (7 sections);

d. מגדל, of vessels into which uncleanness does not penetrate (3 sections).

e. תנור, when the upper story may be regarded as separated from the lower part (7 sections).

f. אדם וכלי, how men and vessels form a cover over a carcass; of the uncleanness in the wall of a house (7 sections).

g. הטומאה, of a woman giving birth to a dead child (6 sections).

h. יש מביאין, of things conveying and separating uncleanness, and of others which do not (6 sections).

i. כוורת, how far a large basket separates (16 sections).

j. ארובה, and

k. הבַית, of openings in a house and cracks on a roof (7 and 9 sections).

l. נסר, of uncleanness in parts of the house and roof (8 sections).

m. העושה מאור, of the measure of a hole or window which may propagate uncleanness (6 sections).

n. מביא הזיזּ, and

o. סגום, of cornices and partitions in a house; of graves (7 and 10 sections).

p. כל המטלטלין, continuation of graveyards (5 sections).

q. החורש את, and

r. כיצד, of the beth happras (field in which a grave has been detected, or must be presumed, etc.); how far the houses of the heathen must be regarded as unclean (5 and 10 sections).

54. נגעים, Neggaim, or plagues of leprosy, in seventeen chapters, treats of leprosy of men, garments, or dwellings:

a. מראות נגעים, of the four indications of leprosy and their kinds (6 sections).

b. בהרת, of the inspection of leprosy (5 sections).

c. הכל מטמאין, of the time and signs when uncleanness is pronounced (8 sections).

d. בשער יש, of the difference between the different signs of leprosy (11 sections).

e. כל ספק, of dubious cases when uncleanness is pronounced (5 sections).

f. נופה, of the size of the white spot, and the places where no leprosy occurs (S sections).

g. אלו בהרות, of the changes of the spots of leprosy, and when they were rooted out (5 sections).

h. הפורח, of the growing of the spots (10 sections).

i. השחין, of the difference between a boil and a burning (3 sections).

j. הנתקים, of scalds (10 sections).

k. כל הבגדים,

l. כל הבתים, and

m. עשרה בתים, of the leprosy in houses and garments (12, 7, and 12 sections).

n. ביצד מטהרין, of cleansing a leper (13 sections).

55. פרה, Parah, or the red heifer, in sixteen chapters, directs how she is to be burned, etc.

a. ר א אומר, of the heifer's age, and ages of other offerings (4 sections).

b. ר א אומר פרת, blemishes which make her unfit (4 sections).

c. שבעת ימים, separation of the priest for burning the red heifer; procession of heifer and attendants; pile for burning; gatherings the ashes (11 sections).

d. פרת חטאת, how the sacrifices may become unfit under these rites (4 sections).

e. המביא, of the vessels for the sprinkling-water (9 sections).

f. המקדש, of cases where the ashes or the water becomes unfit (5 sections).

g. חמשה שמלאו, how this rite cannot be interrupted by any kind of labor (12 sections).

h. שנים שהיו, of keeping the water; of the sea and other waters with regard to the sprinkling-water (11 sections).

i. צלוחיֹת, continuation (9 sections).

j. כל הראוי, how clean persons and vessels may become unclean (6 sections).

k. שהניחה צלוחית, of the hyssop for sprinkling (9 sections).

l. האזוב, of the persons fit for sprinkling (11 sections).

56. טהרות, Taharoth (prop. Tohoroth), or purifications, in fifteen chapters, teaches how purifications are to be effected.

a. שלשה עשר, of the carrion of a clean and unclean fowl (9 sections).

b. האשה שהטיתה, of the uncleanness of the person who has eaten something unclean; of the effect of the different degrees of uncleanness (8 sections).

c. הרוטב, of beverages; of the estimation of an uncleanness after the time of its detection (8 sections).

d. הזורק,

e. השר, and

f. מקום שהַיה, of doubtful cases of uncleanness (13, 9, and 10 sections).

g. הקדר, how a layman makes something unclean; of the care to be taken in preserving the cleanness of dresses and vessels (9 sections).

h. הדר, how to keep victuals clean (9 sections).

i. זיתים, of the cleanness in pressing the olives (9 sections).

j. הנועל, of the same in the treatment of wine (S sections).

57. מקואות, Mikwaoth, orpools of water (Num 31:23), in fifteen chapters, treats of their construction, and the quantity of water necessary for cleansing:

a. שש מעלות, of the six different grades of pools of water, where one is purer than the preceding, from the water in the pit to the living water. (8 sections).

b. הטמא, of doubtful cases concerning bathing; how much and how far drawn water makes a mikvâh, or bathing-place, unfit for bathing (10 sections).

c. רבי יוסי, how a mikvâh becomes clean again, (4 sections).

d. המניח, how rain-water is to be led into a mikvâh, so as not to become drawn-water (5 sections).

e. מעין, of different kinds of water-spring water, river and sea water (6 sections).

f. כל המעורב, what is regarded as connected with a mikvâh, and how mik-vaoth may become united (11 sections).

g. יש מעלין, what makes a mikvâh complete and fit, and where the change of the color has to be considered (7 sections).

h. אר ישראל, of some uncleanness of the mikvâh (5 sections).

i. חוצצין אלו, of the difference between bathing the body and a vessel (7 sections).

j. כל ידות, of vomiting when eating and drinking, whether it be clean or unclean (8; sections).

58. נדה, Niddah, or separation of women during their menses, after childbirth, etc., in fifteen chapters:

a. אומר שמאי, of computing the time of the sliddih, and where it is to be supposed (7 sections).

b. כל היד, of the uiddas itself (7 sections).

c. המפלת, and

d. בנות כותים, of women in childbed (7 and 7 sections).

e. יוצא דופן, of the different ages of children according to their sex (9 sections).

f. בא סימן, of the blood-spots (14 sections).

g. דם הנדה, what makes unclean if it be damp or dry (5 sections).

h. הרואה, and

i. האשה שהוא, of recognizing the blood-spots; their origin; of changes in the menses (4 and 11 sections).

j. תנוקת, of all kinds of suppositions concerning cleanness and uncleanness (8 sections). This treatise should be read only by persons studying medicine, it being devoted to certain rules not ordinarily discussed, although they appear to have occupied a disproportionate part of the attention of the rabbins. The objections that our modern sense of propriety raises to the practice of the confessional apply with no less force  to the subject of this tract, considered as a matter to be regulated by the priesthood.

59. מכשירין, Makshirinsor liquors that dispose seeds, and fruits to receive pollution, in six chapters:

a. משקה כל, of the precaution by the fault of which something has become wet (6 sections).

b. זיעת, of sweating and steaming; of different rights of cities in which Jews and heathen reside (11 sections).

c. שק, of cases where fruits are moistened unintentionally (8 sections).

d. השוחה; of the regulations of rain-water in similar cases (10 sections).

e. מי שטבל, of cases where eatables, although they have become wet, do not change (11 sections).

f. המעלה, of the seven liquors, their variety; and of such: liquors as at the same time make clean and unclean, or: not (8 sections).

60. זבים, Zabim, or bodily fluxes that cause pollution, in five chapters:

a. הרואה, of computing this uncleanness (6 sections).

b. הכל מיטמאין, of examining whether such an issue is not enforced (4 sections).

c. הזב, and

d. רבי יהישע, of the power and different motions towards pollution (3 and 7 sections).

e. הגוגע, comparison of divers pollutions and what makes the heave- offering unclean (12 sections).

61. טבול יום, Tibbul Yom, or baptism on the day of uncleanness (Lev 22:6), in four chapters:

a. המכנם, when cakes of bread, grain, and seeds become unclean, or remain clean through the touch of a tibbil yôm (5 sections).

b. משקה, how far the dampness of a tibbil yôm is not to be treated as strictly as that of other unclean things; how the union of unwashed hands with those of a tibbull yôm made to be discerned; how the uncleanness through a tibbul yôm differs from another uncleanness in all kinds of boiled things and vessels of wine (8 sections).

c. כל ידות, of the chibbfor, or connection of the parts and the whole concerning the uncleanness through a tibbil yom in fruits, eggs, herbs, boiled things, and eatables of all kinds (6 sections).

d. אוכל מעשר, the same in separating the heave-offering, cakes, etc., according to older more lenient and recent more strict laws (7 sections).

62. ידים, Yadaïm, or hands, in four chapters, treats of the washing of hands before eating bread, though dry fruits are allowed to be eaten without such washing:

a. מי רביעית, how much water is required for ablution of the hands; what kind of water; of the vessels for the same; who may pour it out (5 sections).

b. נטל ידו, of the two ablutions whereby the unclean first water is washed ,away; how the ablution must take place (4 sections).

c. המכנים, whether and how the hands become unclean in the first degree, and how in the second; whether and how far the touching of straps of phylacteries and of holy writings defiles (5 sections).

d. בו ביום, of some special discussions; of the defilement by the Chaldee in the Bible, and of the Assyrian; disputes between the Pharisees and Sadducees (7 sections).

63. עוקציו, טּcatsin, or stalks of fruit which convey uncleanness, in three chapters:

a. כלשהוא, of the difference between the stalks and husks of fruits (6 sections).

b. זתים שכבשן, what is added to the whole from stones, husks, leaves, etc. (10 sections).

c. יש צריכין, of different classes of things, how and when they are apt to absorb an uncleanness (12 sections).

In addition to the treatises, which compose the Geinara, there are certain minor ones which are connected with it as a kind of Apocrypha or appendix, under the title of Mesiktoth Ketanoth (מסכתות קטנות), or smaller treatises. These are:

1. סופרים, Sopherim, concerning the scribe and reader of the law (21 chapters). This treatise is important for the Masorah. A separate edition, with notes, was published by J. Muller (Leips. 1878). See also the article SOPERIM.

2. כלה, Kallah, relates to marriages (1 chapter).

3. אבל רבתי הנקרא שמחות Ebel Rabbathi,or Semachoth, concerning the ordinances for funeral solemnities (14 chapters).

4. דר ִאר, Derek Brets, on social duties (11 chapters).

5. דר ִאר זוטא, Derek Erets Sztta, rules for the learned (10 chapters).

6. פרק השלום, Perek ha-Shailom, on the love of peace (1 chapter).

7. גרים, Gerim, concerning proselytes (4 chapters).

8. כותים, Kuthim, concerning Samaritans (2 chapters).

9. עבדים, Abadim, concerning slaves (3 chapters).

10. ציצית, Tsitsith, concerning fringes (1 chapter).

11. תפילין, Tephillin, concerning phylacteries (1 chapter).

12. מזוזה, Mezuzah, concerning the writing on the door-post (2 chapters). See art. MEZUZAH.

13. ספר תורה, Sepher Thorah, concerning the writing of the law (5 chapters). Nos. 7-13 were published together by R. Kirchheim, under the title Septem Libri Talmudici Parvi (Frankf. — on-the-Main, 1851).

To these treatises are sometimes added:

14. הלכות אר ישראל, Hilkoth Erets Israel, relating to the ways of slaughtering animals for food after the Jewish ideas, a treatise which is much later than the Talmud.

15. אבות דרבי נתן, Aboth di-Rabbi Nathan, a commentary on, or amplification of the treatise Aboth (21 chapters). For the author of this treatise, see the art. sEE NATHAN HA-BABLI.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF THE DIFFERENT TREATISES AS FOUND IN THE BABTYLONIAN TALMUD. The first column gives the names of the treatises; the second indicates the volume of the Talmud where the treatises may be found; the third shows the Seder or division under which they are given; and the fourth the numerical order in which they stand in the Mishna.

Having given an analysis of the contents of the Talmud, we will now give a specimen of its text, which will present to the reader a faint idea of the mode of procedure as we find it in that wonderful work. We open the very first page of the Talmud, the treatise Berakoth, on blessings, commencing מאימתי.

Mishna. — “At what time in the evening should one say the Shema? From the time that the priests go in to eat of their oblation till the end of the first night-watch. These are the words of the rabbi Eliezei; but the wise men say until midnight. Rabbian Gamaliel says till the morning dawn ariseth. It came to pass that his sons were returning from a feast; they said unto him, ‘We have not yet recited the Shema.' He answered and said unto them, ‘If the morning dawn has not yet arisen, ye are under obligation to recite it.' And not this alone have they said, but everywhere where the wise have said ‘until midnight,' the command is binding till the morning dawn ariseth; and the steaming of the fat and of the joints is lawful until the morning dawn ariseth, and so everything which may be eaten on the same day it is allowed to eat until the morning dawn ariseth. If this is so, why do the wise say ‘till midnight?' In order that men may be held far away from sin.”

Gemara. — “The Thanna (i.e. rabbi Judah the Holy), what is his authority that he teaches, from what time onward? And, besides that, why does he teach on the evening first, and might he teach on the morning first? The Thanna rests on the Scripture, for it is written, ‘When thou liest down and  when thou risest up,' and so he teaches, the time of reciting the Shelna, when thou liest down, when is it? From the time when the priests go in to eat of their oblation. But if thou wilt, say I, he hath taken it out of the creation of the world, for it is said it was evening and it was morning one day. If this is so, it might be the last Mishna, which teaches. In the morning are said two blessings before and one after, and in the evening two before and two after, and yet they teach in the evening first. The Thanna begins in the evening, then he teaches in the morning; as he treats of the morning, so he explains the things of the morning, and then he explains the things of the evening.”

This is less than one fourth part of the comment in the Gemara on that passage in the Mishna, and the remainder is equally lucid and interesting.

Subsidiaries to the Talmud, printed either in the margin of the pages or at the end of the treatises, are

(1) the Tosaphoth, exegetical additions by later authors;

(2) Masorah ha-shesh Sedarim, being marginal Masoretic indices to the six orders of the Mishna;

(3) Ain or En-Mishpat, i.e. index of places on the rites and institutions;

(4) Ner Mitsvoth, a general index of decisions according to the digest of Maimonides; and

(5) Perushim, or commentaries by different authors.

IV. Literary Uses. — The Talmud has been applied to the criticism and interpretation of the Old Test. Most of its citations, however, agree with the present Masoretic text. It has probably been conformed to the Masoretic standard by the rabbins, at least in the later editions. For variations, SEE QUOTATIONS OF THE OLD TEST

. IN THE TALMUD; for the interpretation, SEE SCRIPTURE INTERPRETATION AMONG THE JEWS.

The Talmud has also been used in the illustration of the New Test. by Lightfoot, Schöttgen, Meuschen, Wettstein, Gfrorer, Robertson, Nork, Delitzsch, Wünsche. But in this department, also, its utility has been overestimated, and by none more than by Lightfoot himself, who says, in the dedication prefixed to his Talmudical exercitations, “Christians, by their skill and industry, may render them (the Talmudic writings) most usefully  serviceable to their students, and most eminently tending to the interpretations of the New Test.” But not so Isaac Vossius, who said Lightfoot would have sinned less by illustrating the evangelists from the Koran than these nebulae rabbinicae, and exclaimed, “Sit modus ineptiendi et cessent tandem aliquando miseri Christiani Judaicis istiusmodi fidere fabellis!” (“Let Christians at length cease from playing the fool and trusting to such wretched Jewish fables as those contained in the Talmud!”) The mistake of Lightfoot is repeated by Wünsche, in his Neue Beitrage zur Erluterung der Evangelien aus Talmud und Midrash (Gött. 1878 ), whose modus illustrandi et interpretandi is like a Jew writing an apology for Judaism'; hence great caution must be exhibited in the perusal of the latter's work. There is only one way of using the Talmud for the New Test., for which SEE SERMON ON THE MOUNT AND THE TALMUD. For the Old Test. as it was in the time of the Talmud, see the next article.

V. Apparatus for Study of the Talmud. —

1. Manuscripts. — Like the text of the Old Test., the Talmud was copied with the greatest care during the Middle Ages; but, like a good many other works, these MSS. have become the prey of time, and only a few of them are extant. All that is known is (1) the first division of the Jerusalem Talmud in possession of the Jewish congregation at Constantinople; (2) a complete copy of the Babylonian Talmud from the year 1343 in the Royal Library at Munich; (3) a fragment of the same, evidently older than No. 2, in the same place; (4) a fragment: of the same from the year 1134 in the- Hamburg City Library; (5) the treatise Sanhedrin according to the Babylonian redaction, and belonging to the 12th century, in the Ducal Library at Carlsruhe; (6) some fragments with valuable variations, preserved at the University Library of Breslau. There is no doubt that in some libraries fragments may yet be found, if the covers of old books should be properly examined, for which they have been used by ignorant binders. That such, was the case we not only know from the fragments at: the Breslau University, but from a more recent discovery of W.H. Lowe, who published the Fragment of the Talmud Babli Pesachim of the 9th or 10th Century, in the University Library at Cambridge, with Notes and Ca Facsimile (Lond. 1879).

2. Editions. — Like the Old Test., at first only parts of the Talmud were published, on which see De Rossi,. Annales Haebraeo-typographici Sec.  XV (Parmse, 1795). The first part of the Talmud, the treatise Berakoth, was published at Soncino in 1484; but the first complete edition (the basis of later ones) was published by Bomberg (Venice, 1520-23, 12 vols. fol.) (a complete. copy of which is in the libraries of Cassel and Leipsic). Since that time editions have been published at different places, which are enumerated by R. N. Rabbinowicz, in his מאמר על הדפסת התלמוד, or Kritische Uebersicht der Gesammtund Einzelausgaben des babylonischenTalmuds seit 1484 (Munich, 1877) (with the exception of the German title-page, the rest is in Hebrew). The Jerusalem Talmud was first published by D. Bomberg (Venice, 1523); then with brief glosses (Cracov. 1609;. Dessau, 1743; Berlin, 1757; Schitomir, 1860-67,4 vols fol.; Krotoschin, 1866, fol.). A new edition of Bomberg's, with commentaries, was commenced by the late Dr. Z. Frankel, of which, however, only the first division was published (Vienna, 1875-76).

3. Translations. — There exists as yet no complete translation of either of the Talmuds in any language. The Arabic translation, said to have been prepared in A. D. 1000, at the will of king Hashem of Spain, is no longer extant. A large portion of the Jerusalem Talmud is found in a Latin translation in Ugolino, Thesaur Antiq. Sacr., viz. Pesachim (vol. 17), Shekalim, Yoma, Sukkah, Rosh Hashshanah, Taanith, Megillah, Chagigah, Bezah, Moed Katon (vol. 18), Maaseroth, Challah, Orlah, Bikkurimr (vol. 20), Sanhedrin, Makkoth (vol 25), Kiddushin, Sotah, Kethuboth (vol. 30). In thesame work we also find three treatises of the Babvlonians Talmud, viz., Zebachim, Menachoth (vol. 19), and Sanhedrin (vol. 25). Into French, the treatises Berakoth, Peah, Dema', Kilayim, Shebiith, Terumoth, Maaseroth, Maaser Sheni, Challah, Orlah, Bikkurim of the Jerusalem Talmud were translated by M. Schwab (Paris, 187279). The treatise Berakoth according to the Jerusalem and Babylonian Talmuds was also translated into French by L. Chiarini (Leips. 1831) and into German by Rabe (Halle, 1777). Of the Babylonian Talmud we have German translations of Berakoth by Pinner (Berlin, 1842); of Baba Metsia by A. Sammter (ibid. 1876-79); of Aboda Zarah by F. Chr. Ewald (Nuremb. 1868).

These are all the translations, which are known to us.

4. Monographs. — Since the Talmud is the great storehouse of all and everything, different branches of science and religion, have been treated in monographs.  Thus, on

a. Botany: by Duschak, Zur Botanik des Talmud (Leips. 1870).

b. Civil and criminal law: by Frankel, Der gerichtliche Beweis nach nos. — talmudischem Rechte, Ein Beitrag zur Kentniss des mos. — talmudischen Criminal u. Civilrechts (Berlin, 1846); Duschak, Das mosaisch- talmudische Eherecht, etc. (Vienna, 1864); Thonisson. LaPeine de Maort dars le Talmud (Bruxelles, 1866); Bloch, Das mosaisch talmudische Polizeirecht (Leips. 1.879 ) Lichtschein, Die Ehe nach mosaisch- talmudischer Auffassung und das mosaisch-talmudische Eherecht (ibid. 1879); Fassel, Das mosdisch-rabbinische Gerichts- Verfamhren itrr icioilrechtlichen Sachen, etc. (Vienna, 1858); Frankel, Grundlinien des mosaisch-talmudischen Eherechts (Breslau, 1860); Mielziner, Die Verhiatnisse der Sklaven bei den alten Hebraern nach bibl. u. talmud. Quellen dargestellt (Leips. 1859).

c. Coins and weights: by B. Zuckermann, Ueber talxnudische Münzen und Gewichte (Breslauj 1862).

d. Education; S. Marcus, Zur Schul-Pddagogik des Talmud (Berlin, 1866); Simon, L'Education et l'Instruction des Enfants chez les Anciens Juifs d'apres la Bible elle Talmud (Leips. 1879); Sulzbach, Die Pddagogik des Talmud (Frankf.-on-the-Main, 1863). SEE SCHOOLS in this Cyclopaedia.

e. Ethics mniaxims, proverbs, etc. Lazarus, Zur Charakteristik der talmudischen .Ethik (Breslau, 1877 ); maxims and proverbs are given by Dukes, Rabbinische Blumenlese (Leips. 1844), in ספר מלין דרבנן(Warsaw, 1874), and by A. Franck, Les Sentences et Proverbes du Talmud et du Midrash, in the (Paris) Journal des Savants, Nov. 1878, p. 659-676; Dec. p. 709-721.

f. Geography: by A. Neubauer, La Geographie du Talmud, Memoire couronne par I'Academie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres (Paris, 1868).

g. Mathematics:, by Zuckermann, Das mathematische him Talmud (Breslau, 1878); id. Das jiidische Mass System (ibid. 1867).

h. Medicine: Wunderbar, Biblisch-talmudische Medicin (Riga, 1852-59); Halpern, Beitrdge zur Geschichte der talmudische Chirurgie (Breslau, 1869).

i. Magic Brecher, Das Transcendentale, Magie u. magische Heilarten in Talmud (Vierina, 1850).

j. Psychology: Jacobson, Versuch einer Psychologie des Talmud (Hamburg, 1878).

k. Religious philosophy: Nager, Die Religions philosophie des Talmud (Leips. 1864).

l. Zoology: Lewysohn, Zur Zoologie des Talmud (Frankf. — on-the-Main, 1858).

m. Labor and handicraft: S. Meyer, Arbeit und Handwerkim Talmud (Berlin, 1878); Delitzsch, Jüdisches Handwerkerleben zur Zeit Jesu (3d ed. Erlangen, 1879). The latter wrote also on the colors in the Talmud in Nord und Süd, May 1878.

n. Biblical Antiquities: Hamburger, Biblisch- Talmudisch. Worterbuch (Neu-Strelitz, 1861).

o. Textual Criticism. — Lebrecht, Kritische Lese veribes serter Lesarten zum Talmud (Berlin, 1864); Rabbiowicz, Varice Lectiones in Mischnam et in Talmud Babygonicum quum ex aliis Libris Antiquissimis et Scriptis et Impressis tumn e Codice Monacensi Pracstantissimo collecicae, Annotationibus instructee (pt. 1-8, Munich, 1868-77).

6. Bibliography. — Pinner, in his preface to Berakoth, p. 9 sq.; Beer, in Frankel's Monatsschrift, 1857, p. 456458; Lebrecht, Handschriften und erste Gesammtausgaben des babyl. Talmud, in den wissenschaftlichen Blttern des Berliner Bethha Midrasch (Berlin, 1862); Steinschneider, Bebraische Bibliographie. (1863), 6:39 sq.; De Rossi, Annales Hebraeo- typographici Sec. XV (Parma. 1795); id. De Hebraicce Typographice Origine ac Primitiis, etc. (ibid.1776).

7. Linguistic Helps. Buxtorf, Lexicon Chaldaicum, Talmudicum et Rabbinicum (Basil. 1640, fohl.; new ed. by B. Fischer, Leipsic, 1869-75); Lowy, Neuhebrdisches uend chaldaisches Wörterbuch, etc. (ibid. 1875; in the course of publication); ruch, by Nathan ben-Jechiel; new critical edition by A. Kohut, Plenum Arich Targum Talmudico-Midrasch Verbale et Reale Lexicon (Vienna, 1878 sq.); Brull, Fremdsprachliche Redensarten, etc. (Leipsic, 1869); Geiger, Zur Geschichte der talmudischen Lexicographie, in Zeitschri td. D. M. G. 1858. 12:142; Stein, Talmudische  Terminologie (Prague, 1869); Zuckermandel, in Gratz's Monattsschrift, 1873, p. 421430, 475-477; 1874, p. 30-44, 130-138, 183-189, 213-222; Rüilf, Zur Lautlehre der aramadisch-talmudischen Dialecte, i, Die Kehllaute (Leipsic, 1879); Berliner, Beitrage zur hebrqischen Grammatik im Talmud und Midrash (Berlin, 1879); Kalisch [I.], Sketch of the Talmud, including, the Sepher Jezirah, with Translation, Notes, and Glossary (N.Y. 1877).

8. Literature in General. — Treatises on the Talmud have been written in different languages, and their number-is legion. To enumerate them would be not only tedious, but useless, because, written from a certain standpoint, they only give one side of the question. Such are the treatises of Deutsch, written for the glorification of modern Judaism, and repeated by Schwab in his introduction to his treatise Berakoth (Paris, 1871), and of Rohling and Martin, written in a hostile spirit against Judaism, because more or less dependent on Eisenmenger's Entdecktes- Judenthum (Königsberg, 1711, 2 vols.). Quite different is the work of A. M'Caul, The Old Paths (Lond. 1854), and the Pentateuch according to the Talmud (vol. 1, Genesis, ibid. 1874) by P. J. Hershon, because tending to show how Pharisaism has made the law of God void by a multitude of traditions. We therefore confine ourselves to such works as will give the reader the necessary information on the Talmud, viz. Wihner, Antiquitates Ebrceorum (1743), 1, 231-584; Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraea, 2. 657-993; 4:320 456; Brill, Die Entstehungsgeschichte des babyl. Talmuds, in his Jahrbücher (Frankfort- on-the-Main, 1876), 2, 1-123; Auerbach, Das jüdische Obligationsrecht, 1, 62-114; Frankel, Introductio in Talmud Hierosolymitanum (Breslau, 1870 [Heb.]); Wiesner, Gib'eth Jeruschalaim, ed. Smolensky (Vienna, 1872 [Heb.]); Fürst, Literaturblatt des Orients, 1843, No. 48-51; 1850, No. 1 sq.; id. Kultur u. Literaturgeschichte der Juden in Asien (1849), vol. 1; Zunz, Die Gottesdienstlichen Vortrage der Juden, p. 51-55, 94; Jost. Gesch. d. Israeliten, 4:222 sq., 323-328; id. Gesch. d. Judenthums u.s. Secten, 2, 202-212; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 4:384, 408-412 sq.; Frankel, Monatsschrift, 1851-52, p. 3640, 70-80, 203-220, 403-421, 509-521; 1861, p. 186-194, 205-212, 256-272; 1871, p. 120-137; Geiger, Judische Zeitschrift, 1870, p. 278-306; Pinner, Compendium des hierosolym, und babylon. Talmud (Berlin, 1832); id. Einleitung in den Talmud, in his translation of Berakoth, fol. 1-12; Schurer, Handbuch der neutestam. Zeitgeschichte (Leipsic, 1874), p. 37-49: Pressel, art. Talmud, in Herzog's Real-Encyklop.; Davidson, in Kitto's Cyclop. s.v.; Mausseaux, Le Juif, le  Judaisme, et la Judaisation (Paris, 1869), p. 76 sq.; Bernstein, אדר חכמים, an apology for the Talmud (Odessa, 1868); Waldberg, השנוי דרכי, or explanation of the logic of the Talmud (Lemberg, 1876). The expurgated passages are collected by Meklenburg in קבוצת ההשמטות; the difficult passages of the Talmud, which are explained by Raschi, are found.in שפת הים(Schitomir, 1874); Jacob Brill, דורש לצוין, or Mnemotechnik des Talmuds (Vienna, 1864 [Heb.]); Bacher, Die Agada der babylonischen Amorder, AEin Beitrag zur Geschichte der Agadd und zur Einleitung in den babylonischen Talmud (Strasburg, 1878); Friedlander, Geschichtsbilder aus der Zeit der Tanaiten und Ainorder, Ein Beitrag zu Geschichte des Talnmuds (Brinn, 1879). The Hagadoth contained in both Talmuds are collected in Jacob ibn Chabib's עין יעקב(latest edition Wilna, 1877). See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 1, 151; Wolf, Bibl. Heb. 1, 590 sq.; 3, 456 sq.; 4:866 sq.; and in Jafe's יפה מראה(comp. Wolf, ibid. 1, 1204; 3, 1109; Furst, 2, 9,96); the Tosephta is now in course of being edited by Dr. M. S. Zuckermandel (Berlin, 1876 sq.); Schwarz, Die Tosifta der Ordnung Moed in ihremn Verhdltniss zur Mischna kritisch untersucht, Pt. 1, Der Tractat Sabbath (Carlsruhe, 1879.); Jellinek, Hagadische Hermeneutik mit Midrasch-Coommenfar (Vienna, 1878); Placzek, Die Agada unnd der Darwinismus, in the Juid. Literaturblattf vol. 7 No. 1, 6, 8,11, 13,16,17, 23-31; Mihlfelder, Rab: ein Lebens bild zur Geschichte des Talmud (Leips. 1871); Fessler, Mar Samuel, der bedeutendste Amora, Ein Beiträg zur Kunde des Talmud (Breslau, 1879); Hoffmann, Mar Samuel, R.ector der jüdischen Akademie zu Nehardea in Babylonien (Leips. 1873). (B. P.)

## Talmud, The Old Testament In The Time Of The[[@Headword:Talmud, The Old Testament In The Time Of The]]

             The Talmud presupposes a text so firmly established by tradition that the Talmudists no longer venture to alter anything in it; they merely seek to settle it unchangeably for all time by means of very precise regulations on the subject of Biblical calligraphy, the different ways of reading, etc.

1. The Canon (κανών). — This word, which occurs first in the 3rd century after Christ, has no corresponding expression in Jewish writings. The Bible is called ספר, or הספר, “the Book” (Sabbath, fol. 13, Colossians 1); “the Scripture,” כתבא (Targum 2 in Genesis 12:42); “Holy Writings,” כתבי הקדש (Sabbath, fol. 16,Colossians 1); מקרא, “Reading” (Taanith, fol.  27, Colossians 2). In Kiddushin, fol. 49, Colossians 1, we find the expression וכתובי אורייתא נביאים, “the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings.”

The order of books as found in our present Hebrew Bibles is that of the Masorites, and differs from that given in the Talmud, as the following table will show:

Besides these twenty-four books, the Talmud also quotes from the apocryphal book Jesus ben-Sira, better known under the name of Ecclesiasticus, as the passages given in the art. ECCLESASATICUS indicate. But, in spite of this book being quoted so often, we are distinctly told that it is not canonical. Thus Yadaim, ch. 2, says, “The book of Ben- Sira, and all the other books written after its time, are not canonical” ‘(אינן מטמאין את הידים). Again, the declaration made by R. Akiba, that he who studies uncanonical books will have no portion in the world to come (Mishna, Sanhedr. 10:1), is explained by the Jerusalem Talmud to mean “the books of Ben-Sira and Ben-Laanah ;” and the Midrash on Coheleth, 12:12 remarks, “Whosoever introduces into his house more than the twenty-four books (i.e. the Sacred Scriptures), as, for instance, the books of Ben-Sira and Ben-Toglah, brings confusion into his house.” Accordingly, Ecclesiasticus is not included in the canon of Melito, Origen, Cyril, Laodicea, Hilary, Rufinus, etc.; and though Augustine, like the Talmud and the Midrashim, constantly quotes it, yet he, as well as the ancient Jewish authorities, distinctly says that it is not in the Hebrew canon (De Civit. Dei, 17:20). Comp. also Jerome, Prol. in Libr. Solom., where he says that Ecclesiasticus should be read “for the instruction of the people (plebis), not to support the authority of ecclesiastical doctrines.”

2. The Alphabet. — It is difficult to determine with precision the time at which the square character was; perfected. Origen and Jerome ascribe the invention to Ezra, and so does Jose ben-Chalafta, who flourished between A.D. 138 and 164. In the Talmud we find descriptions and allusions to the form of Hebrew letters which precisely suit the square alphabet; and even' in the Mishna, which was completed in the 3d century of our era, traces occur of the same. In our own days the existence of the Hebrew square alphabet before the Talmudic era has been proved by the discovery of some tombstones in the Crimea, a few of which even bear the date A.D. 6 and 30 (comp. Geiger, Jidische Zeitschrift, 3, 128-133, 237; 4:214 sq.). But these  stones cannot be relied upon, and the forgery has been made manifest by Dr. H. Strack, A. Firkowitsch u. seine Entdeckungen (Leips. 1876). In the Talmud, however, we are distinctly told not to change א and ע, ב and כ, ג and צ, ד and ר, ה and ח, ו and י, ז and ן, ט and פ, ם and ס (Shabbath, fol. 103, Colossians 2). The Talmud also knows the five final letters ,ִ , , ן, ם, (ibid. fol. 104, Colossians 1), which were probably used to render reading more, easy by distinguishing one word from another (thus, אלהימאת [the third and fourth words of the Heb. Bible] might be read אלהי מאת, “God is dead”). The Talmud, again, not only mentions the so-called taggin Cyan, (תגין, כתרים), or calligraphic ornaments on the letters , ג, ז, נ, ט, ע, ש(Menachoth, fol. 29, Colossians 1 sq.; Shabbath, fol. 89, Colossians 1; fol. 105, Colossians 2), but also gives different combinations of the alphabet, as כל, ים, טנ, חם, זע, ו, ה, דק, גר, בש, שת את, זן, ומד, חלק, דכ, גי, בטע, כת אחם, יש, טר, חק, ז, י, הע, דס, גן, בם, אל.

The first of these combinations is remarkable on account of Jerome having so confidently applied it to the word Sheshak, שש,ִ in Jer 25:26, it being the same as בבל.

3. The Vowel-points. — See that article.

4. Division of Words. — Hebrew was originally written, like most ancient languages, without any divisions between the words, in a scriptio continua, which fact accounts for the various readings in the Sept., as Gen 7:11, עשרים for עשר יום; Gen 20:16, כלו נכחת for ונכחת כל; Gen 40:17, מכלם אכל for מכל מאכל, etc.; 1 ῥ Samai, בן צו, Alex. ἐν Νασίβ, בנציב; Psa 9:1, עלמותfor על מות, etc. But there is no doubt that a division of words already existed in the time of the Talmud; at least the final letters, which are already mentioned, may have served such a purpose; and in Menachoth, fol. 30, Colossians 1, the space between the words in the sacred MSS. is fixed with precision. Whether or not this division of words by points-as used in the Samaritan Pentateuch-was applied, must be left undetermined.

5. Divisions according, to the Meaning of Verses. There is no doubt that at a very early period a division according to verses (פסוקים) existed. “Every verse divided by Moses may not be otherwise divided,” we read in Megillah, fol. 22, Colossians 1. The reason for such divisions was probably  twofold: a. The reading of the Scriptures, especially in the synagogue, led to such. The Mishna (Megillah, ch. 4:§ 4) mentions the פסוקיםin relation to this, for we read that “not less than three verses of the holy law may be read in the synagogue to each person (called to read). One verse only of the law may at one time be read to the methurgeman, or interpreter; but it is lawful to read three consecutive verses to him from the prophets; but if each verse should form a separate section, one verse only may be read to him at a time.” The Gemara forbids the leaving of the synagogue before the ending of such a section (Berakoth, fol. 8, Colossians 1), introduces the injunction of Ezra (Neh 8:8; Megillah, fol. 3, Colossians 1; Nedarim, fol. 37, Colossians 2), and prescribes, in reference to the prophets, how many sections are to be read on week-days (Baba Kamma, fol. 82, Colossians 1). b. The study of the law, the instruction and school-teaching of the same produced such sense- divisions. These were distinguished from the former, which were merely called פסוקים, by the names טעמים, clauses, sentence, or also טעמי פסוקי, clause sections; To instruct in the dividing of clauses (פיסוק טעמים) was a special part of the rabbinical teaching (Nedarim, fol. 37, Colossians 1); in Berakoth, fol. 62, Colossians 1, the teacher is said to point it out to his scholars with his right hand; and according to it disputed points of the law were settled (Chagigah, fol. 6, Colossians 2). As to the sign of this division which is now found in the Hebrew Bible (:), it is not seen on the synagogue-roll, nor is it mentioned in the Talmud, but is of later origin; and we must conclude it as highly probable that these divisions into verses and periods were not first externally designated, but were merely transmitted by oral tradition, as may be seen from the following quotation. In Kiddushin, fol. 30, Colossians 1. we read: “Therefore are the ancients called Sopherim because they counted all letters in Holy Writ. Thus they said that the Vav in. גחון (Lev 11:42) is the half of all the letters in the Pentateuch; דרש דרש (Lev 10:16) is the middle word; והתגלח (Lev 13:33), the middle verse; that Ayin in מיַער (Psa 80:14) is the middle letter, in the Psalms, and Psalm 77:38 the middle verse.” In the same passage we also read that “the Pentateuch contains 5888 verses, the Psalms eight more, and Chronicles eight less.” Now if we compare this number with that given by the Masorites, we shall find that the Talmud counts forty-three verses more than the Masorites in the Pentateuch, and this difference can only be explained from the statement made by the Talmud (Buba. Bathra, fol. 14, Colossians 2), that Joshua wrote his book and eight verses  of the law (Deu 34:5-12); and the Occidentals, as we read in Kiddushin, loc. cit., divided Exo 19:9 into three verses. Thus much is certain, that in the time of the Talmud there was a division according to verses; but what this mark of division was, if there were any at all-at least Tr. Sopherim, ch. 3, § 5, is against it— is difficult to point out.

6. Stichoi (στίχοι). — The poetical passages in Exodus 15; Deuteronomy 32; Judges 5; 2 Samuel 22 were in the time of the Talmud already written στιχηρῶς (comp. Shabbath, fol. 103, Colossians 2, infine; Sopherim, ch. 12). The same may be said of the poetical books, אמה, i.e. Job, Proverbs, Psalms. The Decalogue was also originally written in ten series (שטים, στίχοι), as is intimated in the Targum on the Song of Songs, 5:13: “The two tables of stone which he gave to his people were written, in ten rows (shittin), resembling the rows or beds (shittin) ins the garden of balsam.” SEE SHITTA.

7. The Smaller Sections of the Pentateuch. — In our Hebrew Bibles, which follow the Masoretic text, the Pentateuch is divided into 669parashas, or sections (פרשיות, פרשה), of which 290 are open (פתוחות, and distinguished in our Bibles by the initial letter פ) and 379 are closed (סתומות, marked by the initial letter ס). Of these parashas mention is made in the Talmud, viz.

1. Taanith, ch. 4:§ 3, the history of creation is divided into seven sections, viz. Gen 1:1-23; Genesis 24-31; Gen 2:1-3.

2. Berakoth, ch. 2, § 2; Tamid, ch. 5, § 1; Menachoth, ch. 3, § 7, the ections of the prayer and phylacteries (Exo 13:1-13; Deu 6:4-9; Deu 11:13-21; Num 15:37-41) are mentioned.

3. Megillah, ch. 3, § 4-6 (comp. also Yoma, ch. 7:§ 1; Sotah, ch. 7:§ 7), the following sections for the Sabbath and festivals are given, viz.: Exo 30:11-16; Deu 25:17-19; Num 19:1-22; Exo 12:1-12; Lev 22:26-33 (for the first day of the Passover); Deu 16:9-12 (for Pentecost); Lev 23:23-25 (for New Year); Lev 16:1-34; Lev 23:26-32 (for the Day of Atonement); Num 6:22 to Num 7:18 (for the Day of Dedication); Exo 17:8 to Exo 1:3 (for Plim) Num 28:11-15 (for the new moon); Lev 26:3 sq. s Deuteronomy 28 sq. (for the fast-days).

4. Tamid, ch. 5, § 1; Sotah, ch. 7:§ 2,6; Num 6:22-27.

5. Yadaim, ch. 3, § 4, Num 10:35-36.

6. Sotah, ch. 7:§ 7, Deu 17:14-20; Num 5:11-31; Num 19:1-22; Deu 21:1-9; Deu 26:1-11; Deu 14:22-27; Deu 26:12-15; Deu 25:5-10, and many others. In the Gemara the following parashas are mentioned:

7. Shabbath, fol. 115, Col 2:6, col . 116 , 150, Num 10:35-36.

8. Berakoth, fol. 12, Colossians 2, states that “every parish which Moses divided we also divide; and any one which he did not divide, neither do we,” in reply to the question why the verse כרע to קימנו (Num 24:9) was not taken out from the long section (ch. 22-24) and used for the prayer Shema Israel, i.e. “Hear, O Israel.”

9. Ibid. fol. 63, Colossians 1, Num 6:1-6; Num 5:11-31, are mentioned. 10. Götting, fol. 60, Colossians 1, Lev 21:1-24; Num 8:5-22; Num 9:6 sq.; Leviticus 16; Lev 10:8-11; Num 8:1-4 are mentioned.

That some of these were open, some closed, we read in, Shabbath, fol. 103, Colossians 2; Menachoth, fol. 30, 31; Jerusalem Megillah, fol. 71, Colossians 2; and in Sopherim, 1, 14, we also read that the open section is an empty space, the width of three letters, at the beginning of a line, and the closed is as much in the middle of a line.

8. The larger sections, marked in our Bibles by פ פ פ and ס ס ס, are not mentioned in the Talmud.

9. Haphtarahs. — After the reading of the law in the synagogue, it was also customary from an early period to read a passage from the prophets (comp. Act 13:15; Act 13:27; Luke 4:66 sq.), and with that to dissolve the meeting (λύειν τὴν συναγωγήν, Act 13:43; Heb. הפטיר); hence the reader who made this conclusion was called מפטיר, and the prophetic passage read הפטרה. The Mishna repeatedly speaks of the Haphtarahs (Megillah, ch. 4:§ 1-3, 5,10), and as early as in the Gemara (Megillah, fol. 29, Colossians 2; fol. 31, Colossians 1), several Haphtarahs are named. Yet in general they cannot then have been fixed determinately, and even now different  usages prevail among the Jews of different countries, as may be seen from the table given in the art. HAPHTARAH, for, as Zunz says, “our present order is the work of later centuries.”

10. Various Readings. — The various readings so frequently found in the margins and foot-notes of the Hebrew Bibles, known as Keri and Kethib (קרי וכתיב, pl. קרייו וכתיבן), are very ancient. The Talmud traces the source of these variations to Moses himself, for we are distinctly told in Nedarim, fol. 37, Colossians 2, that “the pronunciation of certain words according to the scribes (מקרא סופרים), the emendations of the scribes (עטור סופרים), the not reading of words which are in the text (כתיב ולא קרי), and the reading of words which are not in the text (כתיב קרי ולא), etc., are a law of Moses from Sinai (מסיני הלכה למשה).” We here mention some of the Talmudic passages which have reference to these readings: Gen 8:17, Kethib הוצא, but Keri היצא(Bereshith

Rabba, ad loc. sect. 34:fol. 37, Colossians 3). Lev 21:5, Kethib. יַקְרְחֻה, but Keri יקרחו(Makkoth, fol. 20, Colossians 1). Lev 23:13, Kethib ונסכה, but Keri ונסכו(Menachoth, fol. 89, Colossians 2). 1Sa 17:23, Kethib ממערות, but Keri ממערכות (Sotah, fol. 42, Colossians 2). Hag 1:8, Kethib ואכבד, but Keri אֶכָבְדָה (Yoma, fol. 21, Colossians 2). Est 9:27, Kethib וקבל, but Keri וקבלו(Jerusalem Berakoth, fo]. 14, Colossians 3). Ecc 9:4, Kethib יבחר, but Keri יחבר(Jerusalem Berakoth, fol. 13, Colossians 2). Job 13:15, Kethib לא, but Keri לו(Sotah, ch. 5,§ 5). Pro 31:18, Kethib בליל, but Keri בלילה(Pakta, ed. Buber [Lyck, 1868], fol. 65, Colossians 1). Isa 63:9, Kethib לא, but Keri לו(Sotah, fol. 31, Colossians 1; while Taanith, fol. 16, Colossians 1, reads לו). To these variations belongs also the substitution of euphonisms for cacophonisms. SEE KERI AND KETHIB, § 8.

For the most part the rabbins follow the reading of the קרי, often that of τὸ כתיב, especially when they can elicit a new interpretation from the reading of the כתיב; thus, e.g., Rth 3:3, they interpret the reading of the כתיב, וירדתיwhile the קריreads וירדת(Midr. Ruth Rabba, sect. 5, fol. 43, Colossians 3 [Cracov. 1588, fol.]). The reading according to the כתיב is cited in Chullin, fol. 68, Colossians 1, from Lev 2:2 and 2Sa 23:20, in Berakoth, fol. 18, Colossians 1, in fine. In the Mishna we find the marginal reading קריsix times, that of the כתיבtwice, viz.: Lev 9:22, it is written ידו; but il-Sotah, ch. 7:§ 6, and Tamid, ch. 7:§ 2, it reads ידיוDeu 20:7, it is written שפכה; but in Sotah, ch. 9:§ 6, שפכו, according to the Keri. 1Ki 6:6, it is written היצוע; but in Middoth, ch. 4:§ 4, היציע. Isa 10:13, it is written כאביר; but in Yadaim, ch. 4:§ 4, כביר. Eze 43:16, it is written והאראיל; but in Middoth, ch. 3, § 1, והאריאל. Job 13:15, it is written לא; but in Sotah, ch. 5, § 5, לו.

The reading according to the Kethib we find in two passages, Exo 21:8, לא(Berakoth, ch. 1, § 7; Kiddushin, fol. 17, Colossians 1), and Isa 10:13, in Yadaim, ch. 4:§ 4. Words written but not read, כתיב ולא קרי, are mentioned in Nedarim, fol. 27, Colossians 2, viz. נא, 2Ki 5:8; ואת, Jer 32:11; ידר,ִ Jer 41:3; חמש, Eze 48:16; א, Rth 3:12. Words read but not written, קרי ולא כתיב, are mentioned in Nedarim, fol. 37, Colossians 2, viz. פרת, 2Sa 8:3; איש, 2Sa 16:23; באים, Jer 31:38; את, Rth 2:11; אלי, Rth 2:11; Rth 3:5; Rth 3:17.

In connection with this we may remark that in the treatise Megillah, fol. 25, Colossians 2, we are told of certain passages of Scripture which are read in the synagogue and interpreted, read and not interpreted, and such as are neither read nor interpreted. Thus, “The intercourse of Reuben with Billah is to be read without being interpreted; that of Tamar (and Amnon) is to be read and interpreted. The (first part of the) occurrence with the golden calf is to be read and interpreted; but the second part (commencing Exo 34:21) is to be read without any interpretation. The blessing of the priests, and the occurrence of David and Amnon, are neither to be read nor interpreted. The description of the divine chariot (Ezekiel 1) is not to be read as a Haphtarah, but R. Jehudah permits it; R. Eleazer says neither (Ezekiel 16), ‘Cause Jerusalem to know her abomination,' etc.

11. Ablatio Scribarum, עטור סופרים, Nedarim, fol. 37, Colossians 2. See the art. MASORAH, § 6.

12. Correctio Scribarum, תקין סופרים, is not mentioned in the Talmud, but reference is made to it in the Mechilta, Siphri, Tanchuma, Bereshith Rabbaj Shemoth Rabbah (Midrashic works, enumerated under  MIDRASH); the passages belonging to the correctio scribarum are given s.v. MASORAHI, 5. SEE TIKKUN SOPHERIM.

13. Puncta Extraordinaria. — Over single letters, over entire words, we find dots or points, generally called “puncta extraordinaria.” The first instance is mentioned in the Mishna, Pesachim, 9, 2, over the הof the word רחקה, Num 9:10. Ten such words which have these extraordinary points are enumerated in Midrash Bamidbar Rabbâh on Numbers 3, 39, sect. 3, fol. 215, Colossians 4; comp. Pirke de-Rabbi Nathan, ch. 33; Siphri on Numbersix, 10; Sopherim, 6:3; Massora Magna on Numbers 3, 39; Oklahve-Oklah, § 96. The following words are mentioned in the Talmud: Gen 18:9, אֹליֹוֹ. On this passage the Midrash Bereshith Rabba remarks: “ איוare pointed, but not the ל. R. Simeon ben-Eliezer saith, wherever you find more letters than points, you must explain the letters, i.e. what is written; but where you find more points than letters, you must explain the points. In this case, where there are more points than the written text, you must explain the points, viz. אִיוֹ, ‘where is Abraham.' The meaning is that the points over these three letters intend to indicate that the three angels did not ask ‘where is Sarai, איהשרה,', but ‘where is Abraham,' אברה איו: (comp. Baba Metsiah, fol. 87, Colossians 1). Gen 19:3, ובקוֹמה. In the Talmud, Nazir, fol. 23, Colossians 1, we read: “Why is there a point over the Vav, ו, of the word ובקומה?

To indicate that when she lay down he did not perceive it, but when she arose he perceived it” (comp. also. Horayoth, fol. 10, Colossians 1; and Jerome, Quaest. in Genesis: “Appungunt desuper quasi incredibile et quod rerum natura non capiat coire quemquam nescientem”) Num 3:19, וֹאֹהֹרֹןֹ. Ba-midbar Rabbah, loc. cit., says that the points over Aaron indicate that he was not one of that number (comp. also Berakoth, fol. 4, Colossians 1). 9:10, רחקהֹ. In Mishna, Peschim, 9:2, we read: “What is a distant journey? R. Akiba says from Modaim and beyond, and from all places around Jerusalem. situated at the same distance. R. Eleazar says ‘any distance beyond the outside of the threshold of the court of the Temple.' R. Jose says the reason for the point over the ה(in our word) is to denote that it is not necessary to be actually on a distant road, but only beyond the threshold of the court of the Temple.” Deu 29:28, לֹנֹוֹ וֹלֹבֹנֹיֹנֹוֹ עֹדאּעולם. Ba-midbar Rabbah, loc. cit., “You have made manifest, hence I will also manifest unto you hidden things” (comp. Sanhedrin, fol. 43, Colossians 2, in fine). Psa 27:13, לֹוֹלֹאֹ. Berakoth, fol. 4, Colossians 1, says, “Lord of the universe, I am aware that thou greatly rewardest the just in future ages, but I know not whether I shall partake of it with them on account of my sin.” Buxtorf remarks on this passage, טעם בלא טעם, i..e. a sense without any sense: The meaning probably is that לולא, without the points, means if not, like the Latin nisi, but with the points it signifies “a doubt.”

As to the origin and signification of these points, nothing certain can be said. According to the rabbins, Ezra is said to have been the author of them (comp. Ba-midbar Rabbah on Num 3:39, sect. 3, fol. 215, Colossians 4; Aboth de-Rabbi Nathan, ch. 33). This much may be taken for granted, that these points were known long before the Talmud.

14. Inverted Nun, נ. — Before Num 10:35, and after Num 10:36, we find in our Hebrew text the letter Nun, נ, inverted (n). In the Talmud, Shabbath, fol. 115, Colossians 2; fol. 116, Colossians 1, we are told that” the section commencing ויהי בנסע הארן ויאמר משה(Num 10:35) was made by God with signs below and above, to indicate that it is not in its proper place. But Rabbi said this is not so, but that this book was counted by itself. How do you know it? R. Samuel bar-Nachman said, R. Jonathan saith (it is written) ‘She hath hewn out her seven pillars' (Pro 9:1); this means the seven books of the law.” On the inverted Nuns found in Psalms 107, mention is made in Rosh Hash-shanah, fol. 17, Colossians 2.

15. The Vav Ketid in Num 25:12. — Of this קטיעא ויו, or Vavcut— of, which is found in our Hebrew Bible י, we read in the Talmud, Kiddushin, fol. 66, Colossians 2 : “Whence do we have it that a person having some defect is unfit for the sacred ministry? R. Jehudah said that R. Samuel taught that this is because the Scripture says, ‘Wherefore say, Behold I give unto him my covenant of peace'— a perfect peace, and not an imperfect one. But, said one, it is written שלים, i.e. peace; but answered R. Nachman, the Vav in שלוםis cut off” (דשלום קטיעה היא זי ו).

16. The Closed or Final Mem (ם) in the middle of the word Isa 9:6, לםרבה. — In the Talmud, Sanhedrin, fol.. 94, Colossians 2, we find the following:

“Why is it that all the Mems in the middle of a word are open (i.e. מ). and this one closed (i.e. ם)? The Holy One (blessed be he) wanted to.. make  Hezekiah the Messiah, and Seunacherib Gog and Magog; whereupon Jus- tice pleaded before the presence of the Holy One, Lord of the world, “What! David, the king of Israel, who sang so many hymns and praises before thee, wilt thou not make him the Messiah? But Hezekiah, for whom thou, hast performed all the miracles, and who has not uttered one song before thee, wilt thou make him the Messiah?” Therefore has the Mem been closed.

17. Suspended Letters. — The suspended Nun we find in מנשה, Jdg 18:30. The Talmud, Baba Bathra, fol. 109, Colossians 2, states the following: “Was he (i.e. Gershom) the son of Manasseh? while the Scripture says the sons of Moses were Eleazar and Gershom. But because he did the deeds of Manasseh (2 Kings 21), did the Scripture append him to the (family) of Manasseh.” The meaning is that the prophet did not like to call Gershom the son of Moses, because it would be ignominious that Moses should have had an impious son; hence he called him the son of Manasseh, with the suspended letter, which may mean the son of Manassehb or Moses.

The suspended Ayin is found in רשעים, Job 38:15. In the Talmud, Sanhedrin, fol. 103, Colossians 2, we read the following: “Why is the עin רשעיםsuspended? It is to teach that when a man is רש, poor, in this world, he will also be רשin the world to come; or, literally, poor below, he will also be poor above.”

Of the suspended Ayin in מיער, Psa 80:14, we read, Kiddushin, fol. 30, Colossians 2, that this letter is the mid-die letter in the Psalms.

18. Matscular and Minuscular Letters. Of words. written with large and small letters in our Hebrew Bible we find nothing in the Talmud, but some of these instances are mentioned in the Sopherim, ch. 9. That his mode of writing must have been very ancient cannot be doubted, for there is a dispute in the Talmud, Megillah, fol. 16, Colossians 2, whether the וin ויזתא(Est 9:9) should be written as a majuscular or minuscular letter; and the word והתגלח(Lev 13:33), which is now written with a majuscular, is mentioned in Kiddushin, fol. 30, Colossians 2, as being the middle of the verses of the Pentateuch.

19. Mode of Quotations. SEE QUOTATIONS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE TALMUD. (B. P.)

## Talmudists[[@Headword:Talmudists]]

             Under this head we include all those rabbins whose opinions are regarded as authoritative in the Talmud. The period of these men comprises the time from about B.C. 180 to A.D. 500, i.e. from Simon the Just to the completion of the Talmud. This period is again subdivided into that of the Tanaim and that of the Amoraim — the former representing the time from about B.C. 180 to A.D. 219, the latter from A.D. 219 to A.D. 500.

I. Tanaim. — The first recognized, after Simon's death, as the head of the Sanhedrim was Antigonus of Soho, about B.C. 180. His contemporary was Eliezer ben-Charsum, celebrated for his opulence, learning, and zeal in the promotion of religious knowledge. After Antigonus, always two (or zugoth) stand at the head of the community-the first being the president, the second the vice-president. As the first of these zugôth, or pairs, are mentioned Jose ben-Joezer and Joseph ben-Jochanan, about B.C. 70. They were followed by Joshua ben-Perachja and Nithai of Arbela (q.v.). Their successors were Jehuda ben-Tabal and Simon ben-Shetach (q.,v.). The fourth pair is represented in Shemaja and Abtalion, about B.C. 47. The fifth and last pair are Hillel (q.v.) and Shammai (q.v.). Under their presidency lived Baba ben-Buta, Chanina ben-Dose, Jochanan ben-Zachai (q.v.), and Nechunjah ben-haKana (q.v.). Hillel was followed by his son Simon (benHillel) (q.v.). His successorwa's Gamaliel I (q.v.), who was followed by his son Simon (ben-Gamaliel) (q.v.). With Simon closes the period of the so-called earlier Tanaim. The later Tanaim first figure in history when the Temple was in ashes and Jerusalem a heap of ruins. At this period, verging upon decay, when Judaism was without any center and support, appeared Jochanan ben-Zachai, the last among Hillel's eighty disciples. Jochanan established a school at Jamniah, or Jabneh, whose president he became. His successor was Gamaliel bar-Simon (q.v.), and his fellow- laborers were Akiba ben-Joseph (q.v.), Eliezer ben-Asarja, Eliezer ben- Arak, Eliezer ben-Hyrkanos (q.v.), Ismael ben-Elisa (q.v.), Joshua ben- Hananja (q.v.), Nechunjah ben-ha-Kana (q.v.), and Tarphon (q.v.). Gamaliel was succeeded by his son Simon (ben-Gamaliel II) (q.v.),' who transferred the Rabbinical apparatus to Tiberias. To his college belonged Nathan ha-Babli (q.v.), Jose ben-Halephta, Jehudah ben-Ilai, rabbi Meir (q.v.), and Simon ben-Jochai (q.v.). Simon ben-Gamaliel was succeeded by his son Judah the Holy (q.v.).

II. Amoraim. — With the life and labors of rabbi Judah ended the succession of the Tanaim, who were now followed by a new order, the Amoraim (אמוראים), i.e. the expositors of the law, at length no longer oral, but reduced to a written text. Some of the most distinguished of their number were rabbi Chija, Chanina bar-Chana, Abba Areka, or Rab (q.v.), Bar-Kappara, Jochanan bar-Napacha (q.v.), and Simon ben-Lakish (q.v.). Of the scholastic labors of these men we have the monumental result in the Palestine Gemara, commonly called Talmud Jerushalmi (תלמוד ירושלמי).

After the death of Judah, not only learning, but also the patriarchal dignity was more and more in the decline; for with Judah's death the star of Judaea's learning had set, never to rise again in Palestine. Rabban Gamaliel III, Judah's son, and Judah II, son of Gamaliel III, his successor, were weak in character, mediocre in learning, and deficient in theological acumen. The latter transferred his residence to Tiberias, and Galilee, once so despised, now became “the Holy Land,” and Tiberias its Jerusalem. Of Gamaliel IV, the successor of Judah II, and Judah III, son and successor of Gamaliel IV, history has nothing to record, except that they close the line of Palestinian teachers. Meanwhile numerous migrations of rabbins to Babylon had taken place, especially in the reign of Constantius, who persecuted the Jews. We leave Palestine and turn to Babylon, where the schools at Sora. (q.v.), Pumbaditha (q.v.), Nahardea, and Machusa were in a flourishing condition.

At Babylon the greater and more noble part of the Jewish families settled at the Captivity, to return no more to their ancestral soil, and there the literary culture of the people took a development which exerted no small influence on the studies of after-generations. There the Jews lived under their resh gelutha, or prince of the exiles, whose office was of an ecclesiastical and secular kind. So long as the Temple was standing the Babylonian Jews acknowledged the presidency of the high-priest, and paid the didrachm contribution to the Temple, which, however, they did not after the destruction of that edifice. Finally, the Babylonians succeeded in establishing their own independence, in civil and ecclesiastical matters, of the Western patriarchate, and established schools of learning all over the country without material aid from those of the fatherland, though the schools took the same undeveloped form as those of the Holy Land. The names given to these schools were Aramaean forms for the Hebrew ones  of the Palestinian schools. The “house of learning” was called Beth Ulphana (בית אולפנא); Beth Midrash (מדרש בית), “the house of doctrine;” Beth ha Vaad (הוועד; Heb. בית הכנסת), “the house of assemblage;” Beth Metibtha (בית מתיבתא; Heb. ישיבה), “the house of sitting;” Beth Rabbanan (בית רבנן), “the house of the masters;” Beth Sidra (בית סדרא), “the house of order.” The principal or rector of the school was entitled Rab Beth Ulphana (רב בית אולפנא), Resh Metibtha (ריש מתיבתא), Resh Sidra (סדרא ריש), etc.. So, too, the academical degree of Mar (מר) was equivalent to the Palestinian title of rabbi. (רבי), and was conferred after the same course of study by the semikah, (סמיכה), or “imposition of hands.”

III. Schools. — The earliest school of which we have any specific information is that which was situated at

1. Nahardea. — With this school we first become acquainted towards the close of the 2d century. Nahardea was situated on the Euphrates, and for a time she was the Babylonian Jerusalem. While the Temple was yet in existence; this place had the treasury of the Babylonian congregations for the Temple-offerings which were brought to Jerusalem (Josephus, Ant. 18:12). The first rector at Nahardea was R. Shila, who was succeeded by Mar-Samuel, the astronomer (also called Ariob and Jarchinai), in A.D. 190 247. His disciples were Nachman ben-Jacob, Sheshet, Rabba ben-Abbuha, and Joseph ben-Chama. When Nahardea was sacked in 259 and the academy broken up, they migrated to

2. Machusa, a town on the Tigris, about four hours from Cesiphon, where a new academy was founded. Rabba ben-Abbuha promoted this school of learning by his lectures, and Machusa attained some celebrity. Ten years (A.D. 363) after Rabba's death, the city was demolished by the Romans in the war under Julian. The most famous schools, however, were those at

3. Pumbaditha' and Sora, where the Amoraim attained great renown. The teachers of these schools having already been mentioned in the arts, SEE PUIBADITHA and SEE SORA, we need only to refer to them. Of' the names mentioned, we have only given the most prominent, which, in part, are already given under the respective letter, or will be treated, so far as omitted, in the supplement, volume.

IV. Literature. — Luzzatto, סדר תנאים ואמראים (Prague, 1839); Liber Juchasin, ed. Filipowski (Lond. 1857); Frankel, Hodegetica in Mischnam (Lips. 1859[Heb.]); Weiss, Zur Geschichte derjidischen Tradition(Vienna, 1872-77, 2 vols. [Heb.]); Chiarini, Le Talmudc de Babylone (Leips. 1831), 1, 105 sq.; Bacher, Die Agada der babylonischen Amoraer (Strasburg, 1878). The Talmudists whose names are mentioned in the treatise Baba Metsia are given by Sammter in the appendix to his German translation of Baba Metsia (Berlin, 1879), p. 160 sq. SEE SCRIBE. (B. P.)

## Talochon, Marie Vincent[[@Headword:Talochon, Marie Vincent]]

             better known by his clerical name, Pere Elysee, was a French surgeon, born in January, 1753, at Thorigny, and reared among the Brothers of Charity, at Paris, whose order he entered Jan. 30,1774. He was engaged in various public and benevolent enterprises, and died in Paris Nov. 27, 1817. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Talsas[[@Headword:Talsas]]

             (Σαλθας v.r. Σαλόας, Vulg. Thalsas), as corrupt Graecism (1Es 9:22) for the name ELASA SEE ELASA (q.v.) of the Hebrew list (Ezr 10:22).

## Tam, Jacob ben-Meir[[@Headword:Tam, Jacob ben-Meir]]

             better known in Jewish literature under the name of Rabenu Tam, was born at Remers, France, about 1100, and died in 1171. He was; a grandson of Rashi (q.v.), and youngest brother of Rashbam. (q.v.), and was famous not only as a. Talmudist, grammarian, and commentator, but also for his piety, for which he obtained the appellation Tam (תָּם), in allusion to Gen 25:27, where his namesake Jacob is denominated Tam=pious (אַישׁ תָּם יעֲקֹב). Under the title of ספר הישר, “the book of the righteous,” he wrote additions on thirty treatises of the Talmud, published at Vienna in 1811. Supplements are given by Luzzatto from an old MS. in the Kerem Chemed (Prague, 1843), 7:19 sq.; עשר שאלות ותשובות, i.e. ten Talmudic decisions, also given by Luzzatto (loc. cit.); מחברת על משפטי הטעמי, is i.e. a poem on the Hebrew accents, consisting of forty-five stanzas, five of which were first published by Luzzatto (loc. cit.), and the  whole forty-five of which appeared in the following work: סההכרעות, or grammatical and lexical animadversions, designed to reconcile the differences of Dunash ibn-Labral and Menachen ben-Saruk on points of grammar and exegesis (first published by Filipowski, Lond. 1855); תקין ספר תורה, or הלכות ס ת, or תקון סופרי, a guide for transcribing MSS. of the Bible, in MS. extant; פרושי תנ,ִ or a grammatical commentary on the Bible, which has not yet come to light, but is quoted by commentators, lexicographers, and grammarians. R. Tam also enriched the Jewish ritual with some pieces, as the יציב פתגם(i.e. “these words are true,” etc.), in the Machser Ashkenazimn and sused after the haphtarah for the second day of Pentecost. See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 406 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl.), p. 306; Kitto, Cyclop. s.v.; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 6:196 sq.; Braunschweiger, Gesch. d. Juden in den romanischen Staaten (Würzburg, 1865), p. 85; Geiger, Parshandatha (Leips. 1855), Vp. 24 sq.; Kalish, Hebrew Grammar (Lond. 1863), 2, 27; Zunz, Synagogale Poesie (Berlin, 1855), p. 248; id. Literaturgeschichte zur synagogalen Poesie (ibid. 1865), p. 265-267; id. Zur Literatur und Geschichte, p. 32, 109; Rapaport, in Kerem Chemed (Prague, 1843), 7:1- 3; Luzzatto, ibid. p. 19-34, 35-53; Landshuth [L.], Amude Blaabodah (עמודי העבודה) (Berlin, 1857), 1, 106 sq. (B. P.)

## Tama[[@Headword:Tama]]

             (Kethib in 1Ki 9:8). SEE TADMOR.

## Tamah[[@Headword:Tamah]]

             (Heb. תֵּמִח, Te'mach; in pause, תָּמִח, Ta'mach, laughter [Gesen.], or combat [Fürst]; Sept. Θημά, Θεμά; Vulg. Thema), the name of a man whose descendants (or rather a place whose inhabitants) returned among the Nethinim from the captivity with Zerubbabel (Ezra 2, 53, “Thamah ” Neh 7:55).

## Tamar[[@Headword:Tamar]]

             (Heb. תָּמָר, Tamar', a palm-tree, as often; Sept. Θαμάρ [v.r. Θημάρ], but Θαιμάν in Ezekiel; Josephus, Θαμάρα, Ant. 7:3, 3; 8, 1; 10, 3; Vulg. Thamar), the name of one place and of three remarkable women in Old- Test. history. SEE PALM.

1. A spot on the southeastern frontier of Judah, named in Eze 47:19; Eze 48:28 only, evidently called from a palm-tree. We naturally think of Hazezon-tamar, the old name of Engedi; but this is not quite appropriate for location. Eusebius and Jerome mention a Thamara, a place lying between Hebron and Ailah (Onomast. s.v. “Hazezon-tamar”); and Ptolemy (5, 16, 8) mentions a Θαμαρώ, as do also the Peutinger Tables (Reland, Palaest. p. 462). Robinson identifies it with Kurnub, a place containing the ruins of an old fortress about an ordinary day's journey from el-Milh towards the pass es-Sufah (Bibl. Res. 2, 198, 201). This, however, depends' on a conjectural emendation of the Onomasticon, where, in the clause κώμη διεστῶσα Μάψις, (v.r. μόλις, Μάλις), ἡμέρας ὁδόν, Robinson would read Μαλάθης for Μάψις, whereby he makes Thamara a day's journey from Malatha, which he identifies with el-Milh. Besides, as Van de Velde observes, the distance of Kurnub from el-Milh is not a day's journey, but only four hours; nor is Kurnub to the south-west of the Dead Sea, where the Peutinger Tables place Thamaro; nor are the ruins ancient (Van de Velde, Syria, 2, 130). Fürst (Heb. Lex . s.v.) regards it as identical with the Tamar of the Kethib, or text, in 1Ki 9:8; but that is generally thought to mean Tadmor (q. 6). Schwarz (Palest. p. 21, note) thinks that Zoar is meant, on the strength of certain Talmudical notices. De Saulcy (Narr. 1, 7) endeavors to establish a. connection between Tamar and the Kalaat Um-Baghik, at the mouth of the ravine of that name on the south-west side of the Dead Sea, on the ground (among others) that the names are similar. But this, to say the least, is more than doubtful. It is rather to be sought at the extreme south end of the Dead Sea, where the line as run by Ezekiel evidently begins (see Keil, ad loc.); perhaps at some clump of palms anciently existing at Ain el-'Arus, near the mouth of Wady Fikreh.

2. The wife successively of Er and Onan, the two sons of Judah (Gen 38:6-30). Her importance in the sacred narrative depends on the great anxiety to keep up the lineage of Judah. It seemed as if the family were on the point of extinction. Er and Onan (q.v. respectively) had each in turn perished suddenly. Judah's wife, Bathshuah, died; and there only remained a child, Shelah, whom Judah was unwilling to trust to the dangerous union, as it appeared, with Tamar, lest he should meet with the same fate as his brothers. That he should, however, marry her seems to have been regarded as part of the fixed law of the tribe, whence its incorporation into the Mosaic law in after-times (Deu 25:5;  Mat 22:24); and, as such, Tamar was determined not to let the opportunity escape through Judah's parental anxiety. Accordingly, she resorted to the desperate expedient of entrapping the father himself into the union which he feared for his son. He, on the first emergence from his mourning for his wife, went to one of the festivals often mentioned in Jewish history as attendant on sheep-shearing. He wore on his finger the ring of his chieftainship; he carried his staff in his hand; he wore a collar or necklace round his neck. He was encountered by a veiled woman on the road leading to Timnath, the future birthplace of Samson, among the hills of Daniel He took her for one of the unfortunate women who were consecrated to the impure rites of the Canaanitish worship. SEE HAPELOT.

He promised her, as the price of his intercourse, a kid from the flocks to which he was going, and left as his pledge his ornaments and his staff. The kid he sent back by his shepherd (Sept.), Hirah of Adullam. The woman could nowhere be found. Months afterwards it was discovered to be his own daughter-in-law, Tamar, who had thus concealed herself under the veil or mantle, which she cast off on her return home, where she resumed the seclusion and dress of a widow. She was sentenced to be burned alive, and was only saved by the discovery, through the pledges which Judah had left, that her seducer was no less than the chieftain of the tribe. He had the magnanimity to recognize that she had been driven into this crime by his own neglect of his promise to give her in marriage to his youngest son. “She hath been more righteous than I... and he knew her again no more” (Gen 38:26). The fruit of this intercourse was twins, Pharez and Zarah, and through Pharez the sacred line was continued. B.C. 1885. Hence the prominence given to Tamar in the nuptial benediction of the tribe of Judah (Rth 4:12) and in the genealogy of our Lord (Mat 1:3). SEE JUDAH.

3. Daughter of David and Maachah the Geshurite princess, and thus sister of Absalom (2Sa 13:1-32; 1 Chronicles 3, 9; Josephus, Ant. 7:8, 1). She and her brother were alike remarkable for their extraordinary beauty. Her name (“palm-tree”) may have been given her on this account (comp. Son 7:7). This fatal beauty inspired a frantic passion in her half-brother Amnon, the eldest son of David by Ahinoam. He wasted away, from the feeling that it was impossible to gratify his desire, “for she was a virgin”-the narrative leaves it uncertain whether from a scruple on his part, or from the seclusion in which, in her unmarried state, she was kept. Morning by morning, as he received the visits of his friend  Jonadab, he is paler and thinner (Josephus, Ant. 7:8, 1).

Jonadab discovers the cause, and suggests to him the means of accomplishing his wicked purpose. He was to feign sickness. The king, who appears to have entertained a considerable affection, almost awe, for him as the eldest son (2Sa 13:5; 2Sa 13:21; Sept.), came to visit him; and Amnon entreated the presence of Tamar on the pretext that she alone could give him the food that he would eat. What follows is curious, as showing the simplicity of the royal life. It would almost seem that Tamar was supposed to have a peculiar art of baking palatable cakes. She came to his house (for each prince appears to have had a separate establishment), took the dough and kneaded it, and then in his presence (for this was to be a part of his fancy, as if there were something exquisite in the manner of her performing the work) kneaded it a second time into the form of cakes. The name given to these cakes (lebibih), “heart-cakes,” has been variously explained: “hollow cakes,” “cakes with some stimulating spices” (like our word cordial), cakes in the shape of a heart (like the Moravian gerührte Herzen, Thenius, ad loc.), cakes “the delight of the heart.” Whatever it be, it implies something special and peculiar. She then took the pan in which they had been baked and poured them all out in a heap before the prince. This operation seems to have gone on in an outer room, on which Amnon's bedchamber opened. He caused his attendants to retire, called her to the inner room, and there accomplished his design. In her touching remonstrance two points are remarkable. First, the expression of the infamy of such a crime “in Israel,” implying the loftier standard of morals that prevailed as compared with other countries at that time; and, secondly, the belief that even this standard might be overborne lawfully by royal authority, “Speak to the king, for he will not withhold me from thee.” This expression has led to much needless explanation from its contradiction to Lev 18:9; Lev 20:17; Deu 27:22; as, e.g., that her mother, Maachah, not being a Jewess, there was no proper legal relationship, between her and Amnon; or that she was ignorant of the law; or that the Mosaic laws were not then in existence (Thenius, ad loc.).

It is enough to suppose, what evidently her whole speech implies, that the king had a dispensing power which was conceived to cover even extreme cases. The brutal hatred of Amnon succeeding to his brutal passion, and the indignation of Tamar at his barbarous insult, even surpassing her indignation at his shameful outrage, are pathetically and graphically told, and in the narrative another glimpse is given us of the manners of the royal household. The unmarried princesses, it seems, were distinguished by robes  or gowns with sleeves (so the Sept. Josephus, etc., take the word translated in the A. V. “diverse colors”). Such was the dress worn by Tamar on the present occasion, and when the guard at Amnon's door had thrust her out and closed the door after her to prevent her return, she, in her agony, snatched handfuls of ashes from the ground and threw them on her hair, then tore off her royal sleeves, and clasped her bare hands upon her head, and rushed to and fro through the streets screaming aloud. In this state she encountered her brother Absalom, who took her to his house, where she remained as if in a state of widowhood. The king was afraid or unwilling to interfere with the heir to the throne, but she was avenged by Absalom; as Dinah had been by Simeon and Levi, and out of that vengeance grew the series of calamities which darkened the close of David's reign (see Stanley, Jewish Church, 2, 128). B.C. 1033. SEE DAVID.

4. Daughter of Absalom, called, probably, after her beautiful aunt, and inheriting the beauty of both aunt and father (2Sa 14:7). She was the sole survivor of the house of Absalom; and ultimately, by her marriage with Uriah of Gibeah, became the mother of Maachah, the future queen of Judah, or wife of Abijah (1Ki 15:2), Maachah being called after her great grandmother, as Tamar after her aunt. B.C. 1023. SEE ABSALOM.

## Tamarisk[[@Headword:Tamarisk]]

             SEE GROVE

## Tambourine[[@Headword:Tambourine]]

             SEE TIMBREL.

## Tamburini[[@Headword:Tamburini]]

             a name common to several Roman ecclesiastics, of whom we mention the following:

1. MICHAEL ANGELUS, of Modena, was made general of the Jesuits Jan. 31, 1706, and died Feb. 28, 1730.

2. PIETRO, born in 1737 at Brescia, received his theological and philosophical training at the seminary of his native place, where he afterwards acted as the head of the lyceum founded by him. He was also head of the Collegium Germanicum at Rome, and was promoted by Maria Theresa to a professorship of theology, and in 1779 to the chair of natural law and moral philosophy at Pavia. He resigned his professorship in 1795, but was compelled by the French authorities in Lombardy to fill the chair of ethics and international law in 1797. For three years, 1798-1801, this chair  was suppressed, but, being restored in the latter year, was filled by Tamburini till 1818, when he was appointed dean of the faculty of law. He died at Pavia, March 14,1827. He was made a chevalier of the Iron Crown by the emperor of Austria, and received other distinctions. . He wrote, Idea delta Santa Sede (Pavia, 1784): Introduzione allo Studio della Filosofia (Milan, 1797): Lezioni di Filosofia Morale, etc. (Pavia, 1806-12, 4 vols.): — Elementa Juris Naturae (Milan, 1815): — Cenni sulla Perafettibilita del' Umana Famiglia (ibid. 1823): Praelectiones de Ecclesia Christi et Universa Jurisprudentia Ecclesiastica, quae habuit in Academia Ficbnensi (Lipsie, 1845, 4 pts.): — Praelectione; 'de Justitia Christ. et de Sacramentis, de Ultino Hominis Fine deque Virtutibus Theol. et Cardinalibus (Ficino, 1783-85, 3 vols.): Analisi delle Apologie di S. Justino Mart., con alcune Rifessioni (Pavia, 1792): — Ragionamenti sul 1'Libro di Orig. contra Cello (ibid. 1786): — on Tertullian, Analisi del Libro delle Prescrizioni, con alcune Osservazioni (ibid. 1782).

3. TOMMRASO, a Jesuit, was born in 1591 at Caltanisetta, in Sicily, was professor of theology, afterwards censor and counselor of the Holy Office, and died at Palermo in 1675. His moral and theological writings were published at Lyons in 1659, and Venice in 1755.

See Theologisches Universal Lexikon, s.v.; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirch. — Lexikon, 12:1818; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2, 1305; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 1, 316, 897, 900, 913; 2, 797. (B. P.)

## Tamid[[@Headword:Tamid]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Tamil Version[[@Headword:Tamil Version]]

             Tamil, or Tamul, the language of the ancient kingdom of Dravira, is spoken in the extensive country now called the Carnatic, and is the vernacular language from the town of Pulicat in the north to Cape Comorin in the south, and from the shores of the Indian Ocean on the east to the Ghauts on the west. It also obtains along the whole northern coast of Ceylon, including the populous district of Jaffna, where it is spoken by a race of people sometimes called the Malabars. Tamil is likewise, the vernacular language of the Moormen of Ceylon.

A Tamil version of the New Test. was executed by Ziegenbalg, the first Protestant missionary to India, with the help of other missionaries  associated with him, at Tranquebar. He commenced the translation in 1708, and completed it in 1711. The printing of this version was delayed in order that it might receive the benefit of a thorough revisal; and this important task was committed to John Ernest Grundler, a German missionary, who had arrived in India soon after the commencement of the translation. Under his care the work was printed, bearing the title Novum Testamentum D. N. Jesu Christi, ex Originali Texte in Linguam Damulicam o Versum, in Usum Gentis Malabaricae, opera et studio Bartholomrei Ziegenbalg et Joan. Ernesti Grundleri Serenissimi DaniseRegis Friderici IV ad Indos Orientales Missionariorum (Tranquebarae, 1714). In 1717 Ziegenbalg commenced the translation of the Old Test., and in 1719, having carried it as far as the book of Ruth, he died, at the age of thirty-six. After his decease, and that of his fellow- laborer Grundler, which occurred during the following year, the revision of his manuscripts and the prosecution of the version of the Old Test. revolved on Benjamin Schultze, a missionary who had arrived from Halle a short time previously under the patronage of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowiedge. Schultze published the portion of the Old Test. translated by Ziegenbalg in 1723, and completed the version in 1727, which was published in three parts, viz. Biblia Damulica, seu quod Deus Omnipotentissimus semet ipsum ex sua .Eternitate clarius Manifestaturus de Ccelo est Locutus,Veteris Testamenti Pars Prima, in qua Mosis Libri quinque, Josuce Liber unus, atque Liber vnus Judicum, studio et opera Bartholornei Zegenbalgii Missionarii ad Indos Orientales in linguamr Damulicam versi continentur (Tranquebariae in littore Coromandelino, typis et sumptibus Missionis Danicne, 1723). Biblia Damulica, seu quod Deus Sapientissim'us in sua'Divina (Economia cumn Populo Israelitico et Egit t et Locutus est. Veteris Testanenti Pars Secunda, in qua Libellus Ruth, Samnzelis Liber Prior et Posterior, Liber Nehemiae, Liber Esther, Liber Jobi, Liber Psalmorum Davidis, Liber Proverbium, Liber Ecclesiastae, et Liber Cantici Canticorum, studio et opera, etc. (ibid. 1726). Biblia Damulica, seu quod Deus Omnniscius de gratia in Jesu Christo tempore Novi Testamenti Revelanda per Sanctos suos Prophetas est Vaticinatus. Veteris Testamenti Pars Tertiac, in qua Prophetae Majores, Esaias, Jeremias, ejusdemque Lamentationes, Ezechiel, Daniel; Prophetae Minores, Hoseas, Joel, Amos, Obadia, Jona, Micha, Nahum, fabacuc, Zephania, Haggai, Zacharias, et Malachias, studio et opera, etc. (ibid. 1727). To these parts were added, in the year 1728, the Apocryphal books, or Libri Apocryphi, seu Libri a quibusdam Piis Viris Ecclesice A  ntiquce Judaicaepost Prophetas Veteris Testamenti Scripti, continentes partim Varias Regulas Vitce Utiles,partim Supplementum Historic Ecclesiasticae Veteris Testamenti, scilicet Liber Sapientiae, Ecclesiasticus sive Sirach, Liber Esdrce, Liber Tobice, Liber Judith, A djectiones ad Librum Esther, Liberaruch, Epistola Jeremice, A djectiones ad Danielem seu Trium Virorum Hymnologia, Historia Sosannae, item Belis et Draconis, Maccabaeorum Liber Primus, Secundus, et Tertius, denique Oratio Manassis, studio et opera, etc. (ibid. 1728). Schultze likewise addressed himself to a diligent revision of the New Test., a second edition of which he' put to press in 1722, and completed in 1724, at Tranquebar. It has the same title as the first, with the addition. Editio secunda correctior et accessione sumtmariorum cnjusvis capitis auctior. In 1758 a third edition of the New Test. was printed at the same place; it had' previously been subjected to another revision, in which several missionaries took a part. The second Tranquebar edition was reprinted at Colombo in 1741-43, after having undergone some alterations adapting it to the Tamil spoken in Ceylon. This edition was designed for the native Tamilian Christians in that island, and was published under the auspices of L. B. von Imhoff, the governor.

In 1777 an important version of the New Test. was published by the Rev. J. P. Fabricius, one of Schultze's successors in the Danish mission at Madras. This version is far more elegant and classical in diction than that of the Tranquebar translators. Fabricius likewise undertook the revision of Schultze's version of the Old Test., preparatory to a second edition; but the work, as revised by him, has every claim to be considered a new and independent version. He sent the translation, sheet by sheet, for examination and correction to the missionaries at Cuddalore; from them it passed to the Danish missionaries, and from these to the native translator to, the Danish government. The notes and corrections thus obtained were carefully collated by Fabricius, and the whole translation was again subjected by him to a searching revision. It was printed at the mission press at Tranquebar between the years 1777 and 1782 under the special care of two missionaries, one of whom was Dr. Rottler. Fabricius was esteemed an “unparalleled Tamil scholar,” and his translation long held the rank of the standard Tamil version of the Scriptures in the missions of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Tanjore and Madras, and partly in those in Tinnevelly, and also in the missions of the Leipsic Lutheran Missionary Society.  The editions of the two versions of the New Test. above mentioned, printed by the Danish missionaries prior to the commencement of the present century, amount in all to fourteen, besides two versions of the Old Test. But the number of copies issued being very far from adequate to the wants of the native Christians, the deplorable scarcity of the Scriptures in the Tanil country was first pressed upon the notice of the British and Foreign Bible Society in a letter from the Rev. Dr. Buchanan, dated Madura, 1806; and in 1813 an edition consisting of 5000 copies was completed by the Serampore missionaries, the text being that of Fabricius.

As a great demand for the Scriptures still continued throughout the Tamil country, even after the circulation of this large edition, it seemed necessary to take immediate measures for issuing further supplies. The want of copies of the Scriptures appeared to be particularly felt at Ceylon, where the number of native Christians speaking the Tamil language was estimated at 45,000. Besides the edition of the New Test. published at Colombo in 1743, as above mentioned, a version of the Pentateuch, translated by Mr. De Milho, had also been printed in Ceylon, under the patronage of the Dutch government, in 1790. These editions, however, had been long exhausted, and the people in general were almost destitute of the Scriptures. It was therefore deemed advisable not only to issue another edition, but also to obtain such a revision of the existing version as might render it intelligible to the Tamil population of Ceylon and of the adjacent continent. This important version was committed to the Rev. C. T. E. Rhenius, of the Church Mission, subject to the superintendence of the Rev. Dr. Rottler (who had formerly assisted in carrying the version of Fabricius through the press) and to the inspection of the missionaries at Trichinopoly, Tanjore, and Tranquebar. To secure the greater accuracy of the work, a committee of translation was appointed at Madras in 1821. In 1829 Rhenius's version seemed to have been completed, and from the time of its appearance it has been used in the missions of the Church Missionary Society, and in those of the London Missionary Society, the Wesleyan Missionary Society, and the American Board of Missions.

But neither Fabricius's version nor Rhenius's being in universal use among Tamil Christians, neither version had acquired among them that prescriptive reverence and authority which are conceded to the authorized English version (except by Roman Catholics) wherever the English language is spoken. Fabricius's version, though admitted by all to be very faithful to the original, was regarded by Tamil scholars in general as too  frequently unidiomatical and obscure; while Rhenius's version, though generally written in clear, idiomatic Tamil, was regarded by some of those by whom it was used, and by all who were accustomed to Fabricius, as too paraphrastic, as departing too frequently, without sufficient warrant, from the renderings adopted in the principal European versions, and as needlessly differing from Fabricius's forms of expression, even when they happened to be perfectly correct.

For the sake of having a version which should be generally acceptable to Tamil Christians and Tamil scholars, the Rev. P. Percival, assisted by missionaries in Jaffna, Ceylon, undertook in 1849 a new version, known as the “Tentative Version,” which has proved to be a very valuable contribution to the work of Tamil Biblical revision.

The Romanists, who had managed to evade the necessity of publishing any portion of the Holy Scriptures in Tamil during the 300 years in which they had been laboring in the Tamil country, were induced in 1857 to publish at Pondicherry a translation of their own of the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. This translation has been made from the Latin Vulgate, not from the original Greek, and, where it is a good translation, may be regarded as a reproduction of Fabricius, with a still more excessive zeal for literality. Where it differs from Fabricils, though occasionally it succeeds in' giving a happy turn to the expression, it more often presents so curious a mixture of high and low Tamil, and the general character of the composition is so rugged and uncouth, that even the heads of the Roman community themselves need have very little fear that this long delayed, reluctantly published translation of a portion of the Scriptures should be too generally read by their people.

Taking all these circumstances into account, and considering the evils arising from the existence and use among Tamil Christians of a variety of versions of the Tamil New Test., it was felt that another effort was in the highest degree desirable to secure to the Tamil people a version which should be worthy of being accepted by all religious communities in the Tamil country, however they might differ in various other particulars. Accordingly delegates were selected from the various missionary bodies in the Tamil-speaking district. The first meeting was held at Palamcotta. It commenced on April 29,1861 and closed on June 18, during which period the delegates worked nine hours a day. In 1863 the revision of the Tamil  New Test., under the editorial supervision of the Rev. H. Bower, was completed.

In the report for 1865 we read, “The attention of the Madras Auxiliary is now directed to a version of the Tamil Old Test., on the same principles as have led to, the successful completion of the New Test. under the editorial superintendence of the Rev. H. Bower.” The completion of this version was announced in 1869. In 1873 we read that Mr. Bower has been appointed to prepare the marginal references and alternative renderings for the Tamil Bible. Up to March 31, 1889, the British and Foreign Bible, Society had disposed of 2,549,150 copies of the Tamil Bible, while of the Tamil with English 32,000 were distributed. See Masch, Bibliotheca Sacra, 2, 197 sq.; the Bible of Every Land; and the Annual Reports of the British and Foreign Bible Society. (B. P.)

## Tammuz[[@Headword:Tammuz]]

             (Heb. with the article hat-Tammuz', הִתִּמּוּז, the Tammuz, as if originally an appellative; Sept. ὁ Τάμμούζ), a name of great obscurity, which occurs but once in the Scriptures: In the sixth year of the captivity of Jehoiachin, in the sixth month and on the fifth day of the month, the prophet Ezekiel, as he sat in his house surrounded by the elders of Judah, was transported in spirit to the far-distant Temple at Jerusalem. The hand of the Lord God was upon him, and led him “to the door of the gate of the house of Jehovah, which was towards the north; and behold there the women sitting, weeping for the Tammuz” (Eze 8:14). Some translate the last clause (מְבִכּוֹת אֶתאּהִתִּמּוּז) “causing the Tammuz to weep,” and the influence which this rendering has upon the interpretation-will be see hereafter.

1. Etymological Signification of the Word. — If תִּמּוּזbe a regularly formed Hebrew word, it must be derived either from a root נָמִזor תָּמִז(comp. the forms אִלּוּ, חִנּוּן), which is not known to exist. To remedy this defect, Furst (Handwb. s.v.) invents a root, to which he gives the signification “to be strong, mighty, victorious,” and; transitively, “to overpower, annihilate.” It is to be regretted that this lexicographer cannot be contented to confess his ignorance of what is unknown. Rodiger (in Gesenius, Thesaur. s.v.) suggests the derivation from the root מָסִס= מָזִז; according to which תִּמּוּזis a contraction of תִּמְזוּז, and signifies a melting away, dissolution, departure, and so the ἀφανισμὸς Αδώνιδος, or  disappearance of Adonis, which was mourned by the Phoenician women, and, after them, by the Greeks. But the etymology is unsound, and is evidently contrived so as to connect the name Tammuz with the general tradition regarding it. Mühlau (new ed. of Gesenius's Lex.) refers to Delitzsch's elucidation (Stud. z. semit. Religionsgesch. 1, 35, 300 sq.) from the Babylonico-Assyrian form Duzu (for Dumuzi), signifying “sprouting of life.”

2. Old Interpretations. — The ancient versions supply us with no help. The Sept., the Targum of Jonathan ben-Uzziel, the Peshito-Syriac, and the Arabic in Walton's Polyglot merely reproduce the Hebrew word. In the Targum of Jonathan on Gen 8:5, “the tenth month” is translated “the month Tammuz.” According to Castell (Lex. Sept.), tamuz is used in Arabic to denote “the heat of summer;” and Tammi is the name given to the Pharaoh who cruelly treated the Israelites. The Vulg. alone gives Adonis as a modern equivalent, and this rendering has been eagerly adopted by subsequent commentators with but few exceptions. It is at least as old, therefore, as Jerome, and the fact of his having adopted it shows that it must have embodied the most credible tradition. In his note upon the passage he adds that since, according to the Gentile fable, Adonis had been slain in the month of June, the Syrians give the name of Tammuz to this month, when they celebrate to him an anniversary solemnity, in which he is lamented by the women as dead, and, afterwards coming to life again, is celebrated with songs and praises. In another passage. (ad Paulinum, in Opp. 1, 102, ed. Basil. 1565)' he laments that Bethlehem was overshadowed by a grove of Tammuz, that is, of Adonis, and that “in the cave where the infant Christ once cried, the lover of Venus was bewailed.” Cyril of Alexandria (in Oseam, in Opp. 3, 79, ed. Paris, 1638) and Theodoret (in Ezech.) give the same explanation, and are followed by the author of the Chronicon Paschale.

The only exception to this uniformity is in the Syriac translation of Melito's Apology, edited by Dr. Cureton in his Spicilegiunz Syriacum. The date of the translation is unknown; the original, if genuine, must belong to the 2d century. The following is a literal rendering of the Syriac: “The sons of Phoenicia worshipped Balthi, the queen of Cyprus. For she loved Tamuzo, the son of Cuthar, the king of the Phoenicians, and forsook her kingdom and came and dwelt in Gebal, a fortress of the Phoenicians. And at that time she made all the villages (not Cyprians, as Dr. Cureton translates) subject to Cuthar the king. For, before Tamuzo, she had loved Ares and committed adultery with him, and  Hephaestus, her husband, caught her and was jealous of her. And he (i.e. Ares) came and slew Tam'uzo on Lebanon while he made a hunting among the wild boars. And from that time Balthi remained in Gebal, and died in the city of Aphaca, where Tamuzo was buried” (p. 25 of the Syriac text). We have here very, clearly the Greek legend of Adonis reproduced with a single change of name. Whether this change is due to the translator, as is not improbable, or whether he found” Tammuz” in the original of Melito, it is impossible to say. Be this as it may, the tradition embodied in the passage quoted is probably as valuable as that in the same author which regards Serapis as the deification of Joseph. The Syriac lexicographer Bar- Bahlul (10th century) gives the legend as it had come down to his time. “Tomuzo was, as they say, a hunter, shepherd, and chaser of wild beasts; who, When Belathi loved him, took her away from her husband. And when her husband went forth to seek her, Tomuzo slew him. And. with regard to Tomuzo also, there met him in the desert a wild boar and slew him. And his father made for him a great lamentation and weeping in the month Tomuz and Belathi, his wife, she, too, made a lamentation and mourning over him. And this tradition was handed down among the heathen people during her lifetime and after her death, which same tradition the Jews received with the rest of the evil festivals of the people, and in that month Tomuz used to make for him a great feast. Tomuz also is the name of one of the months of the Syrians.”

In the next century the legend assumes, for the first time, a different form in the hands of a Rabbinical commentator. Rabbi Solomon Isaaki (Rashi) has the following note on the passage in Ezekiel: “An image which the women made hot in the inside, and its eyes were of lead, and they melted by reason of the heat of the burning, and it seemed as if it wept; and they (the women) said, He asketh for offerings. Tammuz is a word signifying burning, as עִל דַּי חֲזֵה לְמֵזְיֵה (Dan 3:19), and אִתּוּנָא אֵזֵה יִתַּירָה (Dan 3:22).”‘Instead of rendering “weeping for the Tammuz,” he gives what appears to be the equivalent in French,” faisantes pleurer l'dchauffd.” It is clear, therefore, that Rashi regards Tammuz as an appellative derived from the Chaldee root אֲזָא, azd, “to make hot.” It is equally clear that his etymology cannot be defended for an instant. In the 12th century (1161) Solomon ben-Abraham Parchon, in his Lexicon, compiled at Salerno from the works of Jehuda Chayug and Abulwalid Merwan ben-Gannach, has the following observations upon Tammuz: “It is the likeness of a reptile which they make upon the water, and the water is collected in it and flows  through its holes, and it seems as if it wept. But the month called Tammuz is Persian, and so are all our months; none of them is from the sacred tongue.

Though they are written in the Scripture, they are Persian; but in the sacred tongue the first month, the second month,” etc. At the close of this century we meet for the first time with an entirely new tradition repeated by R. David Kimchi, both in his Lexicon and in his Commentary, from the Moreh Nebuchim of Maimonides: “In the month Tammuz they made a feast of an idol, and the women came to gladden him; and some say that by crafty means they caused the water to come into the eyes of the idol which is called Tammuz, and it wept, as if it asked them to worship it. And some interpret Tammuz ‘the burned one,' as if from Daniel 3, 19 (see above), i.e. they wept over him because he was burned; for they used to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire, and the women used to weep over them.... But the Rab, the wise, the great, our Rabbi Moshe bar- Maimon, of blessed memory, has written that it is found written in one of the ancient idolatrous books that there was a man of the idolatrous prophets, and his name was Tammuz.' And he called to a certain king and commanded him to serve, the seven planets and the twelve signs. And that king put him to a violent death; and on the night of his death there weregathered together all the images from the ends of the earth to the Temple of Babel, to the golden image which was the image of the sun. Now this image was suspended between heaven and earth, and it fell down in the midst of the temple, and the images likewise (fell down) round about it, and it told them what had- befallen Tammuz the prophet. And the images all of them wept and lamented all the night; and, as it came to pass, in the morning all the images flew away to their own temples in the ends of the earth. And this was to them for an everlasting statute; at the beginning of the first day of the month Tammuz each year they lamented and wept over Tammuz. And some interpret Tammuz as the name of an animal, for they used to worship an image which they had, and the Targum of (the passage) ופגשו ציים את איים (Isa 34:14) is תמוזין בחתולין ויערערון.

But in most copies תמוזיןis written with two Yavs.” The book of the ancient idolaters from which Maimonides quotes is the now celebrated work on the agriculture of the Nabathseans, to which reference will be made hereafter. Ben-Melech gives no help, and Abendana merely quotes the explanations given by Rashi and Kimchi. 3. Modern Opinions. — The tradition recorded by Jerome, which identifies Tammuz with Adonis, has been followed by most subsequent commentators; among others, by Vatablus, Castellio, Cornelius a Lapide, Osiander, Caspar  Sanctius, Lavater, Villalpandus, Selden, Simonis, Calmet, and, in later times, bv J. D. Michaelis, Gesenius, Ben-Zeb, Rosenmiuller, Maurer, Ewald, Havernick, Hitzig, and Movers. Luther and others regarded Tammuz as a name of Bacchus. That Tammuz was the Egyptian Osiris, and that his worship was introduced into Jerusalem from Egypt, was held by Calvin, Piscator, Junius, Leusden, and Pfeiffer. This view depends chiefly upon a false etymology proposed by Kircher, which connects the word Tammuz with the Coptic tamut, to hide, and so makes it signify the hidden or concealed one; and therefore Osiris, the Egyptian king slain by Typho, whose loss was commanded by Isis to be yearly lamented in Egypt. The women weeping for Tammuz are in this case, according to Junius, the priestesses of Isis. The Egyptian origin of the name Tammuz has also been defended by a reference to the god Amuz, mentioned by Plutarch and Herodotus, who is identical with Osiris. There is good reason, however, to believe that Amuz is a mistake for Amun. That something corresponding to Tammuz is found in Egyptian proper names as they appear in Greek cannot be denied. Ταμώς, an Egyptian, appears in Thucydides (8, 31) as a Persian officer, in Xenophon (Anab. 1, 4, 2) as an admiral. The Egyptian pilot who heard the mysterious voice bidding him proclaim “Great Pan is dead” was called Θαμούς (Plutarch, Je Dect. Oraf. 17). The names of the Egyptian kings, Θούμμωσις, Τέθμωσις, and Θμῶσις, mentioned by Manetho (Josephus, Cont. Revelation 1, 14, 15), have in turn been compared with Tammuz; but, unless some more certain evidence be brought forward than is found in these apparent resemblances, there is little reason to conclude that the worship of Tammuz was of Egyptian origin.

The identification of Tammuz with an idolatrous prophet, which has already been given in a quotation from Maimonides, who himself quotes from the Agriculture of the Nabathceans, has been recently revived by Prof. Cholson, of St. Petersburg (Ueber Tammuz, etc; [St. Petersb. 1860]). An Arab writer of the 10th century, En-Nedim, in his book called Fihrist el-'Ulum, says (quoting from Abu Sa'id Wahb ben-Ibrahim) that in the middle of the month Tammuz a feast is held in honor of the god T'uiz. The women bewailed him because his lord slew him and ground his bones in a mill, and scattered them to the winds. In consequence of this the women ate nothing, during the feast, that had been ground in a mill (Chwolson, Die Ssabier, etc., 2, 27). Prof. Chwolson regards Ta'uiz as a corruption of Tammuz; but the most important passage, in his eyes, is from the old Babylonian book called the Agriculture of the Nabathceans, to which he  attributes a-fabulous antiquity. It was written, he maintains, by one Qfitam1, towards the end of the 14th century B.C., and was translated into Arabic by a descendant of the ancient Chaldeans, whose name was Ibn- Washiyyah. As Prof. Chwolson's theory has been strongly attacked, and as the chief materials upon which it is founded are not yet before the public, it would be equally premature to take him as an authority, or to pronounce positively against his hypothesis, though, judging from present evidence, we are inclined to be more than skeptical as to its truth. Quit'ami then, in that dim antiquity from which he speaks to us, tells the same story of the prophet Tammuz as has already been given in the quotation, from Kimchi. It was read in the temples after prayers to an audience who wept and wailed; and so great was the magic influence of the tale that Quit'ami himself, though incredulous of its truth, was unable to restrain his tears. A part, he thought, might be true, but it referred to an event so far removed by time from the age in which he lived that he was compelled to be skeptical on many points. His translator, Ibn-Washiyyah, adds that Tammuz belonged neither to the Chaldaeans nor to the Canaanites, nor to the Hebrews nor to the Assyrians, but to the ancient people of Janban. This last, Chwolson conjectures, may be the Shemitic name given to the gigantic Cushite aborigines of Chaldea, whom the Shemitic Nabathaeans found when they first came into the country, and from whom they adopted certain elements of their worship. Thus Tammuz, or Tammuzi, belongs to a religious epoch in Babylonia which preceded the Shemitic (id. Ueberreste d. altbabyl. Lit. p. 19). Ibn-Washiyyah says, moreover, that all the Sabians of his time, both those of Babylonia and of Harran, wept and wailed for Tammuz in the month which was named after him, but that none of them preserved ally tradition of the origin of the worship. This fact alone appears to militate strongly against the truth of Ibn-Washiyyah's story as to the manner in which he discovered the works he professed to translate. It has been due to Prof. Chwolson's reputation to give in brief the substance of his explanation of Tammuz; but it must be confessed that he throws little light upon the obscurity of the subject.

It seems perfectly clear from what has been said that the name Tammuz affords no clue to the identification of the deity whom it designated. The slight hint given by the prophet of the nature of the worship and worshippers of Tammuz has been sufficient to connect them with the yearly mourning for Adonis by the Syrian damsels. Beyond this we can attach no special weight to the explanation of Jerome. It is a conjecture,  and nothing more, and does not appear to represent any tradition. All that can be said, therefore, is that it is not impossible that Tammuz may be a name of Adonis, the sun-god, but that there is nothing to prove it. It is true, however, that the name of Adonis does occur in Phoenician inscriptions (אָדוֹנַי, see Gesenius, Monum. Paen. 2, 400), and the coincidences of the ancient notices above and the mode of worship detailed below with the language of Ezekiel afford the most plausible interpretation hitherto offered.

4. Ceremonies of the Cultus. — There was a temple at Amathus, in Cyprus, shared by Adonis and Aphrodite (Pausan. 9:41, 2); and the worship of Adonis is said to have come from Cyprus to Athens in the time of the Persian war (Apollodor. 3, 14,4; Pausan. 2, 20,5; Ovid, Metam. 10:725; Philostr. Apoll. 7:32; Plutarch, Alcib. c. 18; Athen. 15:672; Aristoph. Pax, 420). But the town of Byblos, in Phcenicia, was the headquarters of the Adonis worship (Hamaker, Miscell. Pheanic. p. 125). The feast in his honor was celebrated each year in the temple of Aphrodite (said to have been founded by Kinyras, the reputed father of Adonis) on the Lebanon (Lucian, De Dea Syra, § 6) with rites partly sorrowful, partly joyful. The emperor Julian was present at Antioch when the same festival was held (Amm. Marc. 22:9, 13). It lasted seven days (20, 1), the period of mourning among the Jews (Sir 22:12; Gen 1:10; 1Sa 31:13; Jdt 16:24), the Egyptians (Heliodor. Eth. 7:11), and the Syrians (Lucian, De Dea Syra, § 52), and began with the disappearance (ἀφανισμός) of Adonis. Then followed the search (ζήτησις) made by the women after him. His body was represented by a wooden image placed in the so-called “gardens of Adonis” (Α᾿δώνιδος κῆποι), which were earthenware vessels filled with mould, and planted with wheat, barley, lettuce, and fennel. They were exposed by the women to the heat of the sun at the house-doors or in the “Porches of Adonis,” and the withering of the plants was regarded as symbolical of the slaughter of the youth by the fire-god Mars. In one of these gardens Adonis was found again, whence the fable says he was slain by the boar in the lettuce (ἀφάκη = Aphaca?), and was there found by Aphrodite. The finding again (εὕρεσις) was the commencement of a wake, accompanied by all the usages which in the East attend such a ceremony-prostitution, cutting off the hair (comp. Lev 19:28-29; Lev 21:5; Deu 14:1), cutting the breast with knives (Jer 16:6), and playing on pipes (comp. Mat 9:23). The image of Adonis was then washed and anointed with spices  placed in a coffin on a bier, and the wound made by the boar was shown on the figure. The people sat on the ground round the bier, with their clothes rent (comp. Ep. of Jeremiah 31, 32), and the women howled and cried aloud. The whole terminated with a sacrifice for the dead, and the burial of the figure of Adonis (see Movers, Phonizier, I, 7). According to Lucian, some of the inhabitants of Byblos maintained that the Egyptian Osiris was buried among them, and that the mourning and orgies were' in honor of him, and not of Adonis (De Dea Syra, § 7).

This is in accordance with the legend of Osiris as told by Plutarch (De Is. et Os.). Lucian further relates that on the same day on which the women of Byblos every year mourned for Adonis, the inhabitants of Alexandria sent them a letter, enclosed in a vessel which was wrapped in rushes or papyrus, announcing that Adonis was found. The vessel was cast into the sea, and carried by the current to Byblos (Procopius on Isaiah 18). It is called by Lucian βυβλίνην κεφαλήν, and is said to have traversed the distance between Alexandria and Byblos in seven days. Another marvel related by the same narrator is that of the River Adonis (Nahr Ibrahim), which flows down from the Lebanon, arid once a year was tinged with blood, which, according to the legend, came from the wounds of Adonis (comp. Milton, Par. Lost, 1, 460); but a rationalist of Byblos gave him a different explanation, how that the soil of the Lebanon was naturally very red-colored, and was carried down into the river by violent winds, and so gave a bloody tinge to the water; and to this day, says. Porter (Handbook, p. 187), “after every storm that breaks upon the brow of Lebanon the Adonis still ‘runs purple to the sea.' The rushing waters tear from the banks red soil enough to give them a ruddy tinge, which poetical fancy, aided by popular credulity, converted into the blood of Thammuz.” The time at which these rites of Adonis were celebrated is a subject of much dispute. It is not so important with regard to the passage in Ezekiel, for there does not appear to be any reason for supposing that tile time of the prophet's vision was coincident with the time at which Tammuz was worshipped.. Movers, who maintained the contrary, endeavored to prove that the celebration was in the late autumn, the end of the Syrian year, and corresponded with the time of the autumnal equinox. He relies chiefly for his conclusion on the account given by Ammianus Marcellirius (22, 9,13) of the Feast of Adonis, which was held at Antioch when the emperor Julian entered the city. It is clear, from a letter of the emperor's (Ep. Jul. 52), that he was in Antioch before Aug. 1, and his entry may therefore have taken place in July, the Tammuz of the Syrian year. This time agrees, moreover, with the explanation of the  symbolical meaning of the rites given by Ammianus Marcellinus (22, 9,15) that they were a token of the fruits cut down in their prime. Now at Aleppo (Russell, Aleppo, 1, 72) the harvest is all over before the end of June, and we may fairly conclude that the same was the case at Antioch. Add to this that in Hebrew astronomical works תקופת תמוז, tekuphath Tammuz, is the “summer solstice;” and it seems more reasonable to conclude that the Adonis feast of the Phoenicians and Syrians was celebrated rather as the summer solstice than as the autumnal equinox. At this time the sun begins to descend among the wintry signs (Kenrick, Phonicia, p. 310),

See, in addition to the above literature, and that cited under ADONIS, Simonis, De Significatione Thammuz (Hal. 1744); Meursii Adonia, in Gronov. Thesaur. 7:208 sq.; Mercersb. Review, Jan. 1860; Christian Remembrancer, April, 1861.

## Tan[[@Headword:Tan]]

             SEE DRAGON.

## Tanach[[@Headword:Tanach]]

             (Jos 21:25). SEE TAANACH.

## Tanaim[[@Headword:Tanaim]]

             SEE SCRIBES, JEWISH.

## Tanchelm[[@Headword:Tanchelm]]

             (TANCHELIN, TANQUELIN), a fanatic who lived in the 11th century, and was identified with the opposition current in that age against the ecclesiasticism then prevailing. We are told that he despised the Church and the clergy, from the pope downward, and claimed that the true Church inhered in him and his followers; that the priestly station has no influence upon the sacrament of the eucharist, worth and sanctity being the only efficient qualifications of the minister. He declared himself to be possessed of the Holy Ghost, and even to be God, as Christ is God; and he affianced himself with the Virgin Mary, whose image he presented to the vision of the assembled multitude, demanding sponsalia, which were readily contributed. Water in which he had bathed was distributed for drinking purposes, with the assurance that its use formed a sacred and powerful sacrament to the good of the body as well as the soul. Tanchelm's followers were chiefly drawn from the lower classes of society, and were mostly women. His operations were carried on along the coast of the Netherlands, and particularly in Utrecht, where disturbances were occasioned which called forth the successful interference of archbishop Frederick of Cologne. Tanchelm then removed to Bruges and Antwerp, where he caused still greater tumults than at Utrecht, and was killed on shipboard by a priest in A.D. 1124 or-1125. His sect continued to exist somewhat longer, but was ultimately scattered or reclaimed to the Church. See Hahn, Gesch. d. Ketzer in Mittelalter (Stuttg. 1845), 1, 459 sq.; Okken, Diss. de Priva Rel. Christ. Med. Evo inter Nederlandos, etc. (Groning. 1846), p. 43 sq.; Ep. Traj. Eccl. ad Fridericum, Archiepiscopum Colon., in Tengnagel, Coll. Vet. Monum. contra Schismaticos (Ingolst. 1612), p. 368 sq.; Du Plessis d'Argentre, Coll. Jud. de Novis Erroribus, etc. (Paris, 1728), 1, 11 sq. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Tanchelmians[[@Headword:Tanchelmians]]

             SEE TANCHELM.

## Tanchum[[@Headword:Tanchum]]

             (OF JERUSALEM) BEN-JOSEF, also called “R. Tanchum Jerushalmi” of Haleb, flourished about A.D. 1265-80. The first who made Tanchum's name known to the learned world was the famous scholar Schnurrer, who in 1791 published ch. 1-12 of Tanchum's Arabic commentary on Judges: R. Tanchumi Hierosolymitani ad Libros V. T. Commentarii Arabici Specimen una cum Annotationibus ad aliquot Loca Libri Judicum (Tübingen, 1791). Since that time his exegetical works have been brought to light, though nothing of his life is known except that he must have lived shortly after the devastation of Palestine by the Mongolians, A.D. 1260. He wrote a commentary in Arabic on the whole Old Test., entitled כתאב אלביאן, i.e. The Book of Exposition, of which the following are still extant in MS. at the Bodleian Library: a. the commentary on the earlier prophets, i.e. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings (Cod. Pocock 314); b. commentaries on Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the minor prophets (Cod. Pocock 344); c. commentaries on the five Megilloth (i.e. Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations. Ecclesiastes, and Esther) and Daniel (Cod. Pocock 320); d. כתאב אלשרח אלהפטרות, i.e. The Haphtaroth, or Lessons from the Prophets, translated into Arabic (Cod. Hunt. 607). These commentaries are preceded by elaborate introductions treating on the general import of Holy Writ. Besides the commentary on Lamentations, מן כתאב אלביאן שרח ספר קינות, which has been edited by W. Cureton, Tanchumi Hierosolymitani Comm. Arabicus in Lamentationes e Codice unico Bodleiano Literis Hebraicis exarato. Descripsit Charactere Arabico et edidit (Lond. 1843), the following portions have been published: 1. Commentary on Joshua, edited by Haarbrücker, in the Wissenschtciliche Blatter aus der Veitel-Heine-Ephraim'schen Lehranstalt (Berlin, 1862); 2. on Judges, in part by Schnurrer, ch. 1-12, and ch. 13-21 by Haarbrucker (Halle, 1847); 3. on Samuel and Kings, by Haarbrücker (Leipsic, 1844); 4. on Habakkuk, with a French translation by Dr. Munk (Paris, 1843, in Cahen's Bible, vol. 13). “R. Tanchum's contributions to Biblical exegesis,” says Dr. Ginsburg, “are very important to its history. His commentaries are based upon the literal and grammatical meaning of the text. He frequently avails himself of the labors of Hai Gaon, Danash ibn-Librat, Ibn-Chajug,  Ibn-Ganach, Ibn-Ezra, Maimonides, etc.; rejects the traditional interpretations (comp. comm. on Jdg 12:7; Jdg 20:28); transposes sundry portions of the sacred narratives, so as to point out their chronological order (comp. Jdg 18:1; Jdg 20:28), and, like Maimonides, distinguishes different degrees and kinds of prophecy (comp. Jdg 6:34; Jdg 13:1; Jdg 20:28).” He also wrote an Arabic Lexicon to the Mishna, entitled אלמרשד אלכאפי, i.e. A Sufficient Guide, treating on the relation of the language of the Mishna and of Maimonides ald ha-Chazaka. There are four different MSS. of this work in the Bodleian Library, viz. Cod. Pocock 297, written by Saadia ben-Jacob in 1388; Cod. Hunt. 129, by Saadia ben-David in 1451; Cod. Hunt. 621, by Solomo ben-David ben- Binjamin in 1393; and Cod. Pocock 215. 216, 229, written in 1449. He also wrote a Grammar of the Old Test. Hebrew, quoted by Tanchum himself, but which has not yet come to light. See De Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl.), p. 145 sq.; Kitto, Cyclop. s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2, 56 sq.; Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodl. col. 2666- 2669; Ewald, Beitrdge zur Gesch. d. dltesten Aisleguig u. Spracherklirung des A. Test. (Stuttgart, 1844), 1, 151 sq.; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden (Leipsic, 1873), 7:144 sq.; Etheridge, Introd. to Heb. Literature, p. 44; Keil, Introd. to the Old Test. 2, 384 sq.; Bleek, Eiznleitugn in das Alte Test. p. 106; Goldziher, Studien über Tanchuns Jeruschalmi (Lei psic, 1870), Geiger, Judische Zeitschriff, 1862, p. 193; 1871, p. 199; Gratz, Monatsschrift, 1870, p. 239, 285; Zuchold, Bibliotheca Theologica, 2, 1306. (B. P.)

## Tanchuma ben-Abba[[@Headword:Tanchuma ben-Abba]]

             who flourished A.D. 380, is the reputed author of the celebrated commentary on the Pentateuch called מדרש תנחומא, for which see the art. SEE MIDRASH. The latest edition is that published by E. Perlmutter (Stettin, 1864). See First, Bibl. Jud. 3, 409; Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodl. col. 2669; Gratz, Gesch. der Juden, 4:458, 558; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. i, 1159 sq.; 3, 1166 sq.; 4:1035; Zunz, Gottesd. Vortrdge (Berlin, 1832), p. 226-238; De Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl.), p. 307; id. Annales Hebraeo-typographici, p. 24. (B. P.)

## Tancred of Bologna[[@Headword:Tancred of Bologna]]

             was a most celebrated canonist of the 13th century (who must not be confounded with another Tancred of Corneto; comp. De Savigny, Gesch. d. rom. Rechts im Mittelalter [2d ed.], 5, 135, and p. 115, 116). His preceptors were Azo in Roman and Laurentius in canon law. In 1210 he was himself a teacher (decretorum magister) at Bologna, and entrusted with the management of important affairs by both the pope and the city. He belonged to the Chapter of Bologna, and in 1226 was made archdeacon by Hoiorius III, which position then included among its duties the supervision of promotions in the university. The year of his decease is not known, but it must have been prior to 1236 as the archdeaconate is then found to be in other hands (see Sarti, De Claris Archigynynasii Bononiens. Professoribus, pars 2, fol. 28, 29, 36, 37, 181). His literary remains include a Summa de Matrimonio, written between 1210 and 1213; first published, with numerous interpolations, by Simon Schard (Cologne, 1563), and again, in revised form, by Wunderlich (Göttingen, 1841): — an OrdoJudiciarius (OrdinariusTancredi), written about 1214, and afterwards revised in 1225. 1234, and often by unknown scholars. It was formerly believed that this work originated in about 1227, but the earlier date is now accepted. An edition of the work in its original form was issued by Bergmann (ibid. 1842). Tancred's lectures at Bologna were, among other matters, upon the collections of decretals received into the curriculum of Bologna after the close of Gratian's collection, and resulted in Apparatus, or commentaries, on the first three compilations. He had no part, however, in the preparation of the fifth ancient compilation. In addition to the above, there is extant of Tancred's works a manuscript list of bishoprics throughout the Church, arranged in the order of provinces (De Savigny, ut sup. p. 117, 118). See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Tancred, Christopher[[@Headword:Tancred, Christopher]]

             an English benefactor, was the son of Sir Richard Tancred, and died unmarried in 1754, leaving his house and estate at Whixley for the maintenance of twelve decayed gentlemen who had borne arms in the  service of their country. He also founded four medial exhibitions at Caius College; four in divinity at Christ's College, Cambridge; and four law studentships at Lincoln's Inn.

## Tanhumeth[[@Headword:Tanhumeth]]

             [some Tanhu'meth] (Heb. Tanchu'meth, תִּנְחֻמֶת, consolation; Sept. Θαναμάθ or Θαναεμέθ ‘v.r. Θανεμάθ, etc.; Vulg. Thanehumeth) the father (Fürst says mother, as the name is fem.) of Seraiah, in the time of Gedaliah (2Ki 25:23, where he appears as a Netophathite by the clerical omission of another name, as is evident from the parallel passage, Jer 40:8). B.C. ante 582.

## Tanis[[@Headword:Tanis]]

             (Τάνις, the Greek form (Judith 1, 10) of the Egyptian city Zoan (q.v.).

## Tankerfield, George[[@Headword:Tankerfield, George]]

             an English martyr, was a native of York, and followed the occupation of a cook. Seeing the great cruelty shown by the papists under queen Mary, he began to doubt their doctrines and to abhor them. After study, reflection, and prayer, he abjured popery, whereupon he was arrested and taken to Newgate, in February, 1555. Being summoned before bishop Bonner, he declared his convictions concerning auricular confession, the mass, etc. He was sentenced to death, and was burned at the stake Aug. 26. See Milner's Fox, Hist. of Christ. Martyrdom, 2, 770.

## Tanner[[@Headword:Tanner]]

             (βυρσεύς, Hebraized in the Talmud as בורסי, also בורסקי), the occupation of Simon of Joppa (Act 9:43; Act 10:6; Act 10:32). This trade, on account of the bad smell connected with it (comp. Schol. on Aristoph. Eq. 44; Petron. Sat. 11), was despised among the Jews (Kethuboth, 7:10; Megillah, 3, 2; see Schöttgen, Hor. Heb. i, 447; Wettstein, N.T. 2, 516). Those who followed it were called by the Greeks βυρσοδρέψαι, in Latin coriarii, subo7tarii (Guter, Inscript. p. 1548, No. 8). They usually had their work-place outside the cities (Artemid. 1, 51; Mishna, Baba Batihra, 2, 9), or on streams or the sea (Act 10:6). See Walch, Dissert. in Act. Apost. 2, 101 sq. — Winer. SEE MECHANIC. The ancient Egyptians used the bark of various trees for tanning (Wilkinson, 2. 106). SEE LEATHER. The tanneries of Joppa are now on the shore south of the cit(Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 281). Several circumstances, however, confirm the tradition of the present “house of Simon” there (Stanley, Palest. p. 269). SEE SIMON.

## Tanner (2)[[@Headword:Tanner (2)]]

             the name of several theological scholars and writers.

1. ADAM, born at Innsbruck in 1572, a Jesuit, lectured on theology at Ingolstadt and Vienna, was made chancellor of the University of Prague, and died March 25, 1632, at Unken. He wrote, Bericht uber die Disputation zu Regensburg, 1601 (Munich, 1602): — Theologia Scholastica (4 vols.): — Anatomia Confessionis Augustance: — Apologia  pro Societate Jesu (Vienna, 1618):Disputationes Theologie in Summam Thomae : — Astrologia Sacra (Ingolstadt, 1621).

2. CONRAD, born at Schwyz Dec. 28,1752, was made abbot of Einsiedeln in 1808, and died April 7, 1825. He wrote. Die Bildung des Geistlichen durch Geistesübunqen (Augsburg, 1807, 2 vols.; 6th ed. 1847): — Berachtungen zur sittlichen Aufklärung im 19ten Jahrhundert (ibid. 1804): — Betrachtungen uaf die Feste des Herrn und der Heiligen (ibid. 1829 sq.).

3. MATTHIAS, born at Pilsen in 1630, a Jesuit, was professor of philosophy and theology, and was sent to Rome in 1675 as procurator of his order. He died about 1705. He wrote, Cruentum Christi Sacriticium Incruenio Missae Sacrificio explicatum (Prague, 1669): — Contra Omnes impie Agentes in Locis Sacris [Latin and Bohemian] : — Societas Jesusque ad Sanguinis et Vitae Profusionem Militans [a glorification of the Jesuitic mission] (ibid. 1675; in Gernman, 1683); similar. is Sociefas Jesu Apostolorum Imitatrix sive Gesta Praeclara et Virtutes, etc. [Latin and German] (ibid. 1694 and 1701): Historia Montis Oliveti in Moravia ad Strambergam Siti [Bohemian] (ibid. 1666). (B. P.)

4. THOMAS, an English divine and antiquary, was born at Market Lavington, Wiltshire, in 1674. He entered Queens College, Oxford in 1689; was admitted clerk in 1690; graduated in 1693; entered holy orders at Christmas, 1694; became chaplain of All-Souls' College in January following; fellow of the same in 1697; and chancellor of Norfolk and rector of Thorpe, near Norwich, in 1706, He was installed prebendary of- Ely Sept. 10, 1713; archdeacon of Norfolk Dec. 7, 1721; canon of Christ Church Feb. 3, 1723; prolocutor of the House of Convocation in 1727; and was consecrated bishop of St. Asaph Jan. 23,1732. He died at Christ. Church, Oxford, Dec. 14, 1735. After his death appeared, Notitia Monastica, or an Account of all the Abbeys, Priories, etc., formerly in England and Wales, etc., with additions by the Rev. John Tanner (Lond. 1744, fol.; Camb. 1787, fol.) : Bibliotheca Britannico Hiberaica, sive de Scriptoribus, qui in Anglia, etc. (Lond. 1748, fol.; 250 copies).

See Theologisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v.; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen- Lexikon, s.v.; Regensburger Conversations-Lexikon, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theolog. Littérateur, 1, 124; 2, 46, 797; Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Hook, Eccles. Biog. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer.  Authors, s.v. On Adam Tanner, see also Werner, Gesch. der kathol. Theol. seit demn trident. Concil. (Munich, 1866), p. 7,17, 25.

## Tanquelmians[[@Headword:Tanquelmians]]

             SEE TANCHELMIANS.

## Tantalus[[@Headword:Tantalus]]

             a Greek mythological character, was, according to some, a son of Zeus, or, according to others, of T'molus. All traditions agree in stating that he was a wealthy king, but assign him to different kingdoms, as Lydia, Sipylus, in Plhrygia or Paphlagonia, and Argos or Corinth. Tantalus is peculiarly celebrated in ancient story for the severe punishment inflicted upon him after his death. The following are some of the traditions, of which the most common is that Zeus invited him to his table and communicated his divine counsels to him. Tantalus divulged these secrets, and the gods punished him by placing him in the midst of a lake, of which he could never drink, the water always withdrawing when he stooped. Branches laden with fruit hung temptingly near, but withdrew whenever he reached after them. Over his head there was suspended a huge rock ever threatening to crush him. Another tradition relates that, wishing to try the gods, he cut his son Pelops in pieces, boiled them, and set them before the gods as a repast. A third account states that Tantalus stole nectar and ambrosia from the table of the gods, and gave them to his friends; while a fourth relates the following story. Rhea caused the infant Zeus and his nurse to be guarded by a golden dog, whom subsequently Zeus appointed guardian of his temple in Crete. Pandrerus stole the dog, and carrying him to Mount Sipylus, in Lydia, gave him to Tantalus to take care of. But when Pandaerus demanded the dog back, Tantalus took an oath that he had never received him. The punishment of Tantalus was proverbial in ancient times, and from it the English language has borrowed the verb "to tantalize," that is, to hold out hopes or prospects which can never be realized. SEE IXION.

## Tantras[[@Headword:Tantras]]

             (from tansu tan, to believe) are the sacred writings of the Hinduls, which are said to have been composed by Siva, and bear the same relation to the votaries of Siva that the Puranas do to the votaries of Vishnu. The Saiva sect look upon the Tantras as the fifth Veda, and attribute to them equal  antiquity and superior authority. The observances they prescribe have, indeed, in Bengal, almost superseded the original ritual. The date of the first composition is involved in considerable obscurity; but professor Wilson thinks that the system originated early in the Christian mera, being founded on the previous worship of the female principle and the practices of the Yoga, with the Mantras or mystical formulae of the Vedas. The principal Tantras are the Syamarahasya, Rudrayamala, Mantramahodadhi, Saradatilaka, and Kalikatantra. Rammohun Roy alleges, in his Apology for Vedantic Theism, that among the Tantras there are forged works and passages, published as if genuine, "with the view of introducing new doctrines, new rites, or new precepts of secular law." Some of the Tantras appear to have been written chiefly in Bengal, and in the eastern districts of Hindustan, being unknown in the west and south, and the rites they teach having there failed to set aside the ceremonies of the Vedas, although they are not without an important influence upon the belief and practices of the people. The Saktas (q.v.) derive the principles of their sect, and their religious ceremomies, wholly from the Tantras, and hence are often called Tantraists.

## Tantum Ergo[[@Headword:Tantum Ergo]]

             (So great therefore). The concluding part of the hymn for Corpus Christi day, entitled Pange lingua, which is sung in the Latin Church when the holy sacrament is exposed for the worship, and elevated for the benediction of the faithful.
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antumt ergo Sacramentum V

eneremur cernui: Et antiqum documentur N

ovo cedat ritui:
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ans et jubilatio,

 S
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 honor,

 virtus quoque,
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men."

## Taoists, Taoism[[@Headword:Taoists, Taoism]]

             SEE LAO-TZU.

## Tapers, Early Use of[[@Headword:Tapers, Early Use of]]

             It became customary at an early period to burn tapers in churches on various occasions. This was done during the reading of the gospel, and is partly excused by Jeromte. He says to Vigilantius, “We do not light candles in open day, therefore you slander us without reason.” He confesses, however, that some untaught laymen and simple religious women, “of whom we may certainly say that they have a zeal of God without knowledge,” do such a thing in honor of martyrs; but he asks, What is the harm? And then he refers to a custom prevalent in the East: “In all churches of the East they light tapers, without any respect to the relics of martyrs, when the gospel is to be read, even when the sun shines brightly; which is done, not for the sake of giving light, but as an expression of joy. Hence the virgins in the Gospel had their lamps lighted; and the apostles were warned to let their loins be girded about, and their lights burning.' Hence it is said, of John also, ‘He was a burning and a shining light.' Also under the figure of a material light is represented that light of which we read in the Psalter, Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path.” But the superstition spread, and during the ceremony of baptism tapers were placed in the hands of the baptized, if adults; if they were infants, in the hands of the sponsors. These tapers were said to be emblematical of the illuminating power of the sacrament. Also at the eucharist we find the same custom. Tapers were also used at marriages; and in funeral processions carried before and behind the coffin. — Farrar, Eccles. Dict. s.v.

The altar tapers were used in those candlesticks which are placed on or about the altar; ordinarily those which were lighted during the office of the Christian sacrifice. Custom in the West expects that at least two be lighted,  even at low celebrations; at high celebrations, in the Latin Church, as also in some English churches, six tapers are ordinarily lighted. They symbolize (1) the fact that our Savior, “God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God,” is the true Light of the world. They are also (2) symbols of joy and gladness on the part of the faithful that Christ is born into the world (a) naturally, (b) sacramentally, i.e. in the eucharistic mystery. A seventh taper is added if the bishop of the diocese celebrates a solemn pontifical mass; even twelve or twenty-one are sometimes used.

## Tapestry[[@Headword:Tapestry]]

             The Church of the Middle Ages required for various purposes a great number of tapestries for dorsalia at the back of the choir-stalls, for closing the doors and windows, for the protecting enclosures of the altars, for the veiling of the sanctuary during the fast-time (fasting-cloths), and especially for clothing the walls and the floor. At first the tapestry came from the East, until, in the 4th century, a tapestry manufactory was formed at Palermo, which, under the hands of Saracen and Byzantine workmen, imitated the Oriental patterns. These old silk webs, of which we find remains here and there in collections, show a strictly architectonic style, and are covered with figures of animals of a typical character, such as griffins, unicorns, lions, elephants, peacocks, and parrots. In the northern cloisters, tapestry-weaving was learned and soon practiced, even from the beginning of the Romanesque period, and the circle of representations was increased by Biblical and symbolical scenes, to which were added representations out of favorite poets. Tapestry embroidery was an occupation followed with zeal in the nunneries. From the 14th century, carpets painted with size-colors on linen were also made. With the entrance of Gothic art, there appears in use a friezelike composition, hand in hand with a naive naturalistic border, which drives out the severe style of the earlier times. Interesting tapestries of the Romanesque period, partly with antique mythological representations, are to be seen in the treasury of the collegiate church at Quedlinburg; others of the same time, with Christian representations, in the cathedral at Halberstadt, intended for the backs of choir-stalls. A complete selection of tapestries is in the monastery of Wienhausen, near Zell, one of them as embroidery with the history of Tristan and Isolde; others in the St. Elizabeth Church at Marburg, in St. Sebald and St. Lorenz, at Nuremberg, and in many church treasuries.

## Taphath[[@Headword:Taphath]]

             (Heb. Taphath', טָפִת, ornament; Sept. Τεφάθ v.r. Ταφατά; Vulg. Tapheth), Solomon's daughter, and wife of Abihadab, his commissariat in the district of Dor (1Ki 4:11). B.C. cir. 1000.

## Taphnes[[@Headword:Taphnes]]

             (Ταφνάς), a Graecized form (Judith 1, 9) of the Egyptian city TAPANHEH SEE TAPANHEH (q.v.).

## Taphon[[@Headword:Taphon]]

             (ἡ Τεφώ); Josephus, Τοχόα or Τοχόαν; Vulg. Thopo; Syr. Tefos), one of the cities in Judmae fortified by Bacchides (1Ma 9:50). It is probably the BETH-TAPPUAIA SEE BETH-TAPPUAIA (q.v.) of the Old Test., which lay near Hebron. The form given by Josephus suggests Tekoa, but Grimm (Exeg. Handbuch) has pointed out that his equivalent for that name is Θεκωέ; and there is, besides, too much unanimity among the versions to allow of its being accepted.

## Tappan, Benjamin, D.D[[@Headword:Tappan, Benjamin, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, tile son of the Rev. David Tappan, professor of divinity in Harvard College, and grandson of Benjamin Tappan, pastor in Manchester, Mass., was born at West Newbury, Mass., Nov. 7,1788. He graduated at Harvard College in 1805, spent some time teaching at Woburn and Salem, and in 1809 became tutor at Bowdoin College, Me., which position he held for two years. In 1811 he was ordained over the Church in Augusta, Me., and continued pastor until he assumed the secretaryship of the Maine Missionary Society in 1849. His death took place Dec. 22, 1863. His ministry was eminently useful, and few men occupy a more prominent place in the history of Congregationalism in  Maine. He was vice-president of the board of Bowdoin College until his death, secretary of the Maine Missionary Society from 1849 to 1863, and trustee of Bangor Theological Seminary from 1825, of which he was a most liberal and steadfast friend, and a professorship in which he declined in 1829. Dr. Tappan was an immense worker, was noted for his hospitality and generosity, and his Christian character was one of beauty and strength. He was an effective preacher, and had a remarkable gift in prayer. Dr. Tappan was one of the pioneers in the temperance reform, preaching a sermon on the subject in 1813. Waterville College (now Colby University) conferred upon him the degree of D.D. in 1836, and Bowdoin in 1845. See Cong. Quarterly art. by his son Benjamin), 1865, p. 131-159.

## Tappan, David, D.D[[@Headword:Tappan, David, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Manchester, Mass., in 1753, graduated at Harvard College in 1771, and was ordained in April, 1774, pastor at Newbury, Mass., where he remained until inaugurated professor of divinity at Harvard College, Dec. 26,1792, which position he retained until his death, Aug. 27,1803. He published, Two Friendly Letters to Philalethes (1785): — An Address to the Students of Andover Academy (1791): — An Address to Andover Students (1794): — and a large number of occasional Sermons; After his death were published Lectures on Jewish Antiquities (1807): — Sermons on Important Subjects (1807). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 2, 97.

## Tappan, Henry Philip, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Tappan, Henry Philip, D.D., LL.D]]

             a distinguished educator, was born at Rhinebeck on the Hudson, April 23, 1805. He graduated from Union College in 1825, and from Auburn Theological Seminary in 1827; became assistant to the Reverend Dr. Van Vechten, in the Reformed Dutch Church at Schenectady; the next year was settled as pastor of the Congregational Church at Pittsfield, Massachusetts; and in 1831 was compelled by ill-health to resign. In 1832 he was appointed professor of moral and intellectual philosophy in the University of the City of New York, and resigned in 1838. During the next few years  he spent most of his time in writing books and conducting a private seminary in New York city. He published, A Review of Edward's Inquiry into. the Freedom of the Will (1839): — The Doctrine of the Freedom of the Will Determined by an Appeal to Consciousness (1840): — The Doctrine of the Freedom of the Will applied to Moral Agency and Responsibility (1841): — Elements of Logic, with an Introductory View of Philosophy in General, and a Preliminary View of the Reason (1844): — a treatise on University Education (1851). In the latter year he went to Europe, and on his return in 1852 published A Step from the New World to the Old. He was president of the University of Michigan from 1852 to 1863, and gave it a new life by his administration. After his retirement from this school he lived almost entirely abroad, and died November 15, 1881, at Vevay, Switzerland.

## Tappan, William Bingham[[@Headword:Tappan, William Bingham]]

             an American divine, was born at Beverly, Mass., in 1794, entered the service of the American Sunday-school Union in 1826, and continued this connection until his death, at West Needham, Mass., in 1849. He published, among other poetical works, Poetry of the Heart (Worcester, 1845. 12mo). — Sacred and Miscellaneous Poems (Boston, 1846, 16mo): — Poetry of Life (ibid. 1847, 16mo): — The Sunday-school and other Poems (ibid. 1848, 16mo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Tappuah[[@Headword:Tappuah]]

             [some Tappu'ah] (Heb. Tappu'ach, תִּפּוּח[in 1Ch 2:43, תִּפְּח, an apple, as often; Sept. Τάφου, Ταφούτ, Θαφέθ, Θαφφού, etc., and  twice [Jos 15:34; Jos 17:8] omits; Vulg. Taphucu), the name of a man and also of two places in Palestine. SEE APPLE.

1. Second named of the four sons of Hebron of the lineage of Caleb (1 Chronicles 2, 43); not to be confounded with either of the following (see Keil, ad loc.). B.C. ante 1618.

2. A town in the lowland district of Judah, mentioned between Engannim and Enam (Jos 15:34), in the group situated in the N.W. corner (see Keil, ad loc.); differs from the Beth tappuah (q.v.) of Jos 15:53, but probably the same with the royal city of the Canaanites (Jos 12:17), conquered by the Israelites (see Keil, ad loc.). It is perhaps the present Beita tab, an important place on a conspicuous hill, about half-way from Jerusalem to Beit-Jebrin. It contains about 600 or 700 inhabitants, is built of stone, and has a ruined tower or castle (Robinson, Bibl. Res. 2, 13). This is apparently the place meant by Schwarz (Palest. p. 102) by “the village Beth-Tapa, five English miles N.W. [ten N.E.] of Beit-Jibrin.”

3. A town in the tribe of Ephraim, near the border of Manasseh, in which latter the adjacent territory (“land of Tappuah”) lay (Jos 16:8; Jos 17:8); probably containing a fine spring, and hence called (Jos 17:7) EN-TAPPUAR SEE EN-TAPPUAR (q.v.). It is no doubt, as suggested by Van de Velde (Memoir,' p. 351), although this is disputed by Keil (Comment. ad loc.), the same as the present ‘Atuf, a deserted village about four hours N.E. by E. of Nablis, with traces of antiquity and ancient wells of excellent water. Schwarz also states that “at the present day the Arabs call the country between Nablds and the Jordan Balad-tapuach, as probably the town of this name was formerly in it” (Palest. p. 89). SEE TRIBE.

## Tappuah (2)[[@Headword:Tappuah (2)]]

             The present Tuffah, which probably represents Beth-tappuah (Jos 15:53), is briefly described in the Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey (3:310). Beit-Ata, which we have conjectured to be the Tappuah of Jos 12:11; Jos 15:34, is copiously described, ibid. page 22 sq., 83; but Tristram suggests (Bible Places, page 48) for the latter Biblical site the present ArtuJ; which lies three and a half miles to the north-west of Beit- Atah, and one and a quarter miles south-east of Surah (Zorah). It is described in the above Memoirs (3:22) as "a small village on a low hill, with an open valley to the nwest. There is a pool in the valley, where the village obtains its water.Olive-trees occur around the place. "There do not seem to be any traces of antiquity. The third Tappuah, or that of-Ephraim (Jos 16:8; Jos 17:8), or Ein-tappuah, is conceded bv Tristram (ut sup. page 195) to be the modern Atuf, but to this Conder objects (Memoirs, 2:357) that there is no spring and no tombs, and that the names have but one letter in common. The place is "a mud village, built on an older site, and supplied by wells and cisterns" (ibid. page 227).

## Tarah[[@Headword:Tarah]]

             (Heb. Te'rach, תֶּרִח [in pause Tdrach, טָרִח], wandering or delay; Sept. Ταράθ v.r. Θαράθ; Vulg. Thaire), a station of the Israelites in the desert, situated between Tahath and Mithcah (Num 33:27); perhaps in the great Wady el-Jerafeh, opposite Mount Hor. SEE EXODE.

## Taralah[[@Headword:Taralah]]

             [some Tara'lah] (Heb. Taratlah', תִּרְאֲלָה, reeling; Sept. Θαραλά v.r. Θαρεηλά; Vulg. Thairem), a town in the western section of the tribe of Benjamin, mentioned between Irpeel and Zelah (Jos 18:27).  Schwarz suggests (Palest. p. 128) that it “is perhaps the village' Thaniel=Thariel, in the neighborhood of Lod,” probably meaning Neby Daniyal, two miles south of Lud; but the name has little resemblance, and the territory of Beniamin did not reach so far west. It is possibly represented by the modern village Beit-Tirza, in Wady Ahmed, just north of Beit-Jala, with a well adjacent and several ruined sites in the vicinity.

## Tarasius[[@Headword:Tarasius]]

             patriarch of Constantinople, was a zealous and active supporter of image- worship in the time of the empress Irene. SEE ICONOCLASM.

He first held the secular position of secretary of state, but was chosen, though a layman, to fill the patriarchal office by both the court and the people (A.D. 784). His election gave great offence to Rome, but he was eventually recognized by Hadrian I on the ground of his avowed intention to restore the worship of images in the Greek Church. A synod to promote the unifying of the Church of Constantinople with other churches, which he had suggested as a condition of his acceptance of the patriarchate, met in 785, but was compelled by a mob to adjourn to Nicea, where it reconvened in 787. In this body the papal legates were accorded the first place and the patriarch of Constantinople the second, and the latter heartily endorsed the new creed, which determined that worship, in the exercises of kissing, bowing the knee, illuminations, and burning of incense, should be rendered to the images of the human person of Christ and of Mary, the angels, apostles, prophets, and all saints; but not such worship as is due to the Divine Being only (Τὴν τιμητικὴν προσκύνησιν-οὐ μὴν τὴν ἀληθινὴν λατρείαν, ἣ πρέπει μόνῃ τῇ θείᾷ φύσει). All laws directed against the worship of images were anathematized. In his own person, Tarasius was also especially active in the work of converting the opponents of image-worship. In the matrimonial affairs of Constantine, the son of Irene, Tarasius played an unworthy part. He protested at first against the rejection of queen Maria and the substitution for her of Theodota, but soon gave way to the wishes of the court, and thereby came into collision with the monks, who regarded the emperor as excommunicated. Tarasius died in 806, and ranks among the saints of both the Greek and the Romish Church. His literary remains consist of letters and homilies (see. Walch, Entwufeiner vollst. Hist. d. Ketzereien, Spaltungen u. Religions streitigkeiten [Leips. 1782], 10:419-511). — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Tarbox, Increase Niles, D.D[[@Headword:Tarbox, Increase Niles, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at East Windsor, Connecticut, February 11, 1815. He graduated from Yale College in 1839, and from the Theological Seminary, in 1844; was a teacher at East Hartford in 1839-41, and, tutor at Yale College in 1842-44; pastor at Framingham, Massachusetts, in 1844-511 from 1851 till 1874 secretary of the American Education Society, and from 1874 to 1884 secretary of the American College and Education Society; thereafter without charge until his death, May 3, 1888. Dr. Tarbox was a member of the New England Historical and Genealogical Society, and its historiographer from 1881; one of the editors of the Congregationalist, 1849-51, and of the Congregational Quarterly, 1875-78. He published, Nineveh, a Buried City (1864): — Tyre and Alexandria (1866): — Missionary Patriots: Memoirs of James H. and Edward M. Schneider (1867): — Uncle George's Stories (1868, 4 volumes): — Winnie and Walter: Stories (1869, 4 volumes): — Life of Israel Putnam (1876): — Songs and Hymns for Common Life. (1885): — Diary of Thomas Robbins, D.D., with annotations (2 volumes). He also edited, with a Memoir, Sir Walter Raleigh's Colony in America (1884).

## Tarea[[@Headword:Tarea]]

             [some Tare'a] (Heb. Tare'd, תִּאְרֵע, by interchange of gutturals for Tahrea; Sept. Θαρεέ v.r. Θαράχ; Vulg. Tharaa), son of Micah in the lineage of king Saul (1Ch 8:35 ); elsewhere (9, 41) called TAHREA SEE TAHREA (q.v.).

## Tares[[@Headword:Tares]]

             (ζιζάνια; Vulg. zizania). There can be little doubt that the ζιζάνια of the parable (Mat 13:25) denote the weed called “darnel” (Lolium temulentum), a widely distributed grass, and the only species of the order that has deleterious properties. The word used by the evangelist is an Oriental, and not a Greek, term (the native Greek word seems to be αιρα, Dioscor. 2, 91). It is the Arabic zawân, the Syriac zizàna, and the zoni (זוֹנַין) of the Talmud (Mishna, 1, 109; see Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. s.v.). The derivation of the Arabic word from zân, “nausea,” is well suited to the character of the plant, the grains of which produce vomiting and purging, convulsions, and even death. Volhey (Trav. 2, 306) experienced the ill effects of eating its seeds; and “the whole of the inmates of the Sheffield work house were attacked some years ago with symptoms supposed to be produced by their oatmeal having been accidentally adulterated with lolium” (Engl. Cyclop s.v. “Lolium”).

The darnel before it comes into ear is very similar in appearance to wheat; hence the command that the zizania should be left to the harvest, lest while nen plucked up the tares “‘they should root up also the wheat with them.” Prof. Stanley, however (Sinai and Palest. p. 426), speaks of women and children picking out from the wheat in the cornfields of Samaria the tall green stalks, still' called by the Arabs zuwan. “These stalks,” he ‘continues, “if sown designedly throughout the fields, would be inseparable from the wheat, from which, even when growing naturally and by chance, they are at first sight hardly distinguishable.” See also Thomson (Land and Book, 2, 111): “The grain is just in the proper stage to illustrate the parable. In those parts where the grain has headed out, the tares have done the same, and then a child cannot mistake them for wheat or barley; but where both are less developed, the closest scrutiny will often fail to detect them. Even the farmers, who in this country generally weed their fields, do not attempt to separate the one from the other.” The grain-growers in Palestine believe that the zawân is merely  a legenerate wheat; that in wet seasons the wheat turns to tares. Dr. Thomson asserts that this is their fixed opinion. It is curious' to observe the retention of the fallacy through many ages. “Wheat and zunin,” says Lightfoot (Hor. Heb. on Mat 13:25), quoting from the Talmud, “are not seeds of different kinds.” See also Buxtorf (Lex. Talm. s.v. זוֹנין): “Zizania, species tritici degeneris, sic dicti, quod scortando cum bono tritico, in pejorem naturam degenerat.” The Roman writers (comp. “Infelix lolium,” Virgil, Georg. 1, 154) appear to have entertained a similar opinion with respect to some of the cereals. Thus Pliny (Hist. Nat. 18:17), borrowing probably from Theophrastus, asserts that “barley will degenerate into the oat.” The notion that the zizania of the parable are merely diseased or (egenerate wheat has been defended by Brederod (see his letter to Schultetus in Exercit. Evang. 2, 65), and strangely adopted by Trench, who (Notes on the Parables, p. 91, 4th ed.) regards the distinction of these two plants to be “a falsely assumed fact.” If the zizania of the parable denote the darnel, and there cannot be any reasonable doubt about it, the plants are certainly distinct, and the L. temulentum has as much right to specific distinction as any other kind of grass.

On the route from Beirat to Akka (1852), Dr. Robinson describes fields of wheat “of the most luxuriant growth, finer than which I had not before seen in this or any other country. Among these splendid fields of grain are still found the tares spoken of in the New Test. As described to me, they are not to be distinguished from the wheat until the ear appears. The seed resembles wheat in form, but is smaller and black. In Beirut, poultry are fed upon this seed, and it is kept for sale for that purpose. When not separated from the wheat, bread made from the flour often causes dizziness to those who eat of it” (Bibl. Res. 3, 55). The bearded darnel has the bad reputation of yielding the only deleterious grain among all the countless grasses. We are not aware that any injurious quality has been detected in the seeds of its own congeners, Lolium arvense, L. perenne, the rye-grasses so familiar to British husbandry; but if mixed with bread, L. temulentum occasions giddiness, nausea, difficulty of articulation, and other symptoms ranging from intoxication to paralysis, and instances are on record where mortification of the extremities, or even death, has ensued (see Burnett, Plantce Utiliores, vol. 3). Hence the French have named it icraie, or “tipsy-grass,” a word from which the English have dropped the first syllable, and bestowed it on those unoffending “ray” or ‘rye grasses,” by which the darnel is represented in our hay-fields. Thus understood, “how well do these ‘tares' represent those who make a false profession; who  appear among God's people; who draw near with their mouth, and honor God with their lips, but their heart is far from him (Isa 29:13; Mat 15:8; Mar 7:6) ! Both grow together, and at first may seem alike. Man cannot accurately distinguish between the true and the false; but at the great harvest-day the Lord will separate them. He will gather the wheat into his garner, while the tares shall be consumed” (Balfour, Bot. and Religo p. 251). See Kitto, Pict. Bible, ad loc.; Hackett, Ilustr. of'Script. p. 130; Calcott [Lady], Script. Herbal, p. 475 sq.; Tristram, Na Ht. s. of the Bible, p. 486; Bochelius, De Zizaniis in Eccles. Dei Disseminatis (Arg. 1661).

## Target[[@Headword:Target]]

             (כֹּידוֹן, kiddn, 1Sa 17:6, a spear, as usually rendered; צַנָּה, tsinnâh, 1Ki 10:16; 2Ch 9:15; 2Ch 14:8, a large shield, as usually rendered). SEE SHIELD.

## Targum[[@Headword:Targum]]

             (תִּרְגּוּם, i.e. translation, interpretation) is the name given to a Chaldee version or paraphrase of the Old Test., of which there are several extant.

I. Origin of the Targums. — The origin of the Chaldee paraphrase may be traced back to the time of Ezra. After the exile it became the practice to read the law in public to the people, with the addition of an oral paraphrase in the Chaldee dialect. Thus we read in Neh 8:8, מפורש ושום שכל ויקראו בספר בתורת האלהים, which expression the Talmud, Bab. Megillah, fol. 3, Colossians 1, explains מפורש זו תרגום, i.e. “to explain means Targum.” This ecclesiastical usage, rendered necessary by the change of language consequent on the captivity, was undoubtedly continued in aftertimes. It rose in importance, especially when the synagogues and public. schools began to flourish, the chief subject of occupation in which was the exposition of the Thorah. The office of the interpreter (מתורגמן, תורגמן, אמורא, less frequently דרשן, comp. Zunz, Die gottesd. Vortrage, p. 332) thus became one of the most important, and the canon of the Talmud, that as the law was given by a mediator, so it can be read and expounded only by a mediator, became paramount (Jerus. Megillah, fol. 74). The Talmud contains, even in its oldest portions, precise injunctions concerning the manner of conducting these expository prelections. Thus, “Neither the reader nor the interpreter  is to raise his voice one above the other;” “They have to wait for each other until each have finished his verse;”

“The methurgeman is not to lean against a pillar or a beam, but to stand with fear and with reverence;” “He is not to use a written Targum, but he is to deliver his translation viva voce;” “No more than one verse in the Pentateuch and three in the prophets shall be read or translated at a time ;” “That there should be not more than one reader and one interpreter for the law; while for the prophets one reader and one interpreter, or two interpreters, are allowed” (Mishna, Megillah, 4:5, 10; Sopherinm, 11:1). Again (Megillah, ibid., and Tosiphta, c. 3), certain passages liable to give offence to the multitude are specified, which may be read in the synagogue and translated; others which may be read but not translated; others, again, which may neither be read nor translated. To the first class belong the account of the creation— a subject not to be discussed publicly on account of its most vital bearing upon the relation between the Creator, and the Cosmos, and the nature of both; the deed of Lot and his two daughters (Gen 19:31); of Judah and Tamar (ch. 38); the first account of the making of the golden calf (Exodus 32); all the curses in the law; the deed of Amunon and Tamar (2 Samuel 13); of Absalom with his father's concubines (2Sa 16:22); the story of the woman of Gibeah (Judges 19). These are to be read and translated, or נקדאין ומתרגמין. To be read but not translated, נקראין ולא מתרגמין, are the deed of Reuben with his father's concubine (Gen 25:22); the latter portion of the story of the golden calf (Exodus 32); and the deed of David and Bathsheba (2Sa 11:12).

At what time these paraphrases were written down we cannot state; but it must certainly have been at an early period. Bearing in mind that the Hellenistic Jews had for a long time been in possession of the law translated into their language, and that in the 2nd century not only had the Jews themselves issued Greek versions in opposition to the Alexandrian version, which were received with decided approbation even by the Talmudists, as the repeated and honorable mention of Aquila in the Talmud proves, but that also the Syrians had been prompted to translate the Holy Scriptures, it would indeed be strange had not the Jews familiar with the Aramsean dialect also followed the practice at that time universally prevalent, and sought to profit by it. We have, in point of fact, certain traces of written Targums extant at least in the time of Christ. For even the  Mishna seems ‘to imply this in Yadacim, 4:5, where the subject treated is the language and style of character to be used in writing the Targums. Further, the Talmud, Shabbaih, fol. 115, Colossians 1, mentions a written Targum on Job of the middle of the 1st century (in the time of Gamaliel I), which incurred the disapprobation of Gamaliel. Zunz here justly remarks, “Since it is not likely that a beginning should have been made with Job, a still higher antiquity as very probably belonging to the first renderings of the law may be assumed” (loc. cit. p. 62). Gritz, in his Monatsschrift, 1877, p. 84, believes that this Targum of Job, mentioned four times in the Talmud, can only refer to a Greek translation of that book, and Derenbourg, in his Essai sur l' Histoire et la Geographie de la Palestine, p. 242, accounts for the action of Gamaliel, because it was written avec des caracteres non- hebraiques. But as Delitzsch, in Ioorne lebr. et Talmucd. (Zeitschrift für die luth. Theologieu. Kirche [Leips. 1878], p. 211), remarks,” תרגום כתבmeans ‘in Targum,' i.e. written in the Aramaean and refers not to the characters with which, but to the language in which, it was written. Gamaliel acted according to old principle, דברים שבעל פה אי אתה רשאי לכותכן, i.e. all that belongs to oral tradition was not to appear in written form. This principle included also the Targum, but it was not strictly observed, and, like the Mishna, so, also, Targums were clandestinely circulated in single copies. That this was the case we see from the fact that Gamaliel of Jabneh, the grandson of Gamaliel I or elder, having been found reading the Targum on Job, was reminded of the procedure of his grandfather, who had the copy of the Job Targum, which was brought to him while standing on the mountain of the Temple, immured in order to prevent its further use. Dr. Frarikl, in Die. Zusdtze in der Sept. zu Hiob (in Grlitz, Monatsschrift,. 1872, p. 313), says, “There is no doubt that the additions in the Sept. were made according to an old Aramaean Targum,” and in corroboration of his statement he quotes Tosiphta Shabbath, c. 14; Shabbath, fol. 115, Colossians 1; Jerus. Shabbath, 16, 1; Sopherin, v, 1.5. We are thus obliged to assume an early origin for the Targums, a fact which will be corroborated further on, in spite of the many objections raised, the chief of which, adduced by Eichhorn, being the silence of the Christian fathers, of whom none, not even Epiphanius or Jerome, mention the subject. But this silence is of little weight, because the fathers generally were ignorant of Hebrew and of Hebrew literature. Nor was any importance attached to them in comparison with Greek translations. Besides, in truth, the assertion in question is not even  supported by the facts of the case; for Ephraem Syrus, e.g., made use of the Targums (comp. Lengerke, De Ephraemi S. Arte Hermeneut. p. 14 sq.; Assemani, Bibl. Orient. 1, 66).

II. The Targum of Onkelos. — There is a Targum of Onkelos on the Pentateuch which has always been highly valued by the Jews.

1. Authorship. — In regard to the author, the notices of him are meagre and uncertain. We now approach one of the most mooted questions as to the identity of Onkelos with Akilas or Aquila; but before solving it we must hear the different witnesses. The first mention of Onkelos is found in the Tosipohta, a work drawn up shortly after the Mishna. From this we learn:

a. That Onkelos the Proselyte (אנקלוס הגר) was so serious in his adherence to the newly adopted (Jewish) faith that he threw his share of his paternal inheritance into the Dead Sea, הולי ִחלקו לים המל(ִTos. Demci', 6:9).

b. At the funeral of Gamaliel the elder he burned more than seventy mince worth of spices in his honor (Tos. Shabbath, 100. 8; the same story is repeated with variations Semchoth 100. 8, and Talm. Aboda Zarah, fol. 11, Colossians 1).

c. He is finally mentioned, by way of corroboration to different Halachas, in connection with Gamaliel in- three more places, viz. Chagigah, 3, 1; Mikvaoth, 6:1; Kelim, 3, 2,2. In the Babylonian. Talmud, Onkelos is mentioned in the following passages:

(1.) Gittin, fol. 56, Colossians 2; fol. 57, Colossians 1, where we read, “onkelos the Proselyte, the son of Kalonikos (Callinicus or Cleonicus?), the son of Titus's sister, who, intending to become a convert, conjured up the ghosts of Titus, Balaam, and Jesus [the latter name is omitted in later editions, for which, as in the copy before us, is substituted פושע ישראל, but not in Bomberg's and the Cracow editions], in order to ask them what nation was considered the first in the other world. Their answer that Israel was the favored one decided him.”

(2.) Aboda Zarah, fol. 11, col. I, here called the son of Kalonymos (Cleonymos?); and we also read in this place that the emperor sent three Roman cohorts to capture him, and that he converted them all.

(3.) Baba Bathra, fol. 99, coil. 1, where Onkelos the Proselyte is quoted as an authority on the question of the form of the cherubim (comp. 2Ch 3:10).

(4.) Megillah, fol. 3, Colossians 1, where we read, “II Jeremiah, or, according to others, 1t. Chia bar-Abba, said the ‘Targum, on the Pentateuch was made by the proselyte Onkelos; from the mouth of R. Eliezer and R. Jehoshna; the Targum on the prophets was made by Jonathan ben-Uziel from the month of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi.... But have we not been taught that the Targum existed from the time of Ezra?... Only it was forgotten and Ollelos restored it. In the Miidrash Tanichuma, section ל ִלiִn (Gen 28:20), we read, “Onkelos the Proselyte asked an old man whether that was all the love God bore towards a proselyte, that he promised to give him bread and a garment? The old man replied that this was all for which the patriarch Jacob prayed.” In the book of, Zohar, section אחרי מות(Lev 18:4), Onkelos is represented as a disciple of Hillel and Shammai. Finally a MS. in the library of the Leipsic Senate (B. H.) relates that Onkelos, the nephew of the wicked Titus (נכדו של טיטוס הרשע), asked the emperor's advice as to what merchandise he thought it was profitable to trade in. Titus told him that that should be bought which was cheap in the market, since it was sure to rise in price. Onkelos went to Jerusalem and studied the law under R. Eliezer and R. Jehoshua, and his face became wan (והיו פניו עהובות). When he returned to Titus, one of the courtiers observed the pallor of his countenance, and said to Titus, “Onkelos appears to have studied the law.” Interrogated by Titus, he admitted the fact, adding that he had done it by his advice. No nation had ever been so exalted, and none was now held cheaper among the nations than Israel; “therefore,” he said, “I concluded that in the end none would be of higher price” (comp. Anger, De Onkelo, pt. 2 [Lips. 1846], p. 12, where the whole passage in the original is copied). In all these passages the name of Onkelos is given. But there are many passages in. which the version of Akilas (תרגם עקילס) is mentioned, and the notices concerning Akilas bear considerable likeness to those of Onkelos. Akilas is mentioned in Siphra (Lev 25:7), and in Jerus. Talmud, Demai, 27 d, as having been born in Pontus; that, after having embraced the Jewish faith, he threw his paternal inheritance into an asphalt lake (Jerus. Demaz, 25 d); that he translated the Torah before R. Eliezer and R. Jehoshua, who praised him (וקילסו אותו) and said to him, “Thou art fairer than the sons  of men” (יפיפית מבני אדם); or, according to the other accounts, before R. Akiba (comp. Jerus. Kiddushin, 1, 11, etc.; Jerus. Megillah, 1, 9; Babyl. Megillah, fol. 3, Colossians 1). We learn,. further, that he lived in the time of Hadrian (Chag. 2, 1), that he was the son of the emperor's sister (Tanchun, ed. Prague, fol. 34, Colossians 2), that he became a convert against the emperor's will (ibid. and Shemoth Rabbah, fol. 146 c), and that he consulted Eliezer and Jehoshua about his conversion (Bereshith Rabba, fol. 78 d; comp. Midrash Coheleth, fol. 102 b).

That Akilas is no other than Aquila (Α᾿κύλας), the well-known Greek translator of the Old Test., we need hardly add. He was a native of Pontus (Iren. Adv. Haer. 3,24; Jerome, De Vir. Ill. c. 54; Philbstr. De Icer. § 90). He lived under Hadrian (Epiph. De Pond. et Mens. § 12). He is called the πενθερίδες (Chronicles Alex. πενθερός) of the emperor (ibid. § 14), becomes a convert to Judaism (§ 15), whence he is called the Proselyte (Iren. loc. cit.; Jerome to Jer 8:14, etc.), and receives instructions from Akiba (Jerome, loc. cit.). He translated the Old Test., and his version was considered of the highest import and authority among the Jews, especially those unacquainted with the Hebrew language (Euseb. Praep. Evang. loc. cit.; Augustine, De Civ. Dei, 15:23; Philostr. De Her. § 90; Justin, Novell. 146). Thirteen distinct quotations from this version are preserved in the Talmud and Midrash; and we may classify the whole as follows:

Greek Quotations. Gen 17:1, in Beresh. Rab. 51 b; Lev 23:40, Jelrs. Sukkah, 3, 5, fol. 53 d (comp. Iaj. Rab. 200 d); Isaiah 3, 20, Jerns. Shabb. 6, 4, fol. 8 b; Eze 16:10, Mid. Thren. 58, 100; Eze 23:43, Vaj. Rab. 203 d: Psalms 48, 15 (Masor. text 47, according to the Sept.), Jers. Meg. 2, 3, fol. 73 b; Pro 18:21, Vaj. Rab. fol. 203 b; Est 1:6, Midr. Esth. 120 d; Daniel 5, 5, Jerns. Yoma, 3, 8, fol. 41 a.

Hebrew Quotations (retranslated from the Greek). — Lev 19:20, Jerus. Kid. 1, 1, fol. 59 a; Dan 8:13, Beresh. Rab. 24 c.

Chaldee Quotations. — Pro 25:11, Beresh. Rab. 104 b; Isaiah 5, 6, Midr. Coh. 113 c, d.

All these quotations are treated at: length by Anger, De Onkelo, 1, 13, sq., and the variations adduced there show how carefully they have to be  perused, and the more so since we have as yet no critical edition of the Talmud.

The identity of Akilas and Aquila having been ascertained, it was also argued that, according to the parallel accounts of Onkelos and Aquila, Onkelos and Aquila must be one and the same person, since it was unlikely that the circumstances and facts narrated could have belonged to two different individuals. But who will warrant that the statements are correct? There are chronological differences which cannot be reconciled, unless we have recourse to such means as the Jewish historian Dr. Gratz, who renders ר8 8ג הזקן(i.e. R. Gamaliel I, or elder) “Gamaliel II.” Is it not surprising that on one and the same page Onkelos is once spoken of as “Onkelos the Proselyte,” and “Onkelos the son of Kalonymos became a convert” (Aboda Zarah, fol. 11, Colossians 1)? It has also been stated that Onkelos was neither the author of the Targum nor a historical person, but that Targum Onkelos means simply a version made after the manner of Akils, the Greek translator. Aquila's translation was a special favorite with the Jews, because it was both literal and accurate. Being highly valued, it was considered a model or type after which the new Chaldee one was named, in commendation, perhaps, of its like excellences. This view is very ingenious, but it is hardly probable. Now the question arises, how is it ‘that there is only a version of Onkelos on the Pentateuch, while Aquila translated the whole Old Test.? If Onkelos's Targum was really made after the manner of Aquila, how is it that the latter is so slavishly literal, translating even the את, sign of the accusative, or, as Jerome states (De Opt. Genesis Interpret.), “Non solum verba sed et etymologias verborum transferre conatus est... Quod Hebrsei non solum habent ἄρθρα sed et πρόαρθρα, ille κακοζήλως et syllabas interpretetur et litteras, dictatque σ ὺ ν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ σ ὺ ν τὴν γῆν quod Graeca et Latina lingua non recipit,” while Onkelos is freer, adding sometimes here and there a word or phrase for the better understanding?

That the Targum Onkelos cannot mean a Targum after the manner of Aquila is also evident from the fact that while Aquila made a recension of the then existing Sept., nothing of the kind can be said of Onkelos. The latter wrote for the people in a language which it understood better than the original Hebrew; the former wrote for polemical purposes, to counterbalance the arguments of the Christians, who made use of the Alexandrian version against the Jews. That the author of the Chaldee  paraphrase was not a proselyte, but a native Jew, is sufficiently proved from the excellence and accuracy of his work; for without having been bred up from his birth in the Jewish religion and learning, and long exercised in all the rites and doctrines thereof, and being also thoroughly skilled in both the Hebrew and Chaldee languages, as far as a native Jew could be, he could scarcely be thought thoroughly adequate to that work which he performed. The representing of Onkelos as having been a proselyte seems to have proceeded from the error of taking him to have been the same with Aquila of Pontus, who was indeed a Jewish proselyte. A comparison of both versions must show the superiority of Onkelos's over that of Aquila. The latter, on account of his literal adherence to the original, makes his version often nonsensical and unintelligible, and less useful than the former, as the following will show:

GENESIS.

Gen 2:6. ואיד— Aq. ἐπιφλυγμός; Onk. יעננאּ.

Gen 2:7. נשמת-Aq. ἀναπνοή; Onk. נשמתא.

Gen 6:4. הנפילים-Aq. ἐπιπίπτοντες; Onk. גבוריא.

Gen 6:16. צוהר—Aq. μεσημβρινόν; Olk. ניהור.

Gen 8:1. וישבו—Aq. καὶ ἐστάλησαν; Onk. ונחו

Gen 12:8. ויעתק-Aq. μετῆρε Onk. ואסתלק.

Gen 15:2. ובן משק-Aq. υἱὸς τοῦ ποτίσοντος; Onk. פרנסא ובַר.

Gen 18:12. בקרבה—Aq. κατ᾿ αὐτῆς; Onk. במעהא. בלותי-Aq. κατατριβῆναι; Onk. דסיבית.

Gen 22:2. אר המוריה-Aq. τὴν γῆν τὴν καταφανῆ; Onk. לארעא פולחנא.

Gen 22:13. בסב—ִAq. ἐν συχνῷ; Onk. באאּלנא.

Gen 26:33. באר שבע-Aq. Φρέαρ πλησμονῆς; Onk. שבע באר.  Gen 30:8. נפתולי אלהים נפתלתי-Aq. συνέστρεψέν με ό Θεός; Onk. קבלח בעותו.

Gen 26:11. בגד (Keri בא גד)-Aq. ηλθεν ἡ ζῶσις; Onk. אתא גד.

Gen 32:25. ויאבק-Aq. ἐκυλίετο; Onk. λδτvας.

Gen 34:21. שלמים-Aq. •πηρτισμένοι; Onk. שלמין.

Gen 35:16. כברת אר-Aq. καθ᾿ ὅδον τῆς γῆς; Onk. כרוב ארעא.

Gen 36:24. את הימים—Aq. τοὺς Ι᾿αμεῖν; Onk. גבריא ית.

Gen 37:27. מה בצע-Aq. τὶ πλεονέκτημα; Onk. נתהני לנא מה ממון.

Gen 38:18. ופתיל-ִAq. στρεπτόν; Onk. שישיפא.

Gen 42:4. אסון—Aq. σύμπτωμα; Onk. מותא.

EXODUS.

Exo 1:9. ועצום—Aq. ὀστοῖνον (id. Deu 9:1); Onk. תקיפין.

Exo 1:11. ערי מסכנות-Aq. πόλεις σκηνωμάτων; Onk. קרוי בית אוצרא.

Exo 1:13. בפר-ִAq. ἐν τρυφήματι; Onk. בקשיו.

Exo 4:12. והורותי-ִAq. φωτίσω σε (id. Exo 4:15; Exo 24:12 always φωτίζειν, taken from אור); Onk. אלפינ (ִid. Exo 4:15; Exo 24:12).

Exo 8:12. הערוב-Aq. παμμυῖαν; Onk. עירובין. Exo 14:27. לאיתנו- Aq. εἰς ἀρχαῖον αὐτοῦ; Onk. לתוקפיה.

Exo 15:8. נערמו—Aq. ἐσωρεύθη; Onk. חכימא.

Exo 24:6. באגנות-Aq. ἐν προθύμασιν; Onk. במזרקיא.

Exo 28:8. שני-Aq. διάφορον (id. Exo 35:22; Exo 35:35); Onk. זהורי.

Exo 29:6. נזר-Aq. τὸ πέταλον; Onk. כלילא.  36. על כפורים וחטאת-Aq. ἐξιλασμοῦ περὶ ἁμαρτίας; Onk. על כפוריא ותדכי.

Exo 30:12. כופר—Aq. ἐξίλασμα; Onk. פדרקן.

Exo 30:35. פרוע הוא כי פועה—Aq. ἀποπετασμένος αὐτὸς ὁτι; Onk. בטיל הוא. Aq. ἀπεπέτασεν αὐτόν; Onk. אריאבטליניה.

Exo 34:24. שלוש פעמים—Aq. τρεῖς καθόδονς; Onk. תלת זמנין.

LEVITICUS.

Lev 3:1. שלמים-Aq. εἰρηνικῶς; Onk. נכסת קידשׁא.

Lev 13:6. פשה תפשה-Aq. ἐπιδώση ἐπίδομα; Ouk. אוספא תוסי.

Lev 17:7. לשעירים-Aq. τοῖς τριχιοῦσιν (id. Isa 13:21); Onk. לשידין.

Lev 25:33. ואשר יגאל-Aq. ὅς ἄν ἐγγίζων ἐστιν; Onk. ודי יפרוק.

Lev 27:2. יפליא—Aq. θανμαστώση; Onk. יפרש.

NUMBERS.

Num 1:47. למטה-Aq. εἰς ῥάβδον; Onk. לשבטא.

Num 11:8. לשד השמן—Aq. τοῦ μαστοῦ ἐλαίου; Onk. דליש במשחא.

Num 23:12. הפסגה—Aq. λαξευτήν; Onk. רמתא.

DEUTERONOMY

Deu 1:40. פנו לכם—Aq. νεύσατε αὐτοῖς; Onk. אתפנו לכון.  Deu 22:9. כלאים—Aq. ἀνομοιόμενος; Onk. עיריבין. שעטנז—Aq. ἀντιδιακείμενον; Onk. שעטנזא.

Deu 23:15. ולתת אויכי ִלפני-ִAq. τοῦ δοῦναι τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου εἰς πρόσωπόν σου; Onk. בעלי דבב ִקדמ ִולממסר.

Deu 28:20. את המארה ואת המהומה—Aq. σπανὴ καὶ φαγέδαινα; Onk. שגושיא ית מאירתא וית.

It has been urged that while Akilas's version is always cited in the Talmud by the name of its author, תרגום עקילס, the Targum of Onkelos is never quoted with his name, but introduced with כד מתרגמינן, “as we translate,” or תרגום דדן, “our Targum,” or כתרגומו, “as the Targum has it;” but this only shows the high' esteem in which Onkelos's Targum stood. And as to the quotations of Aquila, almost all which are cited are on the prophets and Hagiographa, while Onkelos's Targum is only on the law; and a close examination of the sources themselves shows that what is said there has reference only to the Greek version, which is fully expressed in the praise of R. Eliezer.and R. Jehoshua when saying יפיפית מבני אדם, “Thou art fairer than the sons of men,” thereby alluding to Gen 9:27, where it is said that Japheth (i.e. the Greek language) should one day dwell in the tents of Shem (i.e. Israel) (Megillah, 1, 11, 71 b and c; Bereshith Rabba, 40 b).

There is another very important point, which has been overlooked by all favoring the identity of Akilas with Onkelos, and thus putting the origin of the Targum of Onkelos at a late date, viz. the use of the mentra = λόγος by Onkelos; and this peculiarity of the Targum shows that its origin belongs to the time of Philo and the New Test. period. It is not unlikely that, in this respect, Onkelos was followed by the other Targumists, and that his intention was to reconcile Alexandrian with Palestinian theology. John's doctrine of the Logos would be without any foundation or point of departure if we could not suppose that at the time of Jesus a similar doctrine concerning the Word of God, as it can be deduced from the Targum, was known among the Palestinian Jews. That later Judaism has put aside this important moment of older theology must be explained from its opposition to Christianity.  In the Targum of Onkelos we find not the least indication that it was made after the destruction of Jerusalem; we find neither the least trace of hostility to the Romans nor of opposition to Christianity. The Temple is regarded as still standing, the festive days are still celebrated, the Jews are still a nation which never ceases to resist its enemies. This may be seen from the prophetic passages, as Genesis 49; Numbers 24; Deuteronomy 33; the explanation of which, as given by Onkelos, could have hardly originated after A.D. 70.

Onkelos uses for Argob (Deuteronomy 3, 4, 14; so also Jonathan, 1Ki 4:13) the name Trachona (טְרָכוֹנָא)=Trachonitis (Luk 3:1); Josephus writes Τραχωνίτις, sometimes ὁ Τράχων (Ant. 15:10, 1 and 3; 18:4, 6; 20:7, 1). The Peshito of the Pentateuch did not follow this explanation (Luke 3, 1, אתרא דטרכונא), probably because the division of Palestine at the time of Jesus did not exist in the Syrian translator's days, or it was unintelligible to him (among the rabbins טרכונאis used in the sense of “palace,” פלטין[Buxtorf, Lex. p. 913 sq.]). All this indicates, or rather confirms, the supposition that this Targum belongs to the time of Jesus. There is a similar indication in Onkelos's rendering of Bashan by מתנן(Syr. מתנין), Batansea (see Gesenius, Comm. zu Jes. 2, 13); ים כנרת, by Gennesaret, גינוסר. This reminds one of the language of the New Test.; so also ממונא(Mammon), “the injustice with the Mammon” (בישין בממונּה ון; it is said, in Gen 13:13, of the Sodomites). When Paul speaks of that “spiritual rock” that followed the children of Israel in the wilderness (1Co 10:3), he undoubtedly refers to the tradition preserved by Onkelos (also by Pseudo Jonathan), “The well which the princes digged, the chiefs of the people cut it, the scribes with their staves; it was given to them in the wilderness. And from [the time] that it was given to them it descended with them to the rivers, and from the rivers it went up with them to the height, and from the height to the vale which is in the field of Moab” (Num 21:18 sq.). Hence the expression of the apostle, “spiritual, following rock.” The Syriac retains the proper names of the Hebrew text. After what has been said, we believe the Targum of Onkelos originated about the time of Philo-an opinion which is also held by Zunz (Gottesd. Vortrige, p. 62). This being true, Onkelos and Akilas (or Aquila) are not one and the same person-a view also expressed by Frankel (Zudem Targum dera Propheten [Breslau, 1872.] p. 6); and the Talmudic notices concerning Onkelos, the disciple of Gamaliel I (or elder), the teacher of the apostle Paul, are corroborated by our argument, minus the notice that  Onkelos was a proselyte, as we have already stated above. For with the identity of Onkelos with Akilas (or Aquila), it is hardly conceivable that a man like Aquila, who, from a Christian, became a Jew, and such a zealous one that he prepared another Greek version for polemical purposes against the Christians, should have spent so much money at the death of Gamaliel I, whose liberal and friendly attitude towards Christianity was known, and who is even said to have become a Christian, as a tombstone covering his remains in a church at Pisa indicates:

“Hoc in sarcophago requiescunt corpora sacra Sanctorumn... Sainctus Gamaliel. Gamaliel divi Patuli didascalus olim, Doctor et excellens Israelita fuit, Concilii mnagui fideique per omnia cultor.” We now come to the work itself.

2. Style, etc. — The language of Onkelos greatly approaches the Biblical Chaldee, i.e. it has still much of Hebrew coloring, though in a less degree than the other. It also avoids many Aramaisms (such as the contraction of nouns), which at a later period became prevalent, and comprises a comparatively small number of Greek words, and of Latin words none whatever. Of Greek words we mention, Exo 28:25, ברלא= βήρυλλος; Exo 28:11, גל= γλυφή; Gen 28:17, הדיוט= ἰδιώτης; Lev 11:30, חלטתא= κωλώτης; Exo 28:19, טרקיא= θρακίας (Pliny, 37:68); 39:11, כרכדינא= καρχηδόνιοι; Deu 20:20, כרכום= χαράκωμα; Exo 28:20, כרום= χρῶμα; Num 15:38, Deu 22:12, כרוספדא= κράσπεδον; Exo 30:34, כשת= κἰσιος; Gen 37:28, לטום = λῆδον; Exo 24:16, פרסא= φάρσος; Exo 26:6, פורפא= πόρπη; Gen 6:14, קדרוס= κέδρος; Exo 28:19, קנכרי= κέγχρος (Pliny, 37:14). There are, besides, some obscure expressions which were partly unintelligible to the Talmudists, as םסגונאfor תחש, etc., in Exo 35:23; Exo 28:4, מרמצאfor תשב; Exo 28:17, ירקןfor פטדה; Exo 28:18, קנכיריfor לשם; Lev 22:20, חילין בעיניהfor בעיניו תבלל, etc.

The translation of Onkelos is, on the whole, very simple and exact. It is obvious from the character of the work that the author was in possession of a rich exegetical tradition; hence we never find him omitting any passage of the original. His elucidations of difficult and obscure passages and  expressions, perhaps less satisfactory, are commonly those most accredited by internal evidence, and in this particular he is worthy of a more careful regard and assent than have usually fallen to his lot. Gen 3:15 he translates מה דעבת ליה מלקדמין ואת תהינטר ליה הוא יהי דכיר לסופא ל,ִ i.e. “he shall remember thee what thou hast done to him from the beginning, and thou shalt watch him unto the end;” Gen 4:7 he translates עובד ִישתנק ל ִואם לא תיטב עובד ִליום הלא אם תיטב דינא חטא ִנטיר ודעתיד לאתפרעא מנ ִוכ8, “.shall not pardon be given to thee if thou doest well; but if thou doest not well, thy sin shall be preserved till the day of judgment, when it will be exacted of thee,” etc. Here שאתis taken from נשא, in the sense of tollere peccata. i.e. “taking- away of sin,” and not in the sense of “lifting-up of the countenance.” Onkelos did not understand the meaning of the verse, but- (says Winer) “sensum hujus loci prudentissimos etiam interpretes mirifice vexavit.” Gen 6:3, Onkelos, like the Sept., Syr., Saad., and many recent commentators, gives לא יתקים דרא בישא הדין בדיל דאנון בשרא( שגם= באשר גם), i.e. “this evil generation shall not stand before me forever, because they are flesh;” Gen 14:14, וזריז ית עולמוהי, i.e. “he armed his young men,” but Gen 15:2, בןאּמשק= בןאּפרנסא, “governor,” is contrary to the true sense of the words; Gen 20:16, he did not rightly understand ונובחת, for he translates ועל כל מה דאמרת אתוכחת“and with respect to all she said she was reproved;” Gen 24:55, עשור ימים אי, which the Sept. correctly translates ἡμέρας ὡσεὶ δέκα, Vulg. salter decem dies, Onkelos, in accordance with all Jewish interpreters, explains by או עשרא ירחין עדן בעדן, i.e.” a season of times, or ten months;” Gen 24:63, לשיחis translated by לצלאה, “to pray ;” Gen 27:42, מתנחםis translated, by way of explanation, כמן ל ִלמקט ל,ִ “plotteth against thee, to kill thee.” The difficult אבר,ִ in Gen 41:43, is explained by אבא למלכא, ‘“a father to the king,” and צפנת פענהby גברא דטמירין גלין ליה, the man to whom mysteries are revealed.” The אח ִנתתי ל ִשכם, in Gen 48:22, is correctly given by חולק חד יהבית ל,ִ “and I give thee one part ;” and פחז כמים, in Gen 49:4, by אזלת לקדם אפ,ִ “thou hast been carried away by thine anger.”  Explanatory additions, which evidently belong to Onkelos, are found in Gen 6:3 (אם יתובון, “if they may be converted,” at the end of the verse); Gen 9:5 (דישוד ית דמא דאחוהי,”who sheddeth the blood of his brother”); Gen 14:22 (where בצלי, “in prayer,” is added to הרימותי ידי); Gen 43:32 (where we have אכלין אריבעירא דמצראי דחלין ליה עבראי, “because the Hebrews eat the animals ‘which are sacred to the Egyptians”) (comp. Winer, De Onkeloso, p. 41). Larger additions and deviations from the original text are found mostly in the poetical parts of the Pentateuch (Genesis 49, Numbers 24; Deuteronomy 32, 33). In the multiplicity of words, which is here employed, the original text almost disappears. Thus Gen 49:11-12, which is referred to the Messiah (the parallel being Num 24:17), is rendered, “Israel shall dwell in the circuit of his city; the people shall build his temple; and there shall be the righteous in his circuit, and the makers of the law in his doctrine; the best purple shall be his clothing; his covering shall be silk dyed with purple and with various colors. His mountains shall be redder in their vineyards; his hills shall drop wine: his fields shall be white with his grain and with flocks of sheep.”

In passages relative to the Divine Being, we perceive the effect of a doctrinal bias in certain deviations from the Hebrew text. Anthropomorphic and anthropopathic expressions are avoided, lest human attributes should be assigned to the Deity. Thus, אלהיםand יהוהare rendered דיי מימרא, “the Word of God ;” or יקרא דיי, “the splendor of God;” or שכנתא דיי, “the Shechinah of God.” Akin to this peculiarity is the avoidance of אלהים, when it is applied to men or idols, and the employment of רב, דיניא, טעון, דחלן. In cases where divine qualities or ornaments appear to be assigned to men, Onkelos modifies and smoothes the meaning, and substitutes a different idea. Thus, ותהון כרבהבין, i.e. ye shall be as princes,” is ,substituted for כאלהי חייתם, in Gen 3:5; or הן האדם היה כאחד ממנו, in Gen 3:22, is translated by הוה יחידי בעלמא מניה אדם, “behold Adam is the only one in the world of himself.”

Onkelos shows an apparent desire to present the great men of his nation in as favorable a light as possible (comp. Gen 16:12; Gen 25:27; Genesis 45, 27). Difficult words are not infrequently retained, as in Genesis 2, 12; Exo 12:7; Lev 13:30; and Deu 22:12. Names  of peoples, cities, and mountains are given as they were common in his time. Thus, in Gen 8:4, instead of הרי אררט, he has טורי קרדו, as in Syr. and Arab.; אר שנעי, in Gen 10:10, becomes: ארעא בבל; כפתורים, in Gen 8:14, becomes קפוטקאי; ישמעאלים, in Gen 37:25,.becomes ערבאי, etc. (see Winer, op. cit. p. 39). In perusing Onkelos as a source of emending the Hebrew text, great caution is necessary, and the more so because we have not as yet a critical edition of this Targum. The only safe rule in emending the Hebrew text is when the same variety of readings which the Chaldee presents is found in several Hebrew MSS. Thus, e.g., in Exo 9:7, we read in the Hebrew ממקנה ישראל, but in the Chaldee מבעירא דבני ישראל. The original reading was probably ממקנה בני ישראל, which is found in several MSS. of Kennicott and De Rossi, and in most of the ancient versions. The Targum of Onkelos has always been held in high regard among the Jews, who also composed a Masorah upon it. Such a Masorah has lately been published, from a very ancient codex, by Dr. Berliner, Die Massorah zum Targqum Onkelos, enthaltend Massorah Magna und Massorah Parva (Leips. 1877).

3. Manuscripts of Onkelos are extant in great numbers. Oxford has five, London (British Museum) two, Vienna six, Augsburg one, Nuremberg two, Altdorf one, Carlsruhe three, Stuttgart two, Erfurt three, Dresden one, Leipsic one, Jena one, Dessau one, Helmstadt two, Berlin four, Breslau one, Brieg one, Ratisbon one, Hamburg seven, Copenhagen two, Upsala one, Amsterdam one, Paris eight, Molsheim one, Venice six, Turin two, Milan four, Leghorn one, Sienna one, Geneva one, Florence five, Bologna two, Padua one, Trieste two, Parma about forty, Rome eighteen, more or less complete, etc., containing Onkelos. For a full description of these MSS, see Winer, De Onkeloso, p. 13 sq.

4. Editions. — The Targum of Onkelos was first published with Rashi's commentary on the Pentateuch (Bologna, 1482, fol.). It was subsequently reprinted quite frequently, and may be found in the Rabbinic and Polyglot Bibles. Buxtorf was the first to add the vowel-points to the Targum. As yet, we have no critical edition of this Targum. Dr. Berliner purposes to publish a new and critical edition according to that of Sabioneta (1557). This Targum has been translated into Latin by Alphonso de Zamora in the Complutensian Polyglot, by Paul Fagius, and by John Mercier (1568). That  of Fagius is the best. It was rendered into English by Etheridge (Lond. 1862-65).

5. Literature. — Jes. Berlin (Pik), מיני תרגימא, or glosses and comments upon the Targum of Onkelos (Breslau, 1827); Luzzato, אוהב גר, Philoxenus, sire de Onkeloosi Chaldaica Pentateuchi Versione Dissertatio, etc. (Vienna, 1830), distributes the deviations from the Hebrew into thirty-two classes, and endeavors to emend the text from MSS., although the genius of the version is not well described in it (the writer of the art. “Targum” in Smith's Dict. of the Bible, besides a great deal of useless ballast, thought it' necessary to copy Luzzato); Berkowitz, עוטה איר, on the hermeneutics of Onkelos (Wilna, 1843); id. חליפות שמלות(ibid. 1874); Levy, in Geiger's Zeifschrift, 1844, 5, 175-198; Fürst, Literaturblatt, 1845, p. 337 sq., 354; Smith, Diatribe de Chald. Paraphrastis eorumque Versionum (Oxf. 1662); Winer, De Onkeloso ejusque Paraphrasi Chaldaica (Lips. 1820); Maybaum, Die Anthropomorphien und Anthropopathien bei Onkelos, etc. ( Breslau, 1870); Geiger, Jidische Zeitschrift, 1871, p. 85-104; לגר נתינה, or a commentary on Onkelos by Dr. Adler in the edition of the Pentateuch with ten commentaries (Wilna, 1874); and the literature given in the art. ONKELOS SEE ONKELOS in this Cyclopaedia.

III. Jonathan ben-Uzziel on the Prophets, i.e. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets, stands next in time and importance to Onkelos.

1. Authorship and Sources — As to Jonathan himself, we read in the Talmud—

(1.) “Eighty disciples had Hillel the elder, thirty of whom were worthy that the Shechinah [Divine Majesty] should rest upon them, as it did upon Moses our Lord; peace be upon him. Thirty of them were worthy that the sun should stand still at their bidding, as it did at that of Joshua ben-Nun. Twenty were of intermediate worth. The greatest of them all was Jonathan ben-Uzziel, the least R. Jochanall ben-Zachai; and it was said of R. Jochanan ben-Zachai that he left not [uninvestigated] the Bible, the Mishna, the Gemara, the Halachahs, the Haggadahs, the subtleties of the law, and the subtleties of the Sopherim . . . the easy things and the difficult things [from the most awful divine mysteries to the common popular proverbs].... If this is said of the least of them, what is to be said of the  greatest, i.e. Jonathan ben-Uzziel?” (Baba Bathra, 134 a; comp. Sukkah, 28 a).

(2.) A second passage, referring more especially to our present subject, reads as follows: “The Targum of Onkelos was made by Onkelos the Proselyte from the mouth of R. Eliezer and R. Jehoshua, and that of the prophets by Jonathan ben-Uzziel from the mouth of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. And in that hour was the land of Israel shaken three hundred parasangs. And a voice was heard, saying, ‘Who is this who has revealed my secrets unto the sons of man?' Up rose Jonathan ben-Uzziel and said, ‘It is I who have revealed thy secrets to the sons of man.... But it is known and revealed before thee that not ‘for my honor have I done it, nor for the honor of my father's house, but for thine honor, that the disputes may cease in Israel.'... And he further desired to reveal the Targum to the Hagiographa, when a voice was heard, ‘Enough.' And why? Because the day of the Messiah is revealed therein” (Megillah, 3 a).

There is some exaggeration in ‘this description of Jonathan's paraphrase, but it only shows the high esteem in which it stood. Fabulous as the whole may appear, yet there is no doubt as to the high antiquity of this paraphrase. Many doubts were raised as to the authorship of this Targum. Some, who would not deny the existence of Jonathan, hesitate to believe that he had any share in the Targum commonly ascribed to him. ‘It has also been suggested by Luzzato and Geiger that Jonathan is the same with the Greek Theodotion, and that the Babylonians gave this name to the paraphrase-especially as they were acquainted with that of Jonathan ben- Uzziel-to indicate that the Targum was after the manner of Theodotion, like the reputed origin of the name Onkelos in connection with the Greek Akilas or Aguila.” But this more ingenious than true suggestion has no support, and needs no refutation. It has also been suggested by most of the modern critics that because this Targum is never once quoted as the Targum of Jonathan, but is invariably introduced with the formula יוס כדמתרגם ר, “as R. Joseph interprets,” that not Jonathan, but R. Joseph, is the author of this Targum; and this supposition is based upon the fact that the Talmud relates that this R. Joseph, in his latter years, occupied himself chiefly with the Targum when he had become blind. This relation of the Talmud, and perhaps the fact that Jonathan's Targum, which was called, by way of abbreviation, ת י, i.e. תרגום יונתן, made Joseph the author of this Targum, since ת י may also mean תרגום יוס, or  something else, and the real Targum is now quoted under Joseph's name.

That Jonathan's Targum was really extant before the time of R. Joseph we see from Megillah, 3 a, where on Zec 12:12 R. Joseph remarks, “Without the Targum to this passage, we could not understand it;” but when the writer, of the art. “Targum” in Smith's Dict. of the Bible remarks, Twice even it is quoted in Joseph's name, and with the addition, Without the Targum to this verse (due to him), we could not understand it,' he only betrays his carelessness as to the Talmudic sentence. After all, we do not see why we should not rely upon the Talmudic notice concerning Jonathan equally as much as upon that concerning R. Joseph. The language concerning the former, we admit, is a little hyperbolical, but this does not exclude the truth of the matter. Besides, there is nothing to militate against Jonathan having written a Targum on the prophets; and even the expression that this Targum was made “from the mouth of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi” is not so absurd as the writer of the art. “Targum” in Kitto's Cyclopaedia would suppose, for if it means anything, it means this, that the explanation of Jonathan contains the transmitted- exposition in the spirit of Hillel, and, as Zunz remarks (Gottesd. Vortrage, p. 332), “Jonathan's Targum on the prophets, as a result of studies which were instrumental in forming fixed national opinions, proves that a considerable time before it was customary to explain the contents of the prophetical books, by means of Targumical prelections or otherwise, to the public. Nay, he commends the teachers for-even in evil times teaching the law in the synagogues at the head of the congregations” (Targ. on Jdg 5:2; Jdg 5:9). From the New Test. we know that Moses and the prophets were read in the synagogues, and, deducting all hyperbolical language, there is no reason for doubting the high antiquity of this Targum. The text is rendered, in the same manner as by Onkelos, free from all one- sided and polemical considerations, which the Jews since the 2d century followed. Many passages are referred to the Messiah; even such as do not rightly belong to him, so that no polemical tendency against Christians appears in the version. The following is a list of them: 1Sa 2:10; 2Sa 23:3; 1Ki 4:33; Isa 4:2; Isa 9:6; Isa 10:27; Isa 11:1; Isa 11:6; Isa 15:2; Isa 16:1-5; Isa 28:5; Isa 42:1; Isa 43:10; Isa 45:1; Isa 52:13; Isa 53:10; Jer 23:5; Jer 30:21; Jer 33:13; Jer 33:15; Hos 3:5; Hos 14:8; Mic 4:8; Mic 5:2; Zec 3:8; Zec 4:7; Zec 6:12; Zec 10:4.

2. Character, etc. — In the historical books the exegesis is simple and tolerably literal. A few words are added occasionally, which have no  representatives in the original, but they are not many. The interpretation is good, giving the sense fully and fairly; but in the prophetic books the text is more freely handled, for, as Zunz justly remarks (op. cit. p. 63), “The prophetical writings, not containing anything of the nature of legal enactment, admitted of a greater latitude in handling the text. This became even unavoidable because of the more obscure language and the predictions concerning Israel's future by which they are characterized. Even in the case of the historical books, Jonathan often acts the part of an expositor. In the case of the prophets themselves, this course of exposition- in reality becoming a Haggadah-is pursued almost uninterruptedly.” “This pervading, often misunderstood, characteristic,” says Havernick, “constitutes the chief proof, confirmed also by external evidence, of the oneness of the authorship of this Targum; for not only do parallel passages (such as Isaiah 36-39; comp. 2Ki 18:13 sq.; Mic 5:1-3) literally harmonize, but he is also in the habit of furnishing, particularly the poetical portions of the historical books (Judges 5; 1 Samuel 2; 2 Samuel 23), with profuse additions. These additions often very much resemble each other (comp. Jdg 5:8 with Isa 10:4, 2Sa 23:4 with Isa 30:26).”

Another peculiarity of this Targum are the Jewish dogmatical opinions of that day with which the work is interwoven, and the theological representations, in introducing which a special preference was given to the book of Daniel. Examples of this are the interpreting of the phrase “stars of God” by “people of God” (Isa 14:13; comp. Dan 8:10; 2Ma 9:10); the application of the passage in Dan 12:1 to that in Isa 4:2. In Isa 10:32 the author introduces a legend framed in. imitation of the narrative in Daniel 3, which is repeated by later Targumists (comp. Targ. Jesus; Gen 11:28; Gen 16:5; 2Ch 28:3); in Isa 22:14 and 65:35 he has interwoven the doctrine concerning the second death (comp. Rev 2:11), which the wicked should die in the next world or kingdom of the Messiah; and in Isa 30:33 he mentions Gehenna. In various places the notices respecting the Messiah's offices, character, and conduct, the effects of his advent and personal influence, harmonize with those of the New-Test. writers (comp. Isa 42:1 sq.; Mat 12:17 sq.); but from this the Sept. differs, and at other times the N.T. writers differ from this Targum. Isaiah 53 it recognizes as referring to the Messiah, and assumes a suffering and expiatory Messiah. Its author nevertheless here, as well as elsewhere (Mic 5:1), indulges in  many perversions. He seems to have entertained-in germ, at least-the idea, which became further developed in the Talmud, of a Messiah submitting to obscurity for the sake of the sins of the people, and then appearing in glory (comp. Mic 4:8 with Zec 3:8; Zec 4:7). There is little doubt that the text has received several interpolations. To this head Zunz (op. cit. p. 63, 282) refers all that is hostile to Rome, e.g. Exo 39:16; 1Sa 2:5; Isa 34:9. So, too, Armillus, in Isa 11:14. To these may be added perhaps Germania, from Gomer, in Eze 38:6, the superstitious legend inserted in Isa 10:32 relative to the army and camp of Sennacherib; and the peculiar story about Sisera (Jdg 5:8). Even Rashi speaks of interpolations in the text of Jonathan (Eze 47:19); and Wolf says (Bibl. Heb. 2, 1165), “Quse vero, vel quod ad voces et barbaras, vel ad res metate ejus inferiores, ant futilia nonnulla, quamvis pauca triplicis hujus generis exstent, ibi occurrunt, ea merito falsarii cujusdam ingenio adscribuntur.” The printed text of the Antwerp Polyglot confirms this supposition of interpolations, since several of them are wanting there. So long as we have no critical edition of this Targum, we must be careful to draw the inference, as did Morinus and Voss, in favor of a very late origin of the Targum; for a perusal of the recently published edition of this Targum by Lagarde, from the Codex Reuchlin, and its comparison with our present editions, will only show the corrupt state in which the text at present is.

The style of Jonathan is, upon the whole, the same as that of Onkelos. Eichhorn and Berthold asserted that this Targum teems with “exotic words.” Yet, notwithstanding their assertion, we believe that Carpzov (Crit. Sacra, p. 461) is correct when he says, “Cujus nitor sermonis Chaldai et dictionis laudatur puritas, ad Onkelosum proxime accedens et purum deflectens a puro tersoque Chaldaismo Biblico.” The text lying at the basis of the Targum is the Masoretic one; yet it differs from the Masoretic text in various places, where it appears to follow preferable readings. But the freedom which the translator took makes it difficult to tell in every case what particular form of the text lay before him. Hence great caution must be used in applying the Targum to critical purposes, and the more so as we have not as yet a critical edition.

3. Literature. — For the editions, translations, and oldbr literature, see Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 2, 106 sq.; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 2, 1166; Le Long (ed. Masch), II, 1, 39 sq.; Rosenmüller, Handbuch, 3, 9 sq.; Frankel, Zu dem Targum der Propheten (Breslau, 1872); Lagarde, Prophetae Chaldaice. Efide Codicis Reuchliniani (Lips. 1872 sq.); Bacher, Kritische Untersuchungen zum Prophetentargum, in the Zeit schrift d. deutsch. morgenl. Gesellschaft 1874, 28:1 sq.; 1875, 29:157 sq., 319 sq. SEE JONATHAN BENUZZIEL.

IV. The Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan and Jerushalmi on the Pentateuch. — The greater simplicity which characterized the older Targums soon ceased to satisfy the progressively degenerating taste of the Jews, especially after the Talmud began to assume a written form. Hence Targums marked by greater laxity soon began to be written which embraced more the opinions peculiar to the age, and furnished the text with richer traditional addenda. Of these latitudinarian Targums we possess two on the Pentateuch-the one known by the name of Pseudo-Jonathan, inasmuch as writers of a later period ascribe it to the author of the Targum on the Prophets; and the commonly so-called Targum Hierosolymitanum or Jerushalmi.

1. Pseudo Jonathan. This paraphrase is falsely ascribed to Jonathan ben- Uzziel. It extends from the first verse of Genesis to the last of Deuteronomy. The way in which it came to be regarded as his is supposed to have been the mistake of a copyist, who made out of ת י, i.e. Targum Jerushalmi. תיונתן, Targum Jonathan. Proof is not needed at the present day to show that the Jonathan of the prophets is not the Jonathan of the Pentateuch, for he could have little to do with a Targum which speaks of Constantinople (Num 24:19; Num 24:24), describes very plainly the breaking-up of the West-Roman empire (Num 24:19-24), mentions the Turks (Gen 10:2), and even Mohammed's two wives, Chadija and Fatima (Gen 21:21), and which not only exhibits the fullest acquaintance with the edited body of the Babylonian Talmud, by quoting entire passages from it, but adopts its peculiar phraseology: not to mention the complete disparity between the style, language, and general manner of the Jonathanic Targum on the Prophets, and those of this one on the Pentateuch, strikingly palpable at first sight. This was recognized by early investigators (Morinus, Pfeiffer, Walton, etc.), who soon overthrew the old belief in  Jonathan ben-Uzziel's authorship, as upheld by Menahem Rekanati, Asariah de Rossi, Gedaljah, Galatin, Fagius, etc. The work of the Pseudo- Jonathan is not a version. It is rather a paraphrase, though by no means exclusively so. Neither is it a Haggadic commentary. Version and paraphrase are interwoven throughout, the author seldom confining himself to simple explanation, but proceeding to large Midrashim. Halachah and Haggadah are richly imbedded in the work, the latter especially. His legends are rich and copious. His Haggadah is not historical; it is ethical, religious, metaphysical, lyrical, and parabolic. It has been well observed that he is only the interpreter of the ideas prevailing in his time-the narrator of traditions, religious and national, not their inventor, because most of them are found in preceding literature, or, as Zunz states it, “almost all his explanations and embellishments coinciding with the Haggadah we find occurring in the other Haggadic writings; the few which are peculiar to him he has not devised, any more than Jonathan has devised his interpretation of the prophets. In both the culture of the age and the potency of traditional ideas are manifest” (Gottesd. Vortrage, p. 72). To these embellishments belongs the manner in which events and characters are dressed out hyperbolically in Jonathan's Midrashim; not only the Biblical heroes, as was natural, but even the enemies of the Jewish nation. Thus Og carries on his head a piece of rock sufficient to bury all the camp of Israel beneath its weight (Num 21:35). A mountain possessed of divine virtues is suspended in the air over the children of Israel (Exo 19:17), etc. Many examples are given by Zunz (op. cit. p 72, note b) to show, against Winer and Petermann, that all these stories were not invented by Pseudo-Jonathan, but borrowed from traditional usage. The ethical Haggadah is perhaps the best part of the work, for here the exegete becomes didactic. Thus we are told in Genesis 40 that Joseph suffered two additional years of imprisonment because he built on man's rather than God's help, a view also espoused by Rashi. The region of the supernatural is treated very freely by Jonathan. His angelology is marvelous. He has the names of many angels outside the circle of the Bible, as Samael, Gabriel, Uriel, Saglnugael, etc. We find rhetorical or poetical digressions in Gen 22:14 (the prayer of Abraham on Mount Moriah), Deu 34:6 (the hymn on Moses death); Gen 49:4; Num 21:34; Deu 32:50 (parables). Like Onkelos and others, he avoids anthropomorphic ideas, and is averse to ascribe superhuman attributes to heathen gods. The Halachah is also brought within the circle of his paraphrase, and its results employed in the  exposition. This part of Jonathan's version has of late been treated by Dr. S. Gronemann, in his Die jonathanische Pentateuch-Uebersetzung in ihrem Verhalltniss zur Jalacha (Leipsic, 1879).

The language of this Targum shows it to be of Palestinian origin, as it is in what is called the Jerusalem dialect, like that of the Jerusalem Talmud, but with many peculiarities. It is far from being pure, because the Syriac had deeply affected it. Foreign elements enter into it largely, such as Gen 50:7, אוקיינוס= ὠκεανός (Gen 2:6; Num 34:6); Num 34:9, דוכתא= δοχεῖον, or δοχή; Num 34:20, אויר= ἀήρ; Num 2:12, בורלין= βήρυλλος, Syr. ברולא; Num 3:4, דילטור= delator; Num 4:6, איקונין= εἰκόνες; Num 6:2, פקס, from πείκω, or πείξω, or πέκω; Num 34:9, גניסא= γένεσις, γέννησις, γένος; Syr. גנסand גנסא, etc.; comp. Petermann. De Duabus Pentateuchi Paraphrasibus' Chaldaicis, particula 1, p. 66 sq., where a collection of these foreign words is given. The names of Constantinople and Lombardy, and even of two of Mohammed's wives, which occur in this paraphrase, besides the many foreign words, prove the Targum to have originated in the second half of the 7th century. That Jonathan had Onkelos before him, a very slight comparison of both will show. Many places attach themselves almost verbally to Onkelos, as Gen 20:1-15. Indeed, one object which the Pseudo-Jonathan had in view was to give a criticism upon Onkelos. He corrects and alters him more or less. Where Onkelos paraphrases, Jonathan enlargest paraphrase. The same attention to the work of his predecessor is shown in his Halachic as in his Haggadic interpretation; as also in the avoidance of anthropomorphisms and anthro popathisms. Sometimes the divergences from Onkelos are slight, sometimes important and they are often superior to Onkelos, but sometimes the reverse. As his object was different, his production presents a great contrast on the whole, because he intended to interpret, not to translate. Besides, this divergence from Onkelos must be accounted for in another way: he did not base his work primarily on the latter, but upon another paraphrase; or, in other words, he worked upon Onkelos indirectly in the first instance because his whole production rests on the basis of the Jerushalmi, or Jerusalem, Targum. But, before proceeding with our observation on the Pseudo-Jonathan, let us speak of

2. The Jerushalmi, or Jerusalem, Targum — The Jerusalem Targum, written in the same dialect substantially as that of the Pseudo-Jonathan, and interpreting single verses, often single words only, is extant in the  following proportions: a third on Genesis, a fourth on Deuteronomy, a fifth on Numbers, three twentieths on Exodus, and about one fourteenth on Leviticus. Judging from the rounded and complete form in which the different parts are given, we may infer that it is now in its primitive state. If so, it cannot be a fragmentary recension of Jonathan. Yet their similarity is striking. The Haggadah of the one regularly appears in the other, and has usually a more concise form in the Jerusaleni Targum. Indeed, there is often a verbal agreement, or nearly so, between them, so that one might at first be inclined to assume their original identity, if not that they are fundamentally the same work — the Jerusalem Targum containing variations from the other, or being a fragmentary recension of it. The latter opinion is held by Zunz. But against this there are many arguments, especially the fact that the work is complete and rounded off in many parts. And though the similarity of the Jonathan and Jerusalem Targums is considerable, there is so much divergence as to prove diversity of authorship. Thus Jerushalmi knows very little of angels: Michael is the only one ever occurring. In Jonathan, on the other hand, angelology flourishes with great vigor: to the Biblical Michael, Gabriel, Uriel, are added the Angel of Death, Samael, Sagnugael, Shachassai, Usiel; seventy angels descend with God to see the building of the Babylonian tower; nine hundred millions of punishing angels go through Egypt during the night of the Exode, etc. Jerushalmi makes use but rarely of Halachah and Haggadah, while Jonathan sees the text as it were only through the medium of Haggadah: to him the chief end. Hence Jonathan has many Midrashim not found in Jerushalmi, while he does not omit a single one contained in the latter.

There are no direct historical dates in Jerushalmi, but many are found in Jonathan; and since all other signs indicate that but a short space of time intervenes between the two, the late origin of either' is to a great extent made manifest by these dates. The most striking difference between them, however, and the one, which is most characteristic of either, is this, that while Jerushalmi adheres more closely to the language of the Mishna, Jonathan has greater affinity to that of the Gemara. It is also perceptible that the reverence of Onkelos for the name of God, shown in substituting the Memra, or something intermediate, is not so excessive in Jonathan as' in the Jerusalem Targum. If such be the diversity of Jonathan and the Jerusalem Targum, they are not one work fundamentally; nor is the one a recension, now in fragments, of the other. But how is their resemblance to be explained? Only by the fact that both have relation to Onkelos. The author of the Jerusalem Targum worked upon that of Onkelos, his object  being to correct it according to certain principles, and to insert in it a selection of Haggadahs current among the people. Pseudo-Jonathan afterwards resumed the same office, and completed what his predecessor had begun. The Jerusalem Targum formed the basis of Jonathan, and its own basis was that of Onkelos, Jonathan used both his predecessors paraphrases, the author of the Jerusalem Targum that of Onkelos alone. There is no doubt that the small glossarial passages of the Jerusalem Targum are intended as a critical commentary upon Onkelos, and from his standpoint the author proceeds freely in using his predecessor.

Thus he rejects his acceptations of words, and gives closer acceptations for his freer ones. In many places where Onkelos's scrupulosity about removing anthropomorphisms from the text had obscured the sense, the Jerusalem Targum restores the original meaning by some addition or change. Thus in Gen 6:6, where Onkelos omits the name Jehovah and paraphrases, the Jerusalem Targum comes near the original text. Sometimes, where Onkelos Aramaizes a Hebrew word, the Jerusalem Targum substitutes a genuine Aramaean one, as in Gen 8:22, where the קִיְטָאof Onkelos is displaced for שׁוֹרַבָא. So in Gen 34:12, where Onkelos has וּמִתּנָו מוֹהֲרַין, the Jerusalem Targum puts פּוֹוִן וּכְתוּבְתָּא. Vice versa, the Jerusalem Targum often prefers a Hebrew word to Onkelos's Aramaean one, perhaps because the latter was better known in Palestine, as in Gen 22:24.

There is, indeed, no uniformity between Onkelos and Jerusalem in the use of Aramaean words, while consistent divergences may be readily traced. After all that has been said there can be no doubt that the general object of the author of the Jerusalem Targum was to correct and explain Onkelos, adapting it to a later time and different country by enriching it with the Haggadic lore which had accumulated, so that its deficiencies might be removed. From being a version, he wished to supplement it in various parts, so that it should be a paraphrase there. That he has made many mistakes, and departed in not a few cases from Onkelos for the worse, we need not remark, nor enumerate his errors, since Peterman has collated them (op. cit. p. 60 sq.). It is this fragmentary Jerusalem Targum to which Jonathan had regard in the first instance. He uses the larger paraphrases and Haggadic parts of it, as well as the smaller variations from Onkelos, but always with discretion.

More commonly the Haggadah of the Jerusalem Targum is simplified and abridged. Nor does Jonathan follow Onkelos implicitly, but often diverges. If he does not adhere consistently to the Jerusalem Targum, we need not expect to see  him copying ‘Onkelos.' Thus in Gen 7:11; Gen 22:24, he leaves Onkelos for the Jerusalem Targum. It should also be observed that Jonathan relies upon Onkelos much more than the Jerusalem Targum, which is freer and more independent. Thus the former follows Onkelos, and the latter departs from him in Gen 11:30; Gen 12:6; Gen 12:15; Gen 13:6; Gen 14:5; Gen 14:21; Gen 16:7; Gen 16:15; Gen 19:31; Gen 20:18, etc. The interval of time between the Jerusalem Targum and Jonathan cannot be determined exactly, but it must have been a century. From these observations it will no longer be uncertain “whether the Targum of Jerusalem hath been a continued Targum, or only the notes of some learned Jew upon the margins of the Pentateuch, or an abridgment of Onkelos” (Alix, Judgment of the Ancient Jewish Church, etc., p. 88). All the guesses are incorrect. The only objection to this hypothesis is the statement of Zunz that because many citations made by older authors from the two Targums in question are now missing, an older and complete Jerusalem Targum must have existed, which is now lost. But when we consider the probable chances of passages being lost in the course of transcription, and of others being interpolated, as also the fact of variations in the editions, it need not be assumed, in the face of-internal evidence, that they are very different now from what they were at first. Many of the passages cited by authors and now wanting, which Zunz has brought together, need a great deal of sifting and correction, as has been ably shown by Seligsohn in Frankel's Monatsschrift, 1857, p. 113. The view of the relation now given between Onkelos, the Jerusalem Targum, and Pseudo-Jonathan was briefly advocated by Frankel (op. cit. 1846, p. 111 sq.) with ability and success. His view has again been taken up by Seligsohn and Traub, and satisfactorily established by them in a prize- essay, published in Frankel's Monatsschrift, 1857.

3. Editions and Commentaries. The Pseudo- Jonathan Targum was first published at Venice in 1591; then at Hanau, 1618; Amsterdam, 1640; Prague, 1646; Amsterdam, 1671 and 1703; Berlin, 1705; Wilna, 1852; Vienna, 1859, etc. — all these, as well as the editio princeps, having Onkelos and the Jerusalem Targum. It is also in the London Polyglot, vol. 4. together with a Latin translation made by Antony Chevalier. It was translated into English by Etheridge (Lond. 1862-65). The Jerusalem Targum was first printed by Bomberg (Venice, 1518) in his Rabbinical Bible, and reprinted in the subsequent Rabbinical Bibles issued by himand in the great Polyglots. Since its publication by Walton in 1657, it has also appeared at Wilna (1852), Vienna (1859), and Warsaw (1875). Francis  Taylor made a Latin version of this Targum (Lond. 1649); but the more correct one is that of Antony Chevalier above noticed.

A commentary was written upon the Pseudo-Jonathan and Jerusalem Targums by David ben-Jacob Zebrecyn (Prague, 1609), entitled יונתן ותרגום ירושלמי פירוש על תרגום; by Mordecai ben-Naphtali Hirsch (Amsterdam, 1671), entitled קטרת הסמים, but יונתן וירושלמי פירוש על תרגוםis given in the Pentateuch edition published at Wilna in 1859. R. Pheibel benDavid (Hanau, 1614), author of באוד המלות, did not compose, as the writer of the art. “Targum” in Kitto states, a commentary on Pseudo-Jonathan and Jerushalmi, but an elucidation of difficult words found in Jonathan's Targum.

4. Literature. Winer, De Jonathanis in Pentateuchum Paraphrasi Chaldaica (Erlangen, 1823); Petermann, De Duabus Pentateuchi Paraphrasibus Chaldaicis, pt. 1; De Indole Paraphraseos quas Jonathanis esse dicitur (Berolin. 1829); Bar, Geist des Jeruschalnzi (PseudoJonathan), in Frankel's Monatsschrift, 1851-52, p. 235-242; Seligsohn and Traub, Ueber den Geist der Urebersetzung des Jonathan ben-Usiel zum Pentateuch und die. Abfassung des in den Editionen dieser Uebersetzung beigedruckten Targum Jeruschalmi, in Frankel's Monatsschrift, 1857, p. 96-114, 138-149; Geiger, Das Jerusalemische Targum zzum Pentateuch, in the Urschrift u. Uebersetzung der Bibel (Breslau, 1857), p. 457-480; Seligsohn, De Duabus Hierosolymitanis Pentateuchi Paraphrasibus (ibid. 1858); Gronemann, Die Jonathan'sche Pentateuch-Uebersetzung, etc. (Leips. 1879).

V. Targqums on the Hagiographa. — These Targums are generally divided into three groups, viz.: a. Job, Psalms, Proverbs; b. The five Megilloth; c. Daniel, Chronicles, and Ezra. Tradition ascribes to R. Joseph the Blind the authorship of this Targum, but this is contradicted by writers even of the 13th century (see Zunz, op. cit. p. 65).

1. The Targum on the Book of Job. — A feature of this Targum is its Haggadical character.: As early as the middle of the 1st century a  paraphrase on the book of Job is: mentioned. Its difficulty, but more especially its adaptation to allegorizing fancies, presented a peculiar temptation to Chaldee expositors. In many places we find a double Targum. After one interpretation, which is always free in character, another still more paraphrastic is annexed with the introductory, ת א, i.e. תרגום אחר, another Targum (comp. Job 18:7-8; Job 18:18). The extraneous insertions are very numerous, uncertain, fabulous, and incorrect. Thus at Job 2:1 we read, “And the three friends of Job heard of all the evil that had come upon him when they had seen the trees of his garden burned up, and the bread of his food changed into living flesh, and the wine of his drink into blood; and they came each one from his place, and for this service they were delivered from the place appointed them in Gehenna.” In Job 1:15 the words of the original ותפל על שבאare rendered בתכי לילית ממלכת זמרגד ונפלת, “and the queen of Samarcand (?) suddenly rushed in.” If Samarcand be really mentioned, the date is late. The language is intermixed with Greek and Latin words in the same degree as the Palestinian Targumim and Midrashim. Thus the word אנגלי, ἄγγελος (angel), is used in Job 15:15; Job 20:27; Job 35:10. Bacher also finds in this Targum the Latin word delator, and comes to the conclusion that the author lived in Palestine, under Roman dominion, in the 4th or 5th century, while the writer of the art. “Targum” in Kitto states that “the work is a growth belonging to various times and writers, of which the beginning and end cannot be precisely determined.”

With regard to the Masoretic text, the Targum of Job agrees sometimes with the Sept. (as Job 19:29 : בי, Targ. ביה, Sept. ἐν αὐτῷ; Job 22:21 : תבואת,ִ Targ. עללת,ִ Sept. καρπός σου; Job 31:32 : לאוֹרִח, Targ. לאכסניא, Sept. ξένος, both אירֵח),or with the Peshito (comp. Job 3:8; Job 6:16; Job 7:4; Job 9:7; Job 16:10; Job 26:10; Job 33:28). Often the reading of the Targum has to be explained from an interchange of letters, thus:

ר and ד—    Job 24:24; רמו, Tar. דמו (אורוכו).

“           Job 5:5;    אל, “  חל (פולמוסין).

“           Job 30:3;   שואה,  “  שוחה (שוחא).

“           Job 28:7;   איה,  “ חיה (חוה).

אּ and  מ          Job 7:4;    ומדד, Tar. ואדד(ונדדית).

ח “   מ           Job 30:12; פרחה,  “  פרח(בניהון).

ה“    ת           Job 17:2;   םובהמרותם ובֻרות            ַ(ובפירוגיהון).

י“    ו—   Job 19:28;בי,     “  בו(ביה).

י “  ו—           Job 28:7; איה,    “ חוה(חוה).

            Job 22:29; עינים, “  עונים(סורחנא).

            Job 36:10; און,   “ אין(דדמיןלמא).

נ“   ש—     Job 7:9; ענן,     “  עשן( היכמא דפסק(תננא

            Job 36:20; תשא,   “  תנא(תגיר).

In two cases the variation is to be accounted for by hearing amiss, viz. Job 29:22, where, instead of תט, תיטב (תשפר), and Job 39:23, where, for תרנה, תרמה(תשדי) is read. The number is greater where the vowel-points differ from those of the Masorah. Variations of this kind may amount to about thirty.

The Targum on Job was published by John Terentius (Franek. 1663) [the text being that of Buxtorf, and the Latin translation that of Arias Montanus], with notes, consisting of various readings and explanations of Chaldee words. The Latin version of Alphonso de Zamora was published with notes by John Mercier (ibid. 1663), and Victorius Scialai translated it into Latin (Rome, 1618). This Targum has been treated by Bacher, in Gratz's Monatsschrift, 1871, p. 208-223, and by Weiss, De Libri Jobi Paraphrasi Chaldaica (Vratisl. 1873).

2. The Targum on the Psalms. — This Targum is not so Haggadic or diffuse as that of Job. Sometimes it follows the original with a tolerable degree of closeness, as in 1, 3, 5, 6:etc. In more cases, however, it indulges in prolix digressions, absurd fables, and commonplace remarks. Two or three different versions of the same text occasionally follow one another without remark, though the introductory notice ת א, i.e. אחר תרגום, sometimes precedes (comp. Psa 110:1). The additions to the text are  often inappropriate, the sense distorted, the titles wrongly paraphrased, and fables are abundant. Thus in Exodus , 1 the paraphrase has, “The Lord said in his word that he would appoint me lord of all Israel; but he said to me again, Wait for Saul, who is of the tribe of Benjamin, till he die, because he does not agree in the kingdom with an associate; and afterwards I will make thine enemies thy footstool,” to which is subjoined ת א, thus, “The Lord said in his word that he would give me the dominion because I was intent upon the doctrine of the law of his right hand wait till I make thine enemy the footstool of thy feet.” Deviations from the Masoretic text are numerous. On the whole, the linguistic character of this Targum corresponds with that on Job, and resembles that of the Jerusalem Targum. It abounds in Greek words; thus, besides the ἄγγελοι, occurring also in Job, we meet with δῶρον, 20:4; πέλαγος, 46:3; κύρνος, 53:1, and 97:10; νῆσος, 72:10; πλατεῖα, 58:12; κύριος, 73:13; ὅχλος, 89:7; συνέδριον, 57:32; χάλκωμα, 18:34, etc. According to Bacher, Das Targum zu den Psalmen, in Gratz's Monatsschrift, 1872, p. 408416; 463-473, the author of this Targum is the same as that of Job. Davidson, in Kitto's Cyclop. s.v. “Targum,” thinks that, “like the Targum on Job, this one is an accumulation of expositions extending over centuries.” The Targum on the Psalms was printed in Justiniani's Polyglot Psalter (Genoa, 1516), and in the Hexaglot edition of the Psalter, published at Rostock, 1643. It is also printed in the latest Rabbinical Bible (Warsaw. 1875). The Antwerp and following Polyglots (1572, 1645, 1657) contain the Latin version of Arias Montanus. From the Codex Reuchlin, it was published by Lagarde in his Hagiographa Chaldaice (Leips. 1873), and republished by Nestle in his Psalterium Tetraglottum (Tüb. 1877-79).

3. The Targum on Proverbs. — This Targum is not Haggadic, and adheres more closely to the original text. Its remarkable agreement with the Syriac version has often been noticed an agreement which extends even to the choice and position of words, comp. 1, 1-6, 8, 10, 12, 13; 2, 9, 10, 13-15; 3, 2-9; 4:1-3, 26; 5, 1, 2, 4, 5; 8:27; 10:3-5; 26:1; 27:2, 5, 6, 8; 29:5, 6; 31:31. Dathe, in his De Ratione Consensus Versionis Chaldaicae et Syriacae Proverbiorum Solononis (Lips. 1764), was the first who gave special attention to this fact, and came to the conclusion that the Chaldee interpreter was dependent on the Syriac. He endeavors to prove his position by many pertinent arguments, such as that the Syriac explains Aramaean departures from the Hebrew most naturally, and that many Syriacisms in words, forms, and orthography appear in the version which  are otherwise unknown to Chaldee, or at least are very rare. Eichhorn and Volck take the same view. Havernick denies the use of the one by the other, endeavoring to account for their similarity by the cognate dialects in which both are written, the identity of country in which they had their origin, and their literality. Davidson, in Kitto's Cyclopaedia, is inclined to believe that, the Targum having been made in Syria, the Syriac as well as the Hebrew was consulted, or rather the Greek through the medium of the Syriac. While the Hebrew was the basis, the Syriac was freely used. Different entirely is the opinion of Maybaum, who takes the opposite ground to that of Dathe, Eichhorn, and others. He believes that the Syriac interpreter was dependent on the Chaldee. The statements in the art. SEE SYRIAC VERSION, ITS RELATION TO THE SEPTUAGINT AND CHALDEE, in this Cyclopaedia, confirm this view. The greatest obstacle in all these disquisitions is the want of a critical text, and Maybaum, who compared the different readings together with an ancient codex preserved at Breslau, has come to the conclusion that Dathe s evidence is based upon corrupt readings. As to the original language of this Targum, Dathe (op. cit. p. 125) expresses it as his opinion that it was originally written in Syriac, the Chaldaisms which we find at present having been interpolated by Jews: “Nempe Judmei utebantur versionibus Syriacis, quas legere atque intelligere ob summam utriusque linguae consensionem paterant.

Sed.mutabant eas passim, partim ad suse dialecti proprietatem, partim ad lectionem textus Hebrei inter eos receptam.” His hypothesis is based upon the fact that the Chaldee in 18:22 agrees with the Hebrew מצא אשה מצא טוב, and while the other versions read טובהafter אשה, the Chaldee agrees with the Hebrew. But it is evident that because the word is wanting in one MS., this inference cannot be drawn concerning all others. The fact in the matter is, that only in Walton's edition does the Chaldee agree with the Hebrew text; while others, as Dathe himself admits, have the word טובה. And, after all, how is it that the Chaldee so often deviates from the Masoretic text? Whence is it that so many Chaldaisms are found even in those codices which, in the passage quoted above, do not agree with the Masoretic text? The answer is that, as the Chaldaisms in our Targum are as original as the Syriacisms, we have here evidently to do with a mixed dialect; and from the analysis given on the linguistic peculiarities, Maybaum comes to the conclusion that the language of the Targum on Proverbs is Syro-Chaldaic, and the original language of the author. The relation of the Chaldee to the Syriac version having already been treated at some  length in the art. SEE SYRIAC VERSION, ITS RELATION TO THE SEPTUAGINT AND CHALDEE, we can only refer to it.

If the hypothesis of Maybaum, which we have adopted, be true, viz. that the Syriac depended upon the Chaldee, not vice versa for even Davidson admits that “a uniform dependence of the Aramaean upon the Syriac cannot be sustained” the Targum on Proverbs must have existed at a very early period; at any rate, Davidson acknowledges that the Targum on Proverbs is older than those on Job and Psalms, in this respect following Zunz. This being so, we do not err in assuming that the Targum on Proverbs belongs to the 2d or 3d century. It is generally found in the Polyglot and Rabbinical Bibles. It was translated into Latin by Alphonso de Zamora and John Mercier. See, besides Dathe s treatise, already mentioned, Maybaum, Ueber die Sprache des Targum zu den Spriichen und dessen Verhdltniss zum Syrer, in Merx's Archiv für wissenschcftliche Forschung des Alten Testaments, 2, 66 sq.

4. The Targum on the Five Megilloth, i.e. on Ruth, Esther, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, and the Lamentations, is, according to Zunz, a Midrashic paraphrase, exceedingly loose and free in character, containing legends, fables, allusions to Jewish history, and many fanciful additions. The whole bears the impress of a date considerably posterior to the Talmudic time, and is written in an intermediate dialect between, the West Aramaean of Job, Psalms, and Proverbs, and the East Aramaean of the Babylonian Talmud. The least Haggadic is Ruth, the most rhapsodical that of Song of Solomon. Delitzsch (Gesch. d. jüd. Poesie, p. 135) thinks that “the Targums on the five Megilloth are the most beautiful national works of art, through which there runs the golden thread of Scripture, and which are held together only by the unity of the idea.” Whether these Targums are the work of one or different persons cannot be well decided. The former is the opinion of Zunz, Volck, and Deutsch, the latter that of Davidson.

(1.) The Targum on Ruth was published separately with a Latin translation and scholia by John Mercier (Paris, 1564), and the following specimen will give a fair idea of the same: Rth 2:10-11,” Why have I found pity in thine eves to know me, and I of a strange people, of the daughters of Moab, and of a people who are not clean to enter into the Church of the Lord? And Boaz answered and said to her, In telling it has been told me by the saying of the wise men, that when the ‘Lord decreed, he did not decree respecting women, but men; and it was said to me in prophecy that kings  and prophets are about to spring from thee on account of the good thou hast done,” etc.

(2.) The paraphrase on Lamentations is more Midrashic than that on Ruth, but of the same type, being copiously interwoven with pieces of history, allegory, fables, reflections, etc.

(3.) The paraphrase on Ecclesiastes is more Midrashic than the former, the author having given a free rein to his imagination and made copious insertions. The following verses will best illustrate the character of this paraphrase. In 1, 2, we read:

“When Solomon the king of Israel foresaw, by the spirit of prophecy, that the kingdom of Rehoboam his son would be divided with Jeroboam the son of Nebat, and that Jerusalem and the holy temple would be destroyed, and that the people of Israel would be led into captivity, he said, by the Divine Word, Vanity of vanities is this world; vanity of vanities is all which I and my father, David, have labored for, all of it is vanity... (Rth 2:12-13). When king Solomon was sitting upon the throne of his kingdom, his heart became very proud of his riches, and he transgressed the Word of God, and he gathered many horses and chariots and riders, and he amassed much gold and silver, and he married from foreign nations, whereupon the anger of the Lord was kindled against him; and he sent to him Ashmoda, the king of the daemons, who drove him from the throne of his kingdom, and took away the ring from his hand, in order that he should roam and wander about in the world to reprove it; and he went about in the provincial towns and the cities of the land of Israel, weeping and lamenting, and saying, I am Coheleth, whose name was formerly called Solomon, who was king over Israel in Jerusalem: and I gave my heart to ask instruction of God at the time when he appeared unto me in Gibeon, to try me, and to ask me what I desire of him; and I asked nothing of him except wisdom, to know the difference between good and evil, and knowledge of whatsoever was done under the sun in this world, and I saw all the works of the wicked children of men-a sad business which God gave to the children of men to be afflicted by it.” As this Targum has been translated into English by Ginsburg, in his Commentary on, Ecclesiastes (London, 1861), the reader, by perusing the same, will be enabled to judge for himself better than by any extracts.

(4.) The Targum on Song of Solomon is the most Haggadic of all, and hardly deserves the name of a paraphrase, because the words of the  original are: completely covered by extravagant and inflated expressions (nugae atque frivolitates”) which refer to another subject. “The paraphrast has indulged in the greatest license, and allowed his imagination to run riot in a multiplicity of ways.” He has composed a panegyric on his people, describing prophetically the history of the Jewish nation, beginning with their exode from Egypt, and detailing their doings and sufferings down to the coming of the Messiah and the building of the third Temple. Thus, according to this allegory, 1:3 relates Jehovah's fame which went abroad in consequence of the wonders he wrought when bringing the Israelites out of Egypt; Rth 2:12 describes the departure of Moses to receive the two tables of stone, and how the Israelites in the meantime' made the golden calf; Rth 2:14 particularizes the pardon of that sin and the erection of the tabernacle; Rth 3:6-11 refers to the passage of the Israelites, under the leadership of Joshua, over the Jordan, their attacking and conquering the Canaanites, and the building of Solomon's Temple; 5:2 describes the Babylonian captivity; 6:2 represents the deliverance of Israel through Cyrus, and the building of the second Temple; Rth 2:7, etc., names the battles of the Maccabees; 7:11,12 represents the present dispersion of the Jews, and their future anxiety to learn the time of their restoration; 8:5, etc., describes the resurrection of the dead, the final ingathering of Israel, the building of the third Temple, etc.

The very first verse of this Targum reads thus: “The songs and praises which Solomon the prophet, king of Israel, sang by the spirit of prophecy, before God, the Lord of the whole world. Ten songs were sung in this world, but this song is the most celebrated of them all. The first song Adam sang when his sins were forgiven him, and when the Sabbath-day came and protected him he opened his mouth and said, ‘A song for lie Sabbath-day,' etc. (Psalms 92). The second song Moses and the children of Israel sang when the Lord of the world divided the Red Sea for them. They all opened their mouths and sang as one man the song as it is written, ‘Then sang Moses and the children of Israel' (Exo 15:1). The third song the children of Israel sang when the well of water was given to them, as it is written, ‘Then sang Israel' (Num 21:17). The fourth song Moses the prophet sang when his time came to depart front- this world, in which he reproved the people of the house of Israel, as it is written, ‘Give ear, 0 heavens, and I will speak' (Deu 32:1). The fifth song Joshua the son of Nun sang when he waged ‘war in Gibeon, and the sun and moon stood still for him thirty-six hours; and when they left off singing  their song, he himself opened his month and sang this song, as it is written, Then sang Joshua before the Lord' (Jos 10:12). The sixth song Barak and Deborah sang in the day when the Lord delivered Sisera and his army into the hands of the children of Israel, as it is written, ‘Then sang Deborah, etc. (Jdg 5:11). The seventh song Hannah sang when a son was given her by the Lord, as it is written, ‘And Hannah prayed prophetically and said' (1Sa 2:1, and the Targum, ad loc.). The eighth song David the son of Israel sang for all the wonders which the Lord did for him. He opened his mouth and sang a hymn, as it is written, ‘And David sang in prophecy before the Lord' (2Sa 22:1, and the Targum, ad loc.). The ninth song Solomon the king of Israel sang by the Holy Spirit before God, the Lord of the whole world. And the tenth song the children of the captivity shall sing when they shall be delivered from their captivity, as it is written and declared by Isaiah the prophet, ‘This song shall be unto you for joy, as in the night in which the feast of the Passover is celebrated; and gladness of heart as when the people go to appear before the Lord three times in the year, with all kinds of music, and with the sound of the timbrel, to go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to worship before the Lord the mighty one of Israel' (Isa 30:29).” From this specimen it will be seen how far the learned Broughton was correct in saying that the paraphrase “is worth our-study, both for delight and profit.” This Targum is found in the Rabbinical Bibles; it has been translated into Latin, and is also accessible to English readers in the translation of Gill, at the end of his Commentary on the Song of Solomon (Lond. 1751), p. 535 sq.

(5.) The Targum, or rather Targums, on Esther; The book of Esther, enjoying, both through its story like form and the early injunction of its being read or heard by every one on the Feast of Purim, a great circulation and popularity, has been targumized many times. One translation of concise form, and adhering closely to the text, occurs in the Antwerp Polyglot (vol. 3); it was issued enlarged with glosses by Tailer in Targum Prius et Posterius in Esther, studiis F. Taileri (Lond. 1655), and forms the Targum Prius which is contained in the London Polyglot. Much more prolix, and amplilying still more the legends of this Targum (comp. 1:2, 11; 2:5, 7; 3:1; 5:14, etc.) is the Targum Posterius in Tailer, it being “a collection of Eastern romances, broken up and arranged to the single verses; if gorgeous hues and extravagant imagination, such as are to be met with in the Adsharib or Chamis, or any Eastern collection of legends and tales.” Its  final redaction probably belongs to the 11th century. This is the view of Dr. Munk, the latest editor of this second Targum, one of the tales of which runs as follows:

“One day when the king (Solomon) was again full of wine, he commanded that all wild animals, the fowls of the air, and the creeping animals of the earth, as well as the devils, daemons, and spirits, be brought to him, that they might dance before him, and behold, with all the kings who were with him, his glory. The royal scribe called them by their name, and they all congregated before the king, with the exception of the wild cock. At this the king angrily commanded that he should be sought for, and when found, should be brought in, intending to kill him. Then said the wild cock to the king, My lord king, trive heed and hear my words! For three months I weighed in my mind, and flew about in the whole world ill search of a town which does not obey thee. I saw then a city in the East, of the name of Kitor, in which are many people, and a woman governs them all; she is called queen of Sheba. If it please thee, my lord king, I shall go to that city, bind their kings in chains, and their rulers with iron fetters, and bring them hither. As it pleased the king, writers were called who wrote letters and bound them to the wings of the wild cock. He came to the queen, who, observing the letter tied to the wing, loosened it and read the following contents: From me, king Solomon, greeting to thee and to thy princes! Thou knowest well that God has made me king over the beasts of the field, over the birds of heaven, over daemons, spirits, and goblins. The kings from all regions of the earth approach me with homage: wilt thou do this, thou shalt have great honor; if not, I will send upon thee kings, legions, and horsemen. The kings are the beasts of the field; the horsemen the birds of heaven, the hosts, daemons and spirits; the goblius are ‘the legions who shall strangle you in your beds. When the queen had read this, she rent her garments and called for the elders and lords, saying, Know ye what king Solomon has sent to me? They answered, We neither know nor esteem him. The queen, however, trusting them not, called for sailors and sent presents to the king, and after three years she came herself. The king, on hearing of her arrival, sat in a crystal hall to receive her, which made her fancy that he was, sitting in water; she therefore uncovered her feet to pass through. On seeing his glory, she said; May the Lord thy God be praised who has found pleasure in thee and made thee sit on the throne to exercise mercy and justice.” We have purposely selected this: piece from the first chapter, because it is also found in an abridged form in the Koran (sura  27). With a commentary, the second Targum is found in the Warsaw Rabbinical Bible. A separate edition, with various readings, notes, etc., was published by Munk, Targum Scheni zoum Buche Esther (Berlin, 1876). It has lately been translated by Cassel, in an appendix to his Das Buch Esther. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Morgenlandes (ibid. 1878). It has been treated in an essay by Reiss, Das Targum Scheni zu dem Buche Esther, in the Monatsschrift edited by Gratz, 1876, p. 161 sq., 276 sq., 398 sq.

5. The Targum on the Books of Chronicles. — This is preserved in three codices. The oldest, bearing the date of 1294, is in the Vatican, known as Cod. Urbin. I, and is still awaiting a critical edition or perusal. A second codex, of the year 1343, belonging to the Erfurt Library, was published by Beck (Augsburg, 1680-83, 2 vols.), and edited with a Latin translation and learned annotations. The Erfurt MS. has many chasms, especially in the first fourteen chapters. The third codex, of the year 1347, and belonging to the University of Cambridge, was published by David Wilkins (Amster. 1715). Here the text is complete, so that the lacuna in Beck's edition are filled. Like its predecessor, it has also a Latin version, but there are no notes. Great as was Wilkins's ability for editing this Targum, yet it speaks badly for his knowledge that he has put on the title-page R. Joseph as the author (though Beck was of the same opinion), and that he has made him rector of the academy in Syria, instead of Sora in Babylonia. Wilkins's edition was lately republished from a copy found at Prague by Dr. Rahmer, under the title של דברי הימי תרגום(Thorn, 1866), and the deviations from Beck's edition are given in notes. We cannot enter here upon a comparison of the Erfurt codex with that of Cambridge. As to the authorship of this Targum, its ascription to R. Joseph the Blind must be regarded as exploded. Whether it is the work of one author or of more cannot now be decided. Language, style, manner, and Haggadic paraphrase show its Palestinian origin. Zunz remarks that it sometimes transcribes the Jerusalem Targum on the Pentateuch verbally, as in the genealogical table of the first chapter (comp. v. 51 with the Jerusalem Targum on Gen 36:39). So, also, in the psalm passages in 1 Chronicles 16 its words often coincide with the Targum on Psalms 105, 96. The origin of this Targum cannot be put earlier than the 8th century; or, as the most recent writer on this Targum thinks, the older text, as preserved in the Erfurt codex, belongs to the middle of the 8th century, and the later, as preserved in the Cambridge codex, to the beginning of the 9th. Owing to the late origin of this Targum, we must not be surprised at finding the name  of Hungary occurring in it, as well as some other foreign words, besides many fables, especially in the explanation of proper names. For critical purposes both editions must be used-the first, Paraphrasis Chaldaica Libr. Chronicorum, cura M. F. Beckii, for the learned notes; the second, Paraphrasis… auctore R. Josepho, etc., for the more correct and complete text. The writer of the art. “Targum” in Smith's Dict. of the Bible states that “the science of exegesis will profit little by it” (this Targum). What we know of the subject induces us to hold an opposite opinion (see Frankel, Monatsschrifi, 1867, p. 349 sq.; but, more especially, Rosenberg, Das Targum zur Chronik, in Geiger's Jüdische Zeitschrift, 1870, p. 72 sq., 135 sq., 263 sq.).

6. The Targum on Daniel. — The existence of this work was first noticed by Munk, who thinks that he found it in a MS. in the Imperial Library at Paris (No. 45 du Fonds de St. Germain-des-Pres). The MS., however, contains only a Persian Targum, giving an apocryphal account of Daniel. According to the learned writer, this קצה דניאל, or History of Daniel, was taken from a Targum on Daniel in Chaldee. The first words are written in Chaldee, they are then repeated in Persian, and the history continues in the latter language. After several legends known from other Targums, follows a long prophecy of Daniel, from which the book is shown to have been written after the first Crusade. Mohammed and his successors are mentioned, also a king who, coming from Europe (אז רומיאן), will go to Damascus, and kill the Ishmaelitic (Mohammedan) kings and princes; he will break down the minarets (מנארה), destroy the mosques (מסגדהא), and no one will after that dare to pronounce the name of the Profane ( פסול= Mohammed). The Jews will also have to suffer great misfortunes (as, indeed, the knightly Crusaders won their spurs by dastardly murdering. the helpless masses-men, women, and children in the Ghettos along the Rhine and elsewhere, before they started to deliver the holy tomb). By a sudden transition, the prophet then passes on to the “Messiah son of Joseph,” to Gog and Magog, and to the “true Messiah, the son of David.” Munk rightly concludes that the book must have been composed in the 12th century, When Christian kings reigned for a brief period over Jerusalem (Notice sur Saadia [Par. 1838], p. 82). According to the description here given, there can be no doubt that it is the same which Zotenberg published some years ago, in Persian, with a German translation, in Merx's Archiv, 1, 385 sq., and beginning thus: “History of Daniel (peace be upon him). I am Daniel, of the children of Jeconiah, king of the house of  Judah.” Davidson says, “We must express our doubts about such a Chaldee paraphrase on Daniel, in the absence of all proof that the Persian was' made from the Chaldee; for a few Chaldee words at the beginning are no argument in favor of it. All that Munk communicates i.e. part of a page is insufficient to warrant us in accepting the fact. Yet Steinschneider has referred to ‘a Targum on Daniel,' simply on the authority of Munk's notice (Catalogus Librorum Hebraeorum in Bibliotheca Bodleiana). No Targum upon Daniel is extant, so far as we yet know, and it is very doubtful whether one was ever made. The reason assigned in the Talmud for not rendering the book into Chaldee is that it reveals the precise time of the Messiah's advent. A good part of the book is already in Chaldee.” To this it may be answered that at the time when Davidson wrote, this Targum was not yet published, otherwise he would have thought differently. Its contents show that the original Chaldee was the basis of it. A number of Hebrew words occur in it, and it closes with quoting Psa 147:2.

7. There is not any Targum, so far as is known, upon Ezra and Nehemiah. Part of Ezra is already Chaldee, and Nehemiah was counted with it as one book.

8. To the Roman edition of the Sept. of Daniel, published in 1772, a Chaldee version is added of the Apocryphal pieces in Esther. This has been printed by De Rossi, accompanied by a Latin version, remarks, and dissertations (Specimen Variarunz Lectionum Sacri Textus et Chaldaica Estheris Additamenta, etc. [ Tüb. 1783, 8vo ]). An edition of the Chaldee Hagiographa was published by Lagarde (Leips. 1873).

VI. Fragmentary Targums on the Other Books. — According to Zunz, the Jerusalem Targum-or rather, as it should be called, the Palestinian one- extended to the prophetic books also, and he justifies his opinion by the following particulars, which we give in his order: Abudraham cites a Jerusalem Targum on 1Sa 9:13, and Kimchi has preserved several passages from it on Judges (Jdg 11:1, consisting of 47 words), on Samuel (1:17,18; 106 words), and Kings (1:22, 21; 68 words; 2:4, 1; 174 words; 4:6; 55 words; 9:7; 72 words; 13:2; 2 Samuel 9 words), under the simple name of Tosephtah, i.e. Addition, or Additional Targum. Luzzato has also lately found fragments of the same, under the names “Targum of Palestine,” “Targum of Jerushalmi,” “Another Reading,” etc., in an African codex written A.M. 5247=A.D. 1487, viz., on 1Sa 18:19; 2Sa 12:12; 1Ki 5:9; 1Ki 5:11; 1Ki 5:13; 1Ki 10:18; 1Ki 10:26; 1Ki 14:13; on Hos 1:1;  Oba 1:1. On Isaiah (ch. 66), Rashi, Abudraham (Isa 54:11), and Farissol (Isaiah 66) quote it, agreeing in part with a fragment of the Targum on this prophet extant in Cod. Urbin. Vatican. No. 1, containing about 190 words, and beginning, “Prophecy of Isaiah, which he prophesied at the end of his prophecy in the days of Manasseh the son of Hezekiah, the king of the tribe of the house of Judah, on the 17th of Tamuz, in the hour when Manasseh set up an idol in the Temple,” etc. Isaiah predicts in this his own violent death. Parts of this Targum are also found in Hebrew, in Pesiktah Rabbathi, 6 a, and Yalkut Isaiah 58 d. A Jerusalem Targum on Jeremiah is mentioned by Kimchi; on Ezekiel by R. Simon, Nathan (Aruch), and likewise by Kimchi, who also speaks of a further additional Targum on Jonathan for this book. A Targum Jerushalmi on Micah is known to Rashi, and of Zechariah a fragment has been published by Bruns (Repert. pt. 15:p. 174) from a Reuchlinian M6. (Cod. Kennic. 154), written in 1106. The passage, found as a marginal gloss to Zec 12:10, reads as follows:

“Targum Jerushalmi. — And I shall pour out upon the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem the spirit of prophecy and of prayer for truth. “And after this shall go forth Messiah the Son of Ephraim to wage war against Gog. And Gog will kill him before the city of Jerusalem. They will look up to me and they will ask me wherefore the heathens have killed Messiah the Son of Ephraim. They will then mourn over him as mourn father and mother over an only son, and they will wail over him as one wails over a first-born.” A Targum Jerushalmi on the third chapter of Habakkuk, quoted by Rashi, is mentioned by De Rossi (Cod. 265 and 405, both of the 13th century). To these quotations, which led Zunz to draw the inference that the Jerusalem Targum extended to the prophetic books also, a large number of fragments and variations must now be added since the publication of the Reuchlinian codex by Lagarde. These fragments and variations deviate from the common translation, and are introduced by five different designations, as on, תרג, ספראחר, לישנא אחרינא, ואית דמתרגמי, ירוש, alid פליג. These additions, as found in the Reuchlinian codex, have been analyzed in a very scholarly manner by Dr. Bacher, in the Zeifschrift der deutschen morgenl. Gesellschaft, 1874, 28:1 sq., and they extend to the following books, viz.: Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Jonah, Micah, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, and Zechariah. Obadiah, Nahum, Haggai, and Malachi are not included. Zunz, after referring to the conjecture that the Jerusalem Targum  on the prophets embraced nothing more than the Haphtaroth, or lessons, remarks that the idea is untenable, because the expressions of the authors who allude to it go to show that they had seen Targums upon entire books (Gottesd. Vortrage, p. 78). This may be so; but the existence of an entire Targum of Palestine on all the prophets is problematical. We have seen above, if the Reuchlinian MS. may be taken as a standard, that on four prophets, viz. Obadiah, Nahum, Haggai, and Malachi, such fragments are not given. Some books may have received such a paraphrase; on others, and those the great majority of the prophetical books, there is reason to doubt its existence. It is more probable that portions were treated paraphrastically in the spirit of the later Haggadah—portions selected on no definite principle, but adopted by the fancy or liking of paraphrasts; and we are the more justified in this conclusion when comparing Dr. Bacher's parallels from the Talmud and Midrash with these fragmentary additions. Deutsch, the writer of the art. “Targum” in Smith's Dict. of the Bible, thinks “the Babylonian version the Jonathan Targum though paraphrastic, did not satisfy the apparently more imaginative Palestinian public. ‘Thus from heaped-up additions and marginal glosses, the step to a total rewriting of the entire codex in the manner and taste of the later times and the different locality was easy enough.” Be it as it may, this question will always remain, as Dr. Bacher says, “one of the darkest points in the disquisition of the Targum on the prophets.”

VII. Character and Value of the Targums in General. There is nothing to indicate that the Targums were written at first with vowels. Buxtorf endeavored to correct the punctuation and bring it as near as possible to the standard of that in Daniel and Ezra, for which some censured him, though, we believe, unjustly. It is no reproach to his memory to say that he did not perfect their vocalization. As there is at present no critical text of the Targums, they can only be carefully employed in the criticism of the Hebrew original, although they show the substantial integrity of the Masoretic text. They may be advantageously used in suggesting readings of some importance and value. Perhaps they are more useful in interpretation than the lower criticism. On the whole, Richard Simon's view of the Targums deserves to be noted here. In his Hist. Crit. Vet. Test. lib. 2, c. 18, he says,” Omnes iste paraphrases, praeter illam Olnkelosi et Jonathanis. non magna mihi utilitatis esse videntur, nee forsan multum e re fecit, illas curiose quaesiisse. Non quanta tamen multis existimatur, illarum utilitas: ex adverso Judei ex illis arma adversus Christianos depromunt, sibi fingentes,  nobis ipsorum superstitiones aniles et absurdas probari, quasi veteribus cersionibus quibus conjunguntur a nobis aequipararentur. Proeterea videntur Judaici ritus et cerimoniae iis magis quam fides Christiana confirmari: incerta itaque et anceps ex illis ducta contra Judseos victoria. Quid quod qus nostrae fidei fayentia credimus, pleraque verae sunt allegorise, quas non operosum verbis alio convertere; neque enim religio allegoriis probatur.”

VIII. Literature. — Since we have already mentioned under the different heads the special literature, we will here name the works on the Targumim in general. Here belong-besides the general introductions to the Old Test. of Eichhorn, Havernick, De Wette, Bleek, Kaulen, and Kleinert- Prideaux, Connection (ed. Wheeler, Lond. 1865), 2, 443 sq.; Walton, Prolegomena (ed. Dathe); Smith, Diatriba de Chaldaicis Paraphrasibus; Wolf, Bibl. Hebraea, 2, 1135-1191;' 4:730-734; Zunz, Die gotfesd. Tortrdge der Judein (Berlin, 1832), p. 61-83; Gfrorer, Das Jahrhundert des Heils, i, 36- 59; Fürst, Literaturblatt des Orients, 1840, Nos. 44-47; id. Bibl. Jud. 2, 105-107; ‘3, 48; Frankel, Einiges zu den Targum, in the Zeitschrift fuib die religisen Interessen des Judenth. 1846, p. 110-120; Herzfeld, Gesch. d. Volkes Israel, 3, 61 sq., 551 sq.; Geiger, Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel, p. 162-167; Volck, s.v. “Thargumim,” in Herzog's Real- Encyklop. 15:672-683; Deutsch, s.v. “Targum,” in Smith's Dict. ofthe Bible; Davidson, id. in Kitto's Cyclopcedia; id. Biblical Criticism, 1, 224 sq.; langlen, Das Judenth. in Paldstina, p. 70-72, 209-218, 268 sq., 418 sq.; Noldeke, Die alttestamentliche Literatur, p. 255-262; Schurer, Lehrbuch der neutestamnentlichen Zeitgeschichte (Leips. 1874), p. 476 sq. The best lexicon on the Targums is that of Levy, Chalddisches Wörterbuch über die Targumint (ibid. 1867); the latest Aramrean grammar is that of Lerner, ארמית ספר דקדוק לשון(Warsaw, 1875). SEE CHALDEE LANGUAGE. (B. P.)

## Tarnoczy, Maximilian Von[[@Headword:Tarnoczy, Maximilian Von]]

             a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic, was born Oct. 24,1806, at Schwaz, in Tyrol. Having graduated at the gymnasium at Innsbruck, he entered, in 1824, the clerical seminary at Salzburg, and received the first orders in 1829. He completed his studies at Vienna, and, after having been honored in 1832 with the theological doctorate, he was appointed professor of dogmatics at Salzburg. In 1844 he became a member of the Salzburg chapter, and from that time, being the trusty adviser of the cardinal and  prince archbishop Schwarzenberg, he took an active part in ecclesiastical affairs. When Schwarzenberg received the archbishopric of Prague in 1850, Tarnoczy was appointed his successor at Salzburg, and was consecrated June 1, 1851, for that office. In his new position he labored for twenty-five years, and his labors were acknowledged by Pius IX, who made him a member of the college of cardinals, Dec. 22. 1873. After a long illness, Tarnoczy died at Salzburg, April 4,1876. See the fite rarischer Handweiser, 1876, p. 285. (B. P.)

## Tarnov, Johann[[@Headword:Tarnov, Johann]]

             a German doctor and professor of theology, was born April 19, 1586, at Grevismuhlen, in Mecklenburg, and died Jan. 22, 1629, at Rostock, where he had lectured since 1614. He wrote: Declaratio eorum quae ad Dicti Esai. c. 45 5. 8 Sensu Literali Investig. in Exercit. Biblic. allata sunt (Rostock, 1621): Exercilt. Biblic. Libri IV in quibus Verus et Genuin. Sensus Locorum Sacrosrum Multorumn Inquiritur ac Defenditur (2d ed. ibid. 1621, and often): — In Threnos Jerentice Comment. (Hamburg, 1707): — In Prophetas Minores Comm. (Leipsic, 1688, 1706): — In Prophetam Haggteum Comm. (Rostock, 1624): — In Prophetam Malachiam Comm. (ibid. 1624): — Comment. in Epistol. Pauli ad Ephes., Philipp., Coloss., et Thessal. (ibid. 1636). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 1, 188, 220, 222, 253; Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 411; Diestel, Geschichte des Alten Testaments, p. 399,456. (B. P.)

## Tarnov, Paul[[@Headword:Tarnov, Paul]]

             a German doctor and professor of theology, uncle of Johann, was born April 29, 1562, at Grevismihlen, and died at Rostock, March 6,1633. He is the author of, In Joann. Evang. Commentarius (Rostock, 1629): — Libri III de Conjugio .(ibid. 1614): — De Sacros. Ministerio Libri III (ibid. 1623). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 1, 248, 460, 464; 2, 797. (B. P.)

## Tarpelite[[@Headword:Tarpelite]]

             (Chald. only in the plur. emphat. Tarpelaye', טִרְפְּלָיֵא; Sept. Ταρφαλαῖοι v.r. Ταρφαλλαῖοι; Vulg. Tharphalcei), the Aramsean designation of a race of colonists who were planted in the cities of Samaria after the captivity of the northern kingdom of Israel (Ezr 4:9). Junius and others have found a kind of resemblance in name to the Tarpelites in  the Tapyri (Ταπουροί, Ptolemy, 6:2, 6; Arrian, Alex. 3, 8, 7; Τάπυροι, Strabo, 11:511,515, 520, 523), a tribe of Media who dwelt eastward of Elymais, but the resemblance is scarcely more than apparent. Others, with as little probability, have sought to recognize the Tarpelites in the Tarpetes (Ταρπῆτες, Strabo, 11:495),a Maeotic race. In the Peshito-Syriac the resemblance is greater, for they are there called Tarpoye. First (Handwb. s.v.) says in no case can Taspel, the country of the Tarpelites, be the Phoenician Tripolis; although Schwarz (Palest. p. 62) assumes this.

## Tarphon, or Tryphon[[@Headword:Tarphon, or Tryphon]]

             a Jewish rabbi of the 2d century A.D., belonged to a sacerdotal family. He was a friend and contemporary of rabbi Akiba, and for some time rector of the school at Lydda. He was noted as a bitter enemy of Christianity, and declared that, although the gospels and the other writings of the “Minim,” or Christians, contained the sacred name of the Deity, they ought to be burned; that heathenism was less dangerous than Christianity; that heathens offended from ignorance, while Christians did so with full knowledge; and that he would prefer seeking shelter in a heathen temple rather than in a meeting-place of the Minim (Talm. Shabbath, fol. 116, Colossians 1). This, his animosity against Christianity, induced some, as Lightfoot, Carpzov, and others, to maintain that rabbi Tarphon is the same Trypho who is the interlocutor in Justin Martyr's Dialogue, an opinion which probably owes its origin to Eusebius (Eccl. Hist. 4:18), but which has little or no probability in its defense. In the Pirke Aboth, 2, 20 sq., we have the recorded maxim of this sage: “The day is short, the labor vast; but the laborers are slothful, though the reward is great, and the Master presseth for dispatch. It is not incumbent upon thee to complete the work, and yet thou art not at liberty to be idle about it. If thou hast studied the law much, great reward will be given thee; for faithful is thy employer, who will award to thee the hire of thy labor, and be aware that the award of the righteous will be in the future which is to come.” See Basnage, Histoire des Juif (Taylor's Eng. transl.), p. 524; De Rossi, Dizionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei (Hamburger's Germ. transl.), p. 321, s.v. “Tryfon ;” Etheridge, Introduction to Hebrew Literature, p. 65; Friedlander, Patristische und talnmudische Studien (Vienna, 1878), p. 136 sq., 147; Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 449. (B. P.)

## Tarquini, Camillo[[@Headword:Tarquini, Camillo]]

             an Italian Jesuit, was born Sept. 27, 1810, at. Marta, near Montefiascone. He belonged to a noble family and studied at Rome. In 1837 he joined the Society of Jesus. From 1850 he was professor of canon law at the Collegium Romanum, and was one of the editors of the Civilta Cattolica. Besides a number of monographs, he published Juris Ecclesiastici Publici Institutiones (Rome, 1862; 3d ed. 1873). He also wrote a grammar and lexicon on the ancient Etruscan language, which he left in manuscript. In 1873 he was made cardinal-deacon, and died Feb. 15, 1874. Tarquini was the first cardinal who, since 1713, was appointed from the members of the Society of Jesus. , See the Literarischer Handweiser, 1863, p. 182; 1874, p. 176. (B. P.)

## Tarragona, Councils of[[@Headword:Tarragona, Councils of]]

             These two councils were so called because they were held in the city of that name in Spain. This city (anciently Taarraco), capital of the province of the same name, is situated at the mouth of the Francoli, has a population of about 18,000, is the seat of an archbishop, and, besides other schools of learning, has an ecclesiastical seminary.

I. The first council of Tarragona was held in 516, during the reign of Theodoric, king of Italy, and guardian of Amalric, king of Spain. Ten bishops were present, and thirteen canons published.

3. Forbids usury among clerks.

4. Forbids bishops, priests, and clerks to judge any cause on Sundays; allows them to do so on other days, provided they do not interfere in criminal cases.

7. Directs that the priest or deacon appointed to any country parish shall remain there during his week (i.e. that the priest shall remain there one week, and then the deacon shall succeed him and keep his week) in order to celebrate divine service with the clerks; and that on Saturday all the clergy shall attend in order to begin the Sunday office. It also orders that matins and vespers shall be said daily.

1. Forbids monks to leave their convent in order to perform any clerical function without leave from their superior. See Mauisi, Coec. 4:1562.

II. The second council was held in 1242, by Peter the archbishop, against the Waldenses in Aragon. Part only of the acts remain. See Mansi, Cone. 11:592.

## Tarshish[[@Headword:Tarshish]]

             (Heb. תִּרְשַׁישׁ, Tarshish', subdued [Gesen.] or established [Fürst]; Sept. Θάρσεις [but Καρχηδών in Isaiah 23; Καρχηδόνιοι in Ezekiel; θάλασσα in Isaiah 2, 16]; Vulg. usually Tharsis; A.V. “Tharshish,” 1Ki 10:22; 1Ki 22:48; 1Ch 7:10; once Heb. תִּרְשַׁישָׁה, Tarshishah', 1Ch 1:7), the name of three men, of a country, and of a gem.

1. Second-named of the four sons of Javan, the son of Japheth (Gen 10:4; 1Ch 1:7). B.C. post 2514. He may have been the founder of the city noticed below. SEE ETHNOLOGY.

2. Sixth-named of the seven sons of Bilhar, the grandson of Benjamin (1Ch 7:10). B.C. post 1875.

3. Fourth-named of the seven “princes” of Persia in the time of Artaxerxes (Est 1:14). B.C. 483. As a Persian name the word stands in relation with Teresh (2,221; 6:2), and with Tirshatha; all probably from the root torsh, severe (Gesenius, Thesaur. s.v.).

4. A famous port or region the location of which has been much disputed. Josephus (Ant. 1, 6, 1) confounds it with Tarsus in Cilicia; and in the Sept. version of Isa 23:1; Isa 23:10-14, it is rendered Καρχηδών, Carthage. A similar rendering is found in Eze 27:12; Eze 38:13, Καρχήδονιοι, Carthaginians, an identification urged by Davis (Carthage, ch. 1). As the Vulg. translates it by “sea” in the passage quoted above, so the Sept. in Isa 2:16 renders it θαλάσσης, a translation followed by Saadias and Luther. The Targums adopt the same translation in some places, and Jerome apologizes for the blunder by saying that “the Hebrews thought Tharsis was their original term for sea; the noun in common use among them, iam, being a Syriac one.” In other places, as 1Ki 22:48, and Jer 10:9, the Targum gives the peculiar rendering of אפריקא, Africa. Most interpreters, however, are agreed that (with the possible exception of the passage in Chronicles) the allusion is to Tartessus in Spain. It seems to have been the source of the precious stone called by the same name.  In the great genealogical table (Gen 10:4-5) it is placed among the sons of Javan; “Elishah and Tarshish, Kittim and Dodanim.

By these were the islands of the Gentiles divided.” This refers the mind at once to the north-western parts of the Mediterranean. To a similar conclusion does other scriptural language lead. In Psa 72:10 it is said, “The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents;” and in 2Ch 9:21 we read, “The king's (Solomon's) ships went to Tarshish with the servants of Hiram; every three years once came the ships of Tarshish bringing gold and silver, ivory, and apes and peacocks.” Now Hiram's city, Tyre, lay on the Mediterranean coast, and it is easy to see how Solomon's vessels might be associated with his in a voyage towards the west to fetch merchandise. In Isa 66:19 we find Tarshish mentioned in a way which confirms this view: “And I will set a sign among them, and I will send those that escape of them unto the nations (or Gentiles); to Tarshish, Pul, and Lud that draw the bow, to Tubal and Javan to the isles afar off.” These passages make it clear that Tarshish lay at a distance from Judaea, and that that distance was in a north-westerly direction; and the mention of such names as Lud, Javan, and the isles carries the mind to the extreme north- west, and suggests Spain as the place for Tarshish. But Tarshish must have been on the sea-coast, for it was famous for its ships. “The ships of Tarshish” were celebrated under that designation, which may have been used in that wide sense in which we speak of an East India man, reference being made rather to the place whither the vessel traded than to that where it was built; or the phrase may have come to denote a particular kind of vessel, i.e. trading or merchant ships, from the celebrity of Tarshish as a commercial port (1Ki 10:22; Psa 48:7; Isa 2:16; Isa 23:1-14; Isa 60:9; Eze 27:25). These six times do we meet with the phrase, ships or navy of Tarshish; which of itself shows how noted a seaport we have under consideration, if it does not prove also that in process of time the terms had: come to describe vessels according to their occupation rather than their country, as we say “a slaver,” denoting a ship engaged in the slave-trade (comp. Horat. “sevis Liburnis,” Cari. 1, 27; “Bithyna carina,” 1, 35; “trade Cypria,” 1, 1).

In Eze 27:12-25 the place is described by its pursuits and its merchandise-” Tarshish (here again in connection with a western country, Javan, Eze 27:13) was thy (Tyre's) merchant, in all riches with silver, iron, tin, and lead, they traded in thy fairs. The ships of Tarshish did sing of thee in thy market, and thou wast replenished and made very glorious in the midst of the seas.” The last words are admirably descriptive of the south-western coast of Spain. How  could a Hebrew poet better describe the locality where the songs of the sailors of Tarshish made the name of Tyre glorious? Let the reader turn to the map and cast his eye on the ‘embouchure of the Guadalquivir, and say if this spot is not pre-eminently, when viewed from Palestine, “in the midst of the seas.” There is a propriety, too, in the words found in Psa 48:7 (comp, Eze 28:26) “Thou breakest the ships of Tarshish with, an east wind,” if we suppose merchant vessels working eastwardly up the Mediterranean towards Tyre, encountering an east, or rather north-east, gale, which is a very violent and destructive wind to this day. Jer 10:9 tells us that “silver spread into plates” was brought from Tarshish; and from the connection the silver appears to have been elaborately wrought; whence we infer that at one period there was in Tarshish the never-failing connection found between commerce, wealth, and art.

An important testimony occurs in Eze 38:13, “Sheba and Dedan, and the merchants of Tarshish, with all the young lions thereof, shall say unto thee, Art thou come to take a spoil? to carry away silver and gold? to take away cattle and goods, to take a great spoil?” whence it is clear that Tarshish was an opulent place, abounding in cattle and goods, in silver and gold. We are not sure that the words “the young lions thereof” are intended to be taken literally. They may refer to the lion-hearted chiefs of the nation; but if they are understood as implying that lions were literally found in Tarshish, they only concur with, other parts of Scripture in showing that the name is to be taken in a wide acceptation, as denoting, besides modern Andalusia, those parts of Africa which lie near and opposite to Spain. Nor is it impossible that a part of, thee trade of arshish lap in these and in other animals; for we certainly know that Solomon's ships brought that prince apes and peacocks: the lions may have been caught in Africa and conveyed in ships of Tarshish to Tyre. Sheba and Dedan, however, are mentioned here in connection with Tarshish, and they were certainly Eastern countries, lying probably on the western side of the Persian Gulf in Arabia. But the object of the writer may have been to mention the countries placed at the extremities of the then known world—Tarshish on the west, Sheba and Dedan on the east. In Isa 23:1-14 we read, as a part of the burden of Tyre, that the ships of Tarshish are called on to howl at her destruction, because Tyre afforded them no longer a commercial port and a haven: words which entirely agree with the hypothesis that makes Tarshish a city on the seaboard of Spain, trading up the Mediterranean to Tyre.

Nor are the words found in Isa 23:6 discordant-”Pass ye over to Tarshish; howl, ye inhabitants of the isles.” Let us now turn to the book of Jonah (Jon 1:1-3; Jon 4:2). The prophet was commanded to go and prophesy against Nineveh on the Tigris. For this he should, on quitting Jerusalem, have gone in an easterly direction but he shunned the duty and fled. Of course he naturally fled in a direction the opposite of that in which the avoided object lay; he proceeded, in fact, to Tarshish. Tarshish, then, must have been to the west, and not to the east, of Jerusalem. In order to reach Tarshish, he went to Joppa and took ship for the place of his destination, thus still keeping in a westerly course and showing that Tarshish lay to the west. In Tarshish, indeed, placed in the extreme north-west, he might well expect to be distant enough from Nineveh. It is also worthy of notice that, when he arrived at Joppa, on the coast of Palestine, “he found a ship going to Tarshish;” which fact we can well understand if Tarshish lay to the west, but by no means if it lay on the Red Sea. SEE OPHIR.

Thus far all the passages cited agree, with more or less evidence, in fixing Tarshish somewhere in or near Spain. But in 2Ch 20:36 it is recorded that Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, joined himself with Ahaziah, king of Israel, “to make ships to go to Tarshish and they made the ships in Ezion-geber,” that is, on the Elanitic gulf on the eastern arm of the Red Sea. If, then, these vessels built at Ezion-geber were to go to Tarshish, that place must lie on the eastern side of Palestine, instead of the western; for we cannot suppose they circumnavigated Africa; not' because such a voyage was impossible, but because it was long and tedious and not likely to be taken when a nearer and safer way to Tarshish lay from the ports of the Palestinian coast. But in the parallel passage, found in 1Ki 22:49, these vessels are described as “ships of Tarshish” (merchant vessels), which were intended to go to Ophir, not to Tarshish. This removes the difficulty at once, for Ophir was in the East, and accounts for the fact that the fleet was built on the Red Sea, since it was an eastern, not a western, voyage which was intended. The reference appears to be to the same eastern trade of which mention is made in 1Ki 10:22, where we find Hiram and Solomon importing from the East in ships of Tarshish, or merchantmen, gold and silver, ivory, apes and peacocks.

We have not space to enter into the critical questions which this contrariety between the books of Kings and Chronicles suggests for consideration; but we may remark that, in a case in which a diversity appears in the statements of these two authorities, no competently informed theologian could hesitate to give the preference to the former. The alternative of two places by the name of Tarshish, one in Spain and the other in India, was adopted by  Bochart, Phaleg, 3, 7, and has probably been the ordinary view of those who have perceived a difficulty in the passages of the Chronicles; but the above reconciliation, which was first suggested by Vitringa, has been adopted by the acutest Biblical critics of our own time, such as De Wette, Introduction to the Old Testament (Parker's translation, Boston, .1843), 2, 267; Winer, Biblisches Realwörterbuch, s.v.; Gesenius, Thesaurus Linguae Heb. et Chald. s.v.; and Ewald, Geschichte des Volkes Israel (1st ed.), 3, 76; and is acknowledged by Movers, Ueber die Chroniken (1834), p. 254, and Havernick, Spezielle Einleitung in das Alte Testament (1839), 2, 237.

It appears, then, clear, from this minute review of the scriptural accounts and allusions, that Tarshish was an old, celebrated, opulent, cultivated, commercial city, which carried on trade in the Mediterranean and with the seaports of. Syria, especially Tyre and Joppa, and that it most probably lay on the extreme west of that sea. Was there, then, in. ancient times any city in these parts which corresponded with these clearly ascertained facts? There was Such was Tartessus in Spain, said to have been a Phoenician colony (Arrian, Alex. 3, 86), a fact which of itself would account for its intimate connection with Palestine and the Biblical narratives. As to the exact spot where Tartessis (so written originally) lay, authorities are not agreed, as the city had ceased to exist when geography began to receive attention; but it was not far from the Straits of Gibraltar, and near the mouth of the Guadalquivir, consequently at no great distance from the famous Granada of later days. The reader, however, must enlarge his notion beyond that of a mere city, which, how great soever, would scarcely correspond with the ideas of magnitude, affluence, and power that the Scriptures suggest. The name, which is of Phoenician origin, seems to denote the district of South-western Spain, comprising the several colonies which Tyre planted in that country, and so being equivalent to what we might designate Phoenician Spain. We are not, however, convinced that the opposite coast of Africa was not included, so that the word would denote to an inhabitant of Palestine the extreme western parts of the world. We seem, however, authorized, by considerations besides those which have already been elicited, in identifying the Hebrew Tarshish with the Spanish Tartessus, whatever may have been the extent of the neighboring country over which the latter held dominion or possessed immediate influence. Among these considerations we mention:

1. That the two names are similar, if they are not the same; the Greek Ταρτησσός with the Aramaic pronunciation would be תרתישׁ, a fact  which would of itself-seem to settle the question in the absence of conflicting evidence and claims.

2. Spain was one of the chief seats of Phoenician colonization; and if we unite therewith the north-west of Africa, we shall have some idea of the greatness of the power of Tyre in these parts, for Tyre is reported to have founded not fewer than three hundred cities on the western coast of Africa, and two hundred in South-western Spain (Strabo, 2, 82). Here, then, was found the chief object of the Phoenician sea-trade. These countries were to Tyre what Peru was to Spain. Confining our remarks to Spain, we learn from Heeren that the Phoenician colonies on the European side of the sea were situated in the south of the present Andalusia. Here, with other important places, lay Tartessus, a name which is borne by a river, an island, a town, and a region. Heeren distinctly says that to Orientalists the word indicated the farthest west generally, comprising, of course, many, places. In the commercial geography of the Phoenicians, he adds, the: word obviously meant the whole of their colonial dependencies in Southern Spain. In the, same general way, we use the term West Indies; and thus arose the river, the town, the district of Tartessus, since the country included them all (Heeren, Ideen, 2, 44 sq.).

3. It does much to confirm our view that all the articles reported in Jeremiah and Ezekiel to have been brought from Tarshish might have come from South-western Spain. Here there were mines of gold and silver, and Tartessus is expressly named as affording the latter mineral (Strabo, 3, 157; Diod. Sic.5, 35). Tin was brought by the Phoenicians from Britain into Spain, and thence carried to the Oriental markets. According to Diodorus Siculus (5, 38), tin was procured in Spain also, as well as lead, according to Pliny (Hist. Nat. 3, 4). Pliny's words are forcible: “Nearly all Spain abounds in the metals-lead, iron, copper, silver, gold.” We add one or two corroborations of the above identification. Heeren (Ideen, 2, 64) translates Eze 27:25, “The ships of Tarshish,” etc., by Spanish ships were the chief object of thy merchandise; thou (Tyre) wast a full city, and wast honored on the seas.” The Phoenicians were as eager in their quest of gold and gold countries as were the alchemists and the Europeans of the 16th century. The lust for gold urged them over the deserts of Arabia and the cliffs of the Red Sea as far as Yemen and Ethiopia; and the same passion carried them westwardly to the coasts of Spain and the Pillars of Hercules. “Spain,” says Heeren, “was once the richest land in the world for silver; gold was found there in great abundance, and the baser metals as well. The  silver mountains were in those parts which the Phoenicians comprised under the general name of Tartessus, or Tarshish. The immeasurable affluence of precious metals which, on their first arrival, they found here so astounded them, and the sight thereof so wrought on the imagination of the people, that fact called fable to its aid, and the story gained currency that the first Phoenician colonists not only filled their ships with gold, but made thereof-their various implements, anchors not excepted.” SEE COMMERCE.

In the absence of positive proof, we may acquiesce in the statement of Strabo (3, 148) that the river Betis (now the Guadalquivir) was formerly called Tartessus, that the city Tartessus was situated between the two arms by which the river flowed into the sea, and that the adjoining country was called Tartessus. But there were two other cities which some deem to have been Tartessus; one, Gadir or Gadira (Cadiz) (Sallust,Fragnm. lib. 2; Pliny, Hist. Nat. 4:36; and Avienus, Descript. Orb. Terr. p. 614); and the other, Carteia, in the Bay of Gibraltar (Strabo, 3, 151; Ptolemy, 2, 4; Pliny, 3, 3; Mela, 2, 6). Of the three, Carteia, which has found a learned supporter at the present day (Ersch and Gruber, Encyclop. s.v.), seems to have the weakest claims, for, in the earliest Greek prose work extant, Tartessus is placed beyond the Columns of Hercules (Herodotus, 4:152); and in a still earlier fragment of Stesichorus (Strabo, 3, 148) mention is made of the river Tartessus, whereas there is no stream near Carteia (=El Roccadillo) which deserves to be called more than a rivulet. Strictly speaking, the same objection would apply to Gadir; but, for poetical uses, the Guadalquivir, which is only twenty miles distant, would be ‘sufficiently near. It was, perhaps, in reference to the claim of Gadir that Cicero, in a letter to Atticus (7, 3), jocosely calls Balbus a native of that town, “Tartessium istum tuum.” But Tartessus was likewise used by poets to express the extreme west where the sun set (Ovid, Maetam. 14:416; Silius Italicus, 10:358; comp. id. 3, 399). See Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v. “Tartessus.” See, in addition to the works cited by Bochart and Winer, ut sup., the Journ. of Sac. Lit. Oct. 1851, p. 226 sq.

5. (A. V. “beryl.”) A precious stone, so- called as brought from Tarshish, as Ophirisn also put for the gold brought thence (Exo 28:20; Exo 39:13; Eze 1:16; Eze 10:9; Eze 28:13; Son 5:14; Dan 10:6). The Sept., followed by Josephus, makes it the “chrysolite,” i.e. the topaz of the moderns, which is still found in Spain: so Braun, De Vestitu Sacerd. 2, 17. Others suppose it to be “amber;” but this does not agree with the  passages in Exodus, which make the Tarshish to have been one of the engraved stones of the high-priest's breastplate. SEE BERYL.

## Tarsus[[@Headword:Tarsus]]

             (Ταρσός), the chief town of Cilicia, “no mean city” in other respects, but illustrious to all time as the birthplace and early residence of the apostle Paul (Act 9:11; Act 21:39; Act 22:3). The only other passages in which the name occurs are Act 9:30 and Act 11:25, which give the limits of that residence in his native town which succeeded the first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion, and preceded his active ministerial work at Antioch and elsewhere (Act 22:21 and Gal 1:21). It was during this period, no doubt, that he planted the Gospel there, and it has never since entirely died out. There is little doubt that Paul was there also at the beginning of his second and third missionary journeys (Act 15:41; Act 18:23). SEE PAUL.

Tarsus was situated in a wide and fertile plain on the banks of the Cydnus, the waters of which are famous' for the dangerous fever caught by Alexander when bathing, and for the meeting of Antony and Cleopatra. The river flowed through it and divided it into two parts. Hence it is sometimes by Greek writers called Ταρσοί in the plural, perhaps riot without some reference to a fancied resemblance in the form of the two divisions of the city to the wings of a bird. This part of Cilicia was intersected in Roman times by, good roads, especially one crossing the Taurus northward by the “Cilician Gates” to the neighborhood of Lystra and Iconium, the other joining Tarsus with Antioch and passing eastward by the “Aunanian” and “Syrian Gates.”

Tarsus was founded by Sardanapalus, king of Assyria. The Greeks, however, claimed a share in its colonization; and Strabo (14, 673) has preserved an ancient legend of certain Argives having arrived there with Triptolemus in search of Io. It appears first in authentic history in Xenophon's time, when it was a city of some considerable consequence (Anab. 1, 2, 23). It was occupied by Cyrus and his troops for twenty days and given up to plunder. After Alexander's conquests had swept this way (Q. Curt. 3, 5) and the Seleucid kingdom was established at Antioch,  Tarsils usually belonged to that kingdom, though for a time it was under the Ptolemies. In the civil wars of Rome it took Caesar's side, and on the occasion of a visit from him had its name changed to Juliopolis (Caesar, Bell. Alex. 66; Dion Cass. 47, 26). Alugustus made Tarsus free (Appian, Bell. Civ. 5, 7). This seems to have implied the privilege of being governed by its own laws and magistrates with freedom from tribute; but did not confer the jus coloniwarum nor the jus civitatis; and it was not, therefore, as usually supposed, on this account that Paul enjoyed the privilege of Roman citizenship. Tarsus, indeed, eventually did become a Roman colony, which gave to the inhabitants this privilege; but this was not till long after the time of Paul (Deyling, Observat. Sacr. 3, 391 sq.). SEE CITIZENSHIP; SEE COLONY.

We thus find that the Roman tribune at Jerusalem ordered Paul to be scourged, though he knew that he was a native of Tarsus, but desisted on learning that he was a Roman citizen (Act 9:11; Act 21:39; Act 22:24; Act 22:27). We ought to note, on the other hand, the circumstances in the social state of Tarsus, which had, or may be conceived to have had, an influence on the apostle's training and character. It was renowned as a place of education under the early Roman emperors. Strabo compares it in this respect to Athens and Alexandria, giving, as regards the zeal for learning shown by the residents, the preference to Tarsus (14, 673). Some distinguished names adorn its annals; among others, Athenodorus; the tutor of Augustus, and Nestor, the tutor of Marcellus, the nephew of Augustus; Artemidorus and Diodoruos, celebrated grammarians, and Dionysides, a tragic writer. Tarsus, also, was a place of much commerce, and Basil describes it as a point of union for Syrians, Cilicians, Isaurians, and Cappadocians (Ep. Euseb. Samos. Episc.). Owing to its commercial advantages, Tarsus continued to flourish under the Roman emperors, until it fell into the hands of the Saracens. It was taken from them after a memorable siege by the emperor Nicephorus, but soon afterwards restored to them. In the time of Abfeda, that is, towards the end of the 13th and beginning of the 14th century, Tarsus was still large and surrounded by a double wall, and in the occupation of Armenian Christians (Tab. Syrice, p. 133). It still survives, though greatly reduced, under the modern name Tersus. Kinneir, who spent a week in Tarsus, states (Travels, p. 121) that hardly a vestige of the former magnificence of Tarsus remains; nor does, perhaps, the modern town occupy one fourth part of the area of the ancient city. He observed a few ancient ruins, but not a single inscription or any monument of beauty or art. The houses are intersected by gardens and orchards; they seldom exceed one story in height, are flat-roofed, and the  greater part of them are constructed of hewn stone, to furnish which the more ancient edifices have been leveled with the ground. The inhabitants amount to about thirty thousand souls, mostly Turks and Turcomans. The adjoining villages are chiefly inhabited by Greeks, who prefer agricultural pursuits to a town life. The sea is not visible from the town. The Cydnus is there about forty-yards wide, and small canals are cut from it for irrigation.

See Heumann, De Claris Tarsenensib. (Gött. 1748); Altmann, Exerc. de Tarso (Bern. 1731); Zeibich, Συμμικτά Antiq. Tarsens. (Viteb. 1760); Mannert, 2, 97 sq.; Rosenmüller, Bibl., Geo. 3, 38; Beaufort, Ksaramania, p. 275; Irby and Mangles, Travels, p. 502-506; Bellev, in vol. 27 of the Academic des Inscript.; Rennell, Geog. of West. Asia, 2, 87; Cramer, A sia Minor, 2, 344; Leake, Asia Minor, p. 214; Barker, Lares and Penates, p. 31, 173, 187; Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v.; Lewin, St. Paul, i, 78 sq.; Murray's Handbook for Turkey in Asia, p. 370.

## Tartak[[@Headword:Tartak]]

             (Heb. Tartak', תִּרתָֹּק; Sept. Θαρθάκ; Vulg. Tharthac), one of the gods of the Avite, or Avvite, colonists who were planted in the cities of Samaria after the removal of the tribes by Shalmaneser (2Ki 17:31). According to Rabbinical tradition, T'artak is said to have been worshipped inder the form of au ass (Talm. Babyl. Sanhedrin, fol. 63 b). From this it has been conjectured that this idol was the Egyptian Typho; but; though in the hieroglyphics the ass is the symbol of Typho, it was so far from being regarded as an object of worship that it was considered absolutely unclean (Plutarch, Is. et Os. c. 14). A Persian or Pehlvi origin has been suggested for Tartak, according to which it signifies either “intense darkness,” or “hero of darkness,” or the underworld, and so, perhaps, some planet of ill- luck, as Saturn or Mars (Gesenius, Thesaur. s.v.; Fürst, Handw. s.v.). The Carmaniails, a warlike race on the Persian Gulf, worshipped Mars alone of all the gods, and sacrificed an ass in his honor (Strabo, 15:727). Perhaps some trace of this worship may have given rise to the Jewish tradition.

## Tartan[[@Headword:Tartan]]

             (Heb. Tartan', תִּרְתָּן; Sept. Θαρθάν v.r. Τανάθαν or Ταραθάν; Vulg. Tharthan), which occurs only in 2Ki 18:17 and Isa 20:1, has been generally regarded as a proper name (Gesenius, Lex. Heb. s.v.).  Winer assumes, on account of the identity of name, that the same person is intended in the two places (Realw. s.v.). Recent discoveries make it probable that in Tartan, as in Rabsaris and Rabshakeh, we have not a proper name at all, but a title or official designation, like Pharaoh among the Egyptians, or Surena among the Parthians (Tacit. Ann. 6:42). The Assvrian Tartan is a general, or commander-in-chief. It seems as if the Greek translator of 2 Kings had an inkling of the truth, and therefore prefixed the article to all three names, which he very rarely prefixes to the names of persons where they are first mentioned. If this be the true account of the term Tartan, we must understand in 2Ki 18:17 that Sennacherib sent “a general,” together with his “chief eunuch” and “chief cup-bearer,” on an embassy to Hezekiah, and in Isa 20:1 that “a general”-probably a different person-was employed by Sargon against Ashdod, and succeeded in taking the city. SEE TRIBUTE.

## Tascodrugites[[@Headword:Tascodrugites]]

             (Τασκοδρούγγιται, Τασκοδρούγιται, from τασκός, a wooden nail or stake, and δρουγγός, nose, in Epiphanius, Haeret. 48, n. 14), a heretical sect of Galatia (Hieron. Comm. in Ep. ad Gal.) belonging probably to the 4th century, are by some included among the Gnostics of the school of Mark, SEE MARCUS THE HERESIARCH, e.g. by Theodoret, Haeret. Fab. 1, 9, 10, and by others among the Montanists, e.g. by Epiphanius, vt sup. The term is unquestionably a nickname, applied to these heretics because they were accustomed during prayer to place a finger to the nose or mouth like a pole, at the same time observing the profoundest silence. See Aulgustine, De Haeres. 63; Philastr. Haeres. 76; and Epiphanius. Theodoret says that they ridiculed the sacraments, rejected the creeds, repudiated all revelation; ‘and others charge on them a denial of the incarnation. Their assemblies were legally prohibited after the 4th century, but traces of them are seen in Theodore Studita in the 9th. They are by some supposed to be identical with the Passalorynchites. — Herzog, Real- Encyklop. s.v.
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formerly VAN DIEMEN'S LAND, is a considerable island in the South Pacific Ocean, lying between 40° 40' and 43° 40' south :lat. and 144° 30' and 148v 30' east long., at the south of, and separated from Australia by Bass's Strait. Its greatest length from Cape Grim on the north-west to  Cape Pillar on the south-east is 240 miles, and its greatest breadth from east to west 200 miles. Its area, including the adjacent islands, is about 26,000 square miles. Its capital is Hobart-Town, with a population of 25,044. In 186 Lic total population of Tasmania was 133,791.

I. History. — Tasmania was first discovered by Tasman, Dec. 1, 1642, and named by him Van Diemen's Land in honor of his patron, the then governor of the Dutch West Indies. In 1803 Lieut. Bowen was dispatched from Sydney with a few soldiers and convicts to form a settlement in the south of the island, which was finally fixed upon the spot where Hobart- Town now stauds. From 1817 commenced a rapid increase in the number of free settlers; and in 1825 Tasmania was declared independent of New South Wales. The transportation of convicts ceased in 1853, and on Jan. 4,1856, on petition of the Legislative Council to the home government, the name of the colony was officially changed to Tasmania. Of the 3000 aborigines found in the country the number rapidly decreased, until now not one remains.

II. Climate, Soil, etc. — The climate of Tasmania is fine and salubrious; the mean temperature of the hottest month (January) is 63° 57', of the coldest (July) 45° 82', and of the whole year 54° 92'. The agricultural lands may be divided into three classes-alluvial deposits, Tertiary clays, and loamy soils. In their virgin state some of the lands are marvelously productive; but in many cases, through improvident management, the soil has deteriorated.

III. Administration. — Since the passing of the Constitutional Act in 1854, the governing authority has been vested in a Parliament, consisting of the governor, as the queen's representative, and two elective Houses the Legislative Council of eighteen, and the Assembly of thirty-six members. The qualification of voters is, for the former, a freehold of the annual value of fifty pounds, and, for the latter, a freehold valued at one hundred pounds, or a ten pounds rental.

IV. Religion and Education. — By the Constitutional Act fifteen thousand pounds were annually reserved for the support of religion, divided among the various religious denominations, but this is now withdrawn. They were, in 1870: Church of England, 53,047; Roman Catholic, 22,091; Presbyterians, 9064; Wesleyans, 7187; Independents, 3931; Baptists, 931; Jews, 232. For the support of elementary education twelve thousand  pounds a year is appropriated by Parliament, the disbursement of which is entrusted to a Central Board holding its sittings at Hobart-Town. The teachers are appointed by the board, and are under the supervision of the inspector of the schools. There were, in 1881, 204 public schools; 14,241 pupils. with an average attendance of 10,933; 105 male teachers, 108 female teachers, and 32 pupil teachers. There are eight superior schools- Horton College, High school, Hutchins's School, the Church Grammar- school, etc. The efforts of the Wesleyan missionaries in Tasmania have been directed mainly to the English population. The mission was begun in 1820 by the Rev. Mr. Horton, who was on his way to New. South Wales. The mission was approved by the governor of the colony, and another missionary was soon sent out, who was followed by two more in 1827, and by a fifth in 1832. The following is the report of the mission for 1876: Chapels and other preaching places, 95; missionaries and assistants, 16; local preachers, 70, full members, 1286; persons on trial, 202; Sunday- schools, 47; teachers, 401; scholars, 3076; attendants on worship, 9176.

The Primitive Methodist Mission reported in 1873: Principal stations, 4; ministers, 4; members, 223.

The United Methodist Free Churches had, in the same year, 3 lay agents and 38 members.

## Tasschemacher[[@Headword:Tasschemacher]]

             (Dutch, Tesschenmaeker), PETNUS, one of the earliest ministers of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in the United States, was born in Holland, and educated at the University of Utrecht. He was settled in the United States first at Kingston, N. Y., in 1676-77, then went to Dutch Guiana, S. A., 1677-78, and in 1679-80 we find him at New Amstel, now New Castle, Del. Here difficulties arose which induced him to leave that people. He supplied the Church on Staten Island occasionally, 1682-83. In 1684 he took charge of the Church at Schenectady, N. Y., which he retained until his death. Meantime, in 1684, as the records show; he organized the Church at Hackensack, N. J., with thirty-three communicants. He was never their pastor, but seems to have made them occasional visits, to preach and receive members and dispense the Lord's supper, until 1789. This service must have cost him then much time and labor; but in this apostolic method of journeying and visitations many of the old churches were planted and sustained in their primitive worship. At Schenectady Mr. Tasschemacher was the first pastor, although the Church was probably  organized before he went to them. He was the most prominent victim of the Indian massacre and burning of that city. Feb. 8, 1690. “The French, in order to control the Indian trade, had planned the capture of Albany and New York the year before. The plan was not wholly carried out; but a party of French and Indians left Montreal, and, proceeding by way of Lake Champlain, intended attacking Albany. But, the Indian chiefs not consenting, they turned off towards Schenectady. They gave orders that Tasschemacher's life should be saved on account of the information they could obtain from him; but his house was not known, and before he could be personally recognized he was slain and his house and papers burned. His head was cloven open and his body burned to the “shoulderblades.” Sixty persons lost their lives on that fatal Saturday midnight before they could escape or defend themselves from their stealthy and cruel foes. The remnant that escaped kept the Church of Schenectady alive. Without a pastor to instruct them, they met for worship amid the ruins of the city, chose their elders and deacons from year to year, who were ordained by the Rev. Godfriedus Dellius, of Albany, and his successor, Rev. Petrus Van Dressen, until, in 1702, the little flock thus kept alive, and having gained in numbers and strength, called the Rev. Bernardus Freeman and received him as their pastor. Little more is known of Mr. Tasschemacher's history. He died a martyr among his flock, and his ministry and death illustrate the perils amid which the Gospel was preached and churches were established in their early days upon the frontier. See Corwin, Manual of the Ref. Church, p. 486. (V. J. R.T.)

## Tassel[[@Headword:Tassel]]

             In mediaeval times the sacred vestments of the ministers of the Church were adorned with tassels, to which, in the case of dalmatics and tunics, balls of crystal were attached. The word also denotes a thin plate of gold or silver worn on the back of the cope and episcopal gloves.

## Tasso, Torquato[[@Headword:Tasso, Torquato]]

             a celebrated Italian poet, was born at Sorrento, where his parents were visiting, March 11, 1544. Soon after his parents returned to Naples with him, and committed their son, at the age of three years, to the care of a man of learning. At four he was sent to the college of the Jesuits, where he made such rapid progress that at seven years of age he was pretty well  acquainted with the Latin and Greek tongues. Bernardo the father of the poet, following his patron, the prince of Salerno, into France, committed his son, then nine years old, to Maurice Cataneo, who assiduously cultivated the early disposition of his pupil to polite literature. When Tasso was twelve. years of age he went to join his father, who soon afterwards placed him in the University of Padua, where he wrote Rinaldo, a poem, being then in his eighteenth year. Invited by the principal persons of the city and college of Bologna, he took up his residence there, but shortly after, upon the invitation of Scipio Gonzaga, prince of the academy at Padua, returned to that city, and became incorporated into the academy, at the age of twenty years. He here formed the design of his celebrated poem, Jerusalem Delivered, and being urged by Alphonso II, duke of Ferrara, took up his residence hi his palace. He continued to work upon his great poem, which he completed in his thirtieth year, but it was printed, even then, against his will. Not long after, being engaged in a duel, he was arrested by order of the duke, ostensibly to screen him from the designs of his enemies. After about a year's detention, he escaped, and retired to Turin, where he endeavored to remain concealed. He soon became known, and was received by the duke of Savoy, who showed him every mark of esteem. Fearful of being given up to the duke of Ferrara, he left Turin and went to Rome, where he was treated with great honor by all classes. Shortly after he took up his residence with his sister at Sorrento, and then returned to Ferrara, hoping to have his writings restored to him. Failing in this he left that city, and went to Mantua, Padua, and Venice, finally trying his fortune once more with the duke, who, pretending to believe that his mind had become affected, caused him to be confined in the hospital of Santa Anna. After seven years' confinement, his release was procured byVincentio Gonzaga, prince of Mantua, who brought him to his own city. Wearied with dependence, he resolved to retire to Naples, and from there he went to Bisaccio with his friend Manso. At the approach of winter they returned to Naples, and soon after Tasso went to Rome, where he lived about a year, and, after some wandering, took up his residence at Naples again with the count of Palena. Here he applied himself to the composition of Jerusalem Conquered. He abandoned Naples again to go to Rome upon the invitation of cardinal Cynthio Aldobrandini. Disgusted with the life of a courtier, he obtained permission to retire to Naples, where he took up his lodging in the Benedictine convent of San Severino. He was, however, soon recalled to Rome, to be publicly crowned with laurel in the capitol. He arrived in that city in the beginning of 1595, but while the preparations  for the ceremony were being made, Tasso fell ill, and died, in the monastery of San Onufrio, April 25, 1595.

## Tate, Nahum[[@Headword:Tate, Nahum]]

             a well-known psalmodist, was born in Dublin, Ireland, in 1652, and at the age of sixteen was admitted to Dublin College, but does not appear to have followed any profession. He succeeded Shadwell as poet-laureate, and continued in that office till his death, which happened Aug. 12,1715, in the Mint, where he resided as a place of refuge from his creditors. He was the author of nine dramatic performances and a large number of poems; but is  at present better known for his version of the Psalms, in which he was joined by Dr. Brady. For a complete list of his works, see Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v. SEE PSALMODY.

## Tatian[[@Headword:Tatian]]

             a notable Christian writer of the 2nd century, was a native of Assyria, though Clemens Alexandrinus and later fathers term him a Syrian. He had mastered the Graeco-Romaun culture of his day, largely through extended travels; and his reading was very wide, no fewer than ninety-three classic authors being referred to in his works. In the course of his wanderings as a strolling rhetorician he came to Rome, at that time the great center for all intellectual interests and tendencies, and there turned his attention to Christianity. To justify this action he wrote his Λόγος πρὸς ῾Ελληνας, a work in which he confesses himself a convert to the barbarian philosophy of the despised sect, and invites his contemporaries to examine it, that they too might observe the astonishing contrasts it presents, with its simplicity and its clearness, to the darkness of the heathenism of that and every other age. At Rome Tatian was associated with Justin, perhaps as a pupil; but he soon became himself a teacher of Christianity. His attitude was apologetic, and necessarily involved the most marked antagonism to paganism. Stern and even harsh in his morality, he could recognize no truth in heathen philosophy, and feel no sympathy, even though but of a scientific or vesthetical nature, with heathen life and culture. To him, as to his contemporary Christians, the belief in one God was of the highest moral significance.

The loss of this faith, he taught, had exposed the soul of man to the rule of the dark powers of material nature, the daemons with whom polytheistic views originate. Its recovery delivers from servitude to the wandering daemons (the planets) upon which astrological fate is based. In opposition to the materialistic pantheism of the Stoics, Tatian defended the supermundane spirituality of the one God, the Creator and First Cause of all things, in whom, as the Great Source of being, all things, including matter, potentially existed at the first. At the beginning the Logos sprang into being as the first-born work of the-Father, that he might produce the world, himself creating the material. The created universe is everywhere pervaded by the spirit of material life, which is inferior to the Divine Spirit being in man the soul, which is indissolubly connected with the body, and in the world the world-soul (πνεῦμα ὑλικόν). Human nature in its pure state is, however, privileged to a substantial and intimate union (συζυγία)  with the perfect nature, the Spirit of God himself. This throws a significant light upon Tatian's conception of the Trinity.

He teaches that as the Father is (in his essence) Spirit, so the Logos proceeding from the Father is Spirit; and the latter, that he might imitate the Father, has made man in the image of immortality, to the end that man might have part in God and attain to immortality. The Spirit thus became the life-companion of the soul. In this way God himself lives in man by his ministering Spirit, by which is to be understood simply the hypostatized efficiency of the Logos. The fall involved the removal of the Divine Spirit from the soul, and plunged the latter deeper into the condition of the merely hylic, so that but faint sparks of the Spirit and dim longings after God remain. It is possible, however, for-the soul to turn away from evil and towards God in the exercise of its freedom-how, Tatian does not clearly state. The fame which Tatian acquired through his apology, from which the foregoing sketch is principally taken, was lost in consequence of his perversion to Gnosticism. He went to Syria, it would seem, after the death of Justin (in 166?). He is charged with holding to the existence of means after the fashion of Valentinus (q.v.), and similar speculations; with an ascetical course of life, carried even to the extent of using water instead of wine; with rejecting marriage as a state of practical fornication; with promulgating Docetic ideas respecting the person of Christ, etc. — all of which must be regarded as substantially a truthful indictment. He would seem, however, to be more nearly related to Saturninus (q.v.) than to Valentinus in his views. The time of Tatian's death is not exactly known, but it seems to have been prior to the date of the work by Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. (c. 175). His most famous work was a harmony of the Gospels, the Diates saron, of which the Jacobite bishop Bar-Salibi (12th century) reports that Ephraem Syrus (q.v.) wrote a commentary on it, and Theodoret the: genealogical tables and all the passages by which the Lord's descent from David is made apparent. The Oratio ad Graec. was first published at Tigur. 1540, fol., and afterwards often. See Daniel, Tatianus, der Apologet. (Halle, 1837); Mohler, Patroologie; Ritter, Gesch. d. christl. Philosophie, vol. 1; Dorner, Person Christi, 1, 438; Moller, Kosmologie d. griech. Kirche, p. 168 sq.; Stockl, Gesch. d. Philos. in d. patrist. Zeit, p. 148 sq.; Huber, Philos. d. Kirchenvoter, p. 20 sq.; Duneker, Apologet; Secund. Sec. de Essential. Naturae Hum. Partibus Placitc (Gott. 1850), pt. 2; and Herzog, Real- Encyklop. s.v. For monographs, see Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 104.

## Tatiani Evangelium[[@Headword:Tatiani Evangelium]]

             Epiphanius (Haeres. 46, 1; 47, 4) mentions a Gospel of Tatian as being used by the Encratites, and even among the Catholic Christians of Syria. Being compiled from the four gospels, it is also called εὐαγγελ. διὰ τεσσάρων (Theodoret. Haeret. Facbul. 1, 20; Coll. Ambros. Proam. in Luc; Euseb. Hist. Eccl. 4:20). Epiphanius erroneously identified it with the Evangelium sec. Hebraeos (see Fabric. 1, 377). See Semisch, Tatiani Diatessaron, Antiquissimum N.1. Evangeliorum in unum Digestorum Specimen (Breslau, 1856). Tatian is otherwise also censured as being a dangerous compilator and falsifier of Holy Writ (Fabric. 2, 538). The still extant gospel harmony (reprinted in Orthodoxogrraphis and Bibl. Patrum, s.v. Tatian), ascribed to Tatian by Victor Capuanus in Praefatio. ad Anonymi Harmoniam Evangelicam, does not belong to him. See Fabricius, Codex Apocryphus N.T. 1, 378; 2. 510. (B. P.)

## Tatianists[[@Headword:Tatianists]]

             followers of Tatian (q.v.). SEE ENPCRATITES.

## Tatnai[[@Headword:Tatnai]]

             (Heb. Tatnay', תִּתְנִיַ; Pers., perhaps-gift; Sept. Θανθαναϊv v.r. Θαναναϊv, Θαθθαναϊv, etc.; Vulg. Thathanazi a Persian governor (פֶּחָה, i.e. pasha) who succeeded Rehum in the rule of Samaria, and probably of other provinces north of Judea, in the time of Darius Hystaspis and Zerubbabel (Ezr 5:3; Ezr 5:6; Ezr 6:6; Ezr 6:13), B.C. 520. He appears to have been a more just person, and more friendly to the Jews, than his predecessor. An adverse report of their proceedings at Jerusalem reached him; but he resolved to suspend his judgment till he had examined into the matter on the spot. He accordingly repaired thither, accompanied by another great officer, named Shethar-boznai (q.v.), and their colleagues, and, finding that the Jews alleged the authority of a royal decree for their proceedings, he sent to the supreme government a temperate and fair report, founded on the information he had obtained, suggesting that the statement made by the Jews as to the decree of Cyrus and other matters should be verified by reference to the archives at Babylon. Then, without one word to influence the decision or to prejudice the claim advanced, Tatnai concludes with intimating that he awaits the royal orders. ‘This official letter of the Persian governor is quite a model of exactness, moderation, and truth, and gives a  very favorable idea of the administrative part of the Persian government. The rescript being favorable to the claim of the Jews, whose statement had been verified by the discovery of the original decree of Cyrus, Tatnai and his colleagues applied themselves with vigor to the execution of the royal commands. SEE EZRA.

## Tattam, Henry[[@Headword:Tattam, Henry]]

             a learned English divine, was born in Ireland, Dec. 28, 1788; and was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, and at the universities of Göttingen and Leyden, where he received his doctorate in laws, theology, and philosophy. He took orders in the Church of England; was rector of St. Cuthbert's, Bedford, 1818-45; and for a portion of that time was rector also of Great Woolstone, Bucks. In 1845 he became archdeacon of Bedford, and in 1849 rector of Stamford Rivers, Essex. He was afterwards chaplain in ordinary to the queen. He died at Stamford Rivers, Jan. 8,1868. Traveling in the East, he laid the foundation of an intimate knowledge of Oriental languages, and became the chief modern authority concerning the Coptic. He discovered at the Convent of Nitria, in the N.W. desert of Egypt, a splendid collection of ancient Syriac MSS. which he secured for the British Museum. He is the author of Helps to Devotion (2d ed. Lond. 1862, 12mo), Compendious Grammar of the Egyptian Language (1828, 8vo): — Lexicon Egyptiaco-Latinum ex Veteribus Linguae Egyptiaca Monunmentis, etc. (Oxon. 1835, 8o): Duodecim Prophetarum Minoruam Libros, in Lingua Eagyptiaca, vulgo Coptica sen Menphitica, etc. (Latine edidit; Lat. et Copt. 1836, 8vo): — Defense of the Church of England against the Attacks of a Roman Catholic (Lond. 1843, 12mo): — The Ancient Coptic Version of the Book of Job the Just (transl. into English and edited, 1847, 8vo): — Apostolical Constitutions in Coptic (English transl. 1849, 8vo): — Prophete Majores in Dialecto Lingue Egyptiace (Oxon. 1852, 2 vols. 8vo). See Allis bone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Tatwine[[@Headword:Tatwine]]

             archbishop of Canterbury, was a distinguished scholar, poet, and divine. He was appointed to the see of Canterbury in 731, and passed the remainder of his life in the quiet routine of episcopal duty. He died in 734. See Hook, Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, 1:195 sq.

## Tau Cross[[@Headword:Tau Cross]]

             is a cross formed like the Greek letter T (Tat), and one of the most ancient forms. SEE STAFF, PASTORAL.

## Tauckney, Anthony[[@Headword:Tauckney, Anthony]]

             a learned Nonconformist divine of England, was born at Kirton, Lincolnshire, in September, 1599. He was matriculated at Emanuel College, Cambridge, at fourteen, received his degree of A.M. in 1620, and was chosen fellow of his college three years after. In 1627 he took his degree of B.D., and became assistant to the famous vicar John Cotton upon whose departure he was chosen to the vicarage. When the assembly of divines met at Westminster, Mr. Tuckney was one of the two nominated for the county of Lincoln, and was appointed minister of St. Michael Querne's, Cheapside. In 1645 he was appointed master of Emanuel College, but did not entirely reside on this employment until 1648, when, being chosen vice-chancellor, he removed with his family to Cambridge, and took his degree of D.D. the year after. In 1653 he was chosen master of St. John's, and two years after regius professor of divinity. At the Restoration complaints were made by royalists against Mr. Tuckney, who resigned both positions June 22,1661, receiving a pension of £100 per year. The rest of his life he spent in retirement, mostly in London. Although appointed commissioner at the Savoy Conference, he never attended it. In the time of the plague he lived at Colwich Hall, near Nottingham, where he was troubled and confined, but was discharged in a few months. Upon the passage of the Five-mile Act he removed to Oundle, and thence to Warmington, Northamptonshire. After the fire of London he removed to Stockerston, Leicestershire, and then to Tottenham, and in 1669-70 to Spitalyard, where he died in February, 1670. He wrote, Sermon on Jer 8:22 (Lond. 1643, 4to): —Five Sermons (1656 12mo): — Forty Sermons (1676, 4to), published by his son Letters, etc. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Tauler (original form Tauweler), Johannes[[@Headword:Tauler (original form Tauweler), Johannes]]

             the famous Dominican preacher and mystic, was born at Strasburg in A.D. 1290 the authorities differ with respect to both time and place. He was of honorable family and early devoted to the priestly office. In (about) 1308 he became a monk and went to Paris, to the College of St. James, to study theology. He found greater pleasure in the study of the writings of the Areopagite St. Bernard, and the two Victors, and especially of Augustine, than in the popular philosophy; his attention was also given to the Neo- Platonists, and, among schoolmen, to Aquinas with respect to ethics. On his return to Strasburg, Tauler came under the influence of Master Eckart, and also of a more simple and practical company of mystical thinkers among the monks, including Nicholas of Strasburg and others. He became a preacher, and associated himself with the Friends of God-a society formed to teach and comfort the people upon whom rested the ban of the Church imposed by pope John XXII; and in this society he labored all his life. His sermons were clear and adapted to the popular needs, but not, it would seem, at this time pervaded by the power of a personal union of the preacher with Christ.

In 1340 occurred an event of decisive importance to Tauler. He was then visited by Nicholas of Basle (q.v.), and by him led to realize his need of a personal conversion to God. During two years, in which he refrained from preaching and became an object of ridicule to his fellow-monks, who were unable to understand the reason for such struggles as he was passing through, did he wrestle with his sense of sin and his need of pardon. Finding peace at length, he passed through further discipline by reason of a disgraceful failure in an attempt to preach; but from that time he preached persistently, and with a power not previously possessed. Wicked clergymen were unable to endure the faithful rebukes with which he visited their sins, and they prohibited him from preaching; but the magistracy prevented the enforcement of their order. Under the preaching of the first sermon after his conversion a number of persons fell down as dead, and he was besought to discontinue the sermon. He was one of the few who refused to cease from preaching to the people in obedience to the papal interdict, and braved the anger of his immediate superiors in the execution of that duty. In 1348 the “black death” swept over Strasburg, carrying off sixteen thousand victims, and adding to the horrors of the situation. Oily l'Taulr and two other monks had pity upon the people, and they appealed in writings (whose circulation was at once prohibited) to the other clergy to do what they could that the “poor ignorant populace should  not thus die under the ban.” Charles IV soon afterwards came to Strasburg and caused the three monks to be brought before him, and, after inquiring into their principles, dismissed them with the admonition not, to “offend against the Church and its interdict again.” Tauler retired to Cologne; and became preacher in the nunnery of St. Gertrude, but after a few years returned to Strasburg, where he had a last interview with Nicholas of Basle. He committed to the care of that friend the writings he wished to have given to the world, and died June 16,1361. He was buried in his convent, and the stone which covered his grave is preserved in the “New Church” of Strasburg.

Tauler's works consist of sermons, homilies, and an Imitation of the Life of Christ in its Poverty. The sermons are extant in manuscript in several libraries, the oldest MS. being a parchment at Strasburg. In printed form the first ed. appeared at Leipsic, 1498, in 4to, and others at Augsburg (1508, fol.) and Basle (1521 and 1522, fil.), the latter being superior to the former. Of modernized editions that of Frankfort (1826, 3 pts. 8vo) is best. The Imitation of Christ also exists in different MSS. and editions, the best ed. being that of Schlosser (Frankf. 1833, 8vo). A number of other writings are attributed to Tauler, but without authority.

The teachings of Tauler are not presented in his works in systematic form. His aim was practical, and the edifying element predominates over the speculative in his theology. As with Eckart, the speculative ideas may be traced back to the concept Being the absolute, simple, uncreated entity, which involves neither distinctions nor relations, and which no name is adequate to express. It is the hidden Deity, whose nature requires, however, revelation and operation. Revelation is the process of the Trinity; operation, with the Deity, is begetting. Hence the Deity in operation becomes Father, as he knows himself, and in that act of knowledge expresses himself, the word which he speaks being the Son. Between them exist reciprocal approval and love, and this love is the Holy Spirit, proceeding from both the Father and the Son. This conception of the Trinity evidently involves a distinction of relations rather than of hypostases in the Godhead. The Son is eternal. With reference to the creation, Tauler comes very near to the teachings of pantheism at times, but nevertheless preserves the distinction between the Creator and the creature, and was constantly opposed to the teachings of the Beghards and Brethren of the Free Spirit. The human soul came forth from God, and contains a divine spark, in which the Trinity is reflected, and which strives  to return to God, while the sensual part of man yearns for the creature world. Sin consists in giving way to the latter impulse. It cannot wholly deprive the soul, which is at bottom noble and in harmony with the good, of its yearning for reunion with God; but man possesses in himself no power to return to God. Righteousness can be recovered only through faith in the merits of Christ. Meditation on the work and imitation of the life, especially the sufferings, of Christ form the way by which to return to God. This imitation should be outward, but also inward, transforming the entire man. By this way the soul rises superior to all creature control; God enters in with all his blessing, and supplies the place of grace with his immediate operation. As the soul becomes, in this way, “free from grace,” so it also becomes “free from virtue,” i.e. it no longer practices an isolated virtue, but, with a being transformed into love, he permits God to work in him all virtues as the outflow of that love. No idle contemplation or passive asceticism finds the approval of Tauler,' but a life of active love and pity, of patience and meekness-a life in the imitation of Christ. Tauler did not contradict the doctrines of his Church, but he was animated by an exalted reformatory spirit; his mysticism displayed a free, practical, evangelical tendency which has given it historical importance; and we may appropriately retain for him the title, early bestowed, of Doctor Illuminatus.

See the preface to Tauler's works; Bohringer, Die Kirche Christi u. ihre Zeugen; Schmidt, Joh. Tauler von Strasburg; Noack, Christliche Mystik (1853); Biblioth. Sacra, 15:253 sq.; Meth. Quar. Rev. 1869, I, art. 3: and Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. SEE NICHOLAS OF BASLE.

## Tausan (or Tagesen), Johan[[@Headword:Tausan (or Tagesen), Johan]]

             a Danish Reformer, was born at Birkinde, island of Funen, 1494; and was educated at Aarhuus and Odense. Becoming a monk, he entered the convent of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem at Antworskow, where he became acquainted with the writings of Luther. He visited Wittenberg, and formed the acquaintance of Melancthon. Returning to his native country, he delivered lectures on theology in the University of Copenhagen, and in 1524 avowed himself a disciple of Luther. After being expelled from one convent and imprisoned in another, he was, in 1526, appointed chaplain to Frederick I, king of Denmark; and in 1529 was appointed to the Church of St. Nicholas at Copenhagen, where he remained till 1537. He was then appointed professor at Roeskilde, and in 1542 was made bishop of Ripen,  and died in 1561. He published several theological treatises, some Danish hymns, and a Danish translation of the Psalms. See Hook, Eccles. Biog. s.v.; Jocher, Gelehrten-Lex. 4:1030.

## Tav[[@Headword:Tav]]

             SEE ALPHABET.

## Tavern[[@Headword:Tavern]]

             SEE THREE TAVERNS.

## Taverner, Richard[[@Headword:Taverner, Richard]]

             a learned and pious layman, was born at Brisley, England, in 1505. ‘He is said to have studied at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and afterwards at Oxford, and then law in the Inner Temple. Having been appointed one of the clerks of the signet in 1537, he held that office until the reign of queen Mary. He was a friend of the Reformation, and, in order to promote it, undertook a new translation or edition of the English Bible (Loud. 1539, fol.). It was dedicated to the king and allowed to be read in the churches; but in 1545 the Romish bishops committed him to the Tower. He was, however, soon released, restored to the king's favor, and elected a member of Parliament in 1545. Taverner's edition of the Bible is a correction of what is called Matthewe's Bible, many of whose marginal notes are adopted, many omitted, and others inserted by the editor. On the accession of king Edward, Taverner, although a layman, received a special license in 1552 to preach throughout the king's dominions, from which he was obliged to desist upon the accession of queen Mary. He resumed his preaching when Elizabeth came to the throne, and, besides receiving other commissions, was made high sheriff of Oxford County in 1569. He died July 14, 1575. Besides his Bible, we have the following list of his publications: The Sum and Pith of CL Psalms of David, etc. (Lond. 1539, 8vo): — The Epistles and Gospels, with a Brief Postill, etc. (ibid. 1540, 2 pts. 4to): — Fruit of Faith, etc. (ibid. 1582, 12mo): — The Garden of Wisdome, etc. (ibid. 1539,2 bks.): — Flores aliquot Sententiarum ex Variis Scriptoribus (translated from Erasmus): — Catonis Disticha Moralia (ibid. 1553, 8vo; 1555, 4to): — In Mimum Publiasnum Lib. I (ibid. 1562): — Catechismus Fidei: — Proverbs, or. Adages (ibid. 1545, etc.). See Masters, History of Corpus Christi College; Ward, Gresham Professors;  Newcombe, English Biblical Translations; Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v. SEE AUTHORIZED VERSION.

## Tavthe[[@Headword:Tavthe]]

             the Babylonian name for “the mother of the gods,” thought to be the same as Tihanmtu or Tihamat, “the sea.”

## Tawals[[@Headword:Tawals]]

             in Slavonic mythology, was a god of the fields, bestower of blessings, worshipped by the Polanders. Tawbutte, a talbot (i.e. a hunting dog), frequently used in mediaeval heraldic devices. In an inventory of church goods at Easington, Oxford, is the following: “Item, a vestment powdered with stars and tawbuttes.”

## Tawdry[[@Headword:Tawdry]]

             a name given to the necklace worn of old by English peasant girls, in memory and honor of St. Ethelreda, or Awdry, patroness of the diocese of Ely, who, after she had become religious, mourned for the vanity in which she had indulged by wearing gold necklaces.

## Tawus Version[[@Headword:Tawus Version]]

             SEE PERSIAN VERSIONS.

## Tax, Clerical[[@Headword:Tax, Clerical]]

             SEE TAXES.

## Tax, Hebrew[[@Headword:Tax, Hebrew]]

             (some form of עָרִךְ, to arrange). Taxes of some kind must have been coeval with the origin of civilized society. The idea of the one is involved in that of the other, since society, as every organization, implies expense, which must be raised by the abstraction of property from the individuals of which it consists, either by occasional or periodical, by self-imposed or compulsory, exactions. In the history of Israel, as of other nations, the student who desires to form a just estimate of the social condition of the people must take into account the taxes which they had to pay. According as these are light or heavy may vary the happiness and prosperity of a nation. To them, though lying in the background of history, may often be traced, as to the true motive power, many political revolutions. We find a provision of income made at the very commencement of the Mosaic polity. Taxes, like all other things in that polity, had a religious origin and import. While the people were in the migratory stage during their marches through the desert, only such incidental taxes were levied, or rather such voluntary contributions were received, as the exigencies of the time demanded. It was not till their establishment in Canaan that taxation assumed a regular  and organized form. We propose, therefore, in the following article (which treats only of public and stated imposts) to consider the subject chronologically from that point. SEE ASSESSMENT.

I. Under the judges, according to the theocratic government contemplated by the law, the only payments obligatory upon the people as of permanent obligation were the tithes (q.v.) the first-fruits (q.v.), the redemption- money of the first-born (q.v.), and other offerings as belonging to special occasions. SEE PRIEST.

The payment by each Israelite of the half-shekel as “atonement-money” for the service of the tabernacle, on taking the census of the people (Exo 30:13), does not appear to have had the character of a recurring tax, but to have been supplementary to the free- will offerings of Exo 25:1-7, levied for the one purpose of the construction of the sacred tent. In later times, indeed, after the return' from Babylon, there was an annual payment for maintaining the fabric and services of the Temple; but the fact that this begins by the voluntary compact to pay one third of a shekel (Neh 10:32) shows that till then there was no such payment recognized as necessary. A little later the third became a half, and finder the name of the didrachma (Mat 17:24) was paid by every Jew, in whatever part of the world he might be living (Josephus, Ant. 18:9,1). From the Talmudical tract Shekalim (Mishna, 2, 4), the time of payment appears to have been between the 15th and the 25th of the month Adar, that is, in March. After the destruction of the Temple, this didrachm was ordered by Vespasian to be paid into the Capitol, “as,” says Josephus, “they used to pay the same to the Temple at Jerusalem”, (War, 7:6, 6). During the prosperity of Palestine, large sums were thus collected in Babylon and other Eastern cities, and were sent to Jerusalem under a special escort (Josephus, Ant. loc. cit.; Cicero. Pro Flacc. c. 28). We have no trace of any further taxation than this during the period of the judges. It was not in itself heavy it was lightened by the feeling that it was paid as a religious act. In return for it the people secured the celebration of their worship, and the presence among them of a body of men acting more or loss efficiently as priests judges, teachers, perhaps also as physicians. We cannot wonder that the people should afterwards look back to the good old days when, they had been so lightly burdened.

II. Under the monarchy, its centralized government and greater magnificence involved, of course, a larger expenditure, and therefore a heavier taxation. This may have come, during the long history of the  kingdom, in many different forms, according to the financial necessities of the times. The chief burdens appear to have been

(1) a tithe of the produce both of the soil and of live-stock, making together with the ecclesiastical tithe, twenty percent on incomes of this nature (1Sa 8:15; 1Sa 8:17);

(2) forced military service for a month every year (1Sa 8:12; 1Ki 9:22; 1Ch 27:1);

(3) gifts to the king, theoretically free, like the old benevolences of English taxation, but expected as a thing of course at the commencement of a reign (1Sa 10:27) or in time of war (comp. the gifts of Jesse, 1Sa 16:20; 1Sa 17:18). In the case of subject princes the gifts, still made in kind-armor, horses, gold, silver, etc. appear to have been regularly assessed (1Ki 10:25; 2Ch 9:24). Whether this was ever the case with the presents from Israelite subjects must remain uncertain. Besides the foregoing, there were

(4) import duties, chiefly on the produce of the spice districts of Arabia (1Ki 10:15);

(5) the monopoly of certain branches of commerce, as, for example, that of gold (1Ki 9:28; 1Ki 22:48), fine linen or byssus from Egypt (1Ki 10:28), and horses (1Ki 10:29);

(6) the appropriation to the king's use of the early crop of hay (Amo 7:1). This may, however, have been peculiar to the northern kingdom or occasioned by a special emergency (Ewald, Proph. ad loc.).

It is obvious that burdens such as these, coming upon a people previously unaccustomed to them, must have been almost intolerable. Even under Saul exemption from taxes is looked on as a sufficient reward for great military services (1Sa 17:25). Under the outward splendor and prosperity of the reign of Solomon there lay the deep discontent of an overtaxed people, and it contributed largely to the revolution that followed. The people complain, not of Solomon's idolatry, but of their taxes (1Ki 12:4). Of all the king's officers lie whom they hate most is Adoram, or Adoniram (q.v.), who was “over the tribute” (1Ki 12:18). At times, too, in the history of both the kingdoms, there were special burdens. A tribute of fifty shekels a head had to be paid by Menahem to the Assyrian king (2Ki 15:20), and under his successor, Hoshea, this assumed  the form of an annual tribute (2Ki 17:4; amount not stated). After the defeat of Josiah by Pharaoh-Necho, in like manner, a heavy income-tax had to be imposed on the kingdom of Judah to pay the tribute demanded by Egypt (2Ki 23:35), and the change of masters consequent on the battle of Carchemish brought in this respect no improvement (Josephus, Ant. 10:9, 1-3).

III. Under the Persian empire, the taxes paid by the Jews were, in their broad outlines, the same in kind as those of other subject races. The financial system which gained for Darius Hystaspis the name of the “shopkeeper king” (κάπηλος, Herod. 3, 89) involved the payment by each satrap of a fixed sum as the tribute due from his province (ibid.), and placed him accordingly in the position of a publicanus, or farmer of the revenue, exposed to all the temptation to extortion and tyranny inseparable from such a system. Here, accordingly, we get glimpses of taxes of many kinds, In Judaea, as in other provinces, the inhabitants had to' provide in kind for the maintenance of the governor's household (comp. the case of Themistocles, Thucyd. 1, 138, and Herod. 1, 192; 2, 98), besides a money- payment of forty shekels a day (Neh 5:14-15). In Ezr 4:13; Ezr 4:20; Ezr 7:24, we get a formal enumeration of the three great branches of the revenue.

1. The מַדָּה, fixed, measured payment, probably direct taxation (Grotüls).

2. בְּלוֹ, the excise, or octroi, on articles of consumption (Gesenius, s.v.).

3. הֲלךְָ, probably the toll payable at bridges, fords, or certain stations on the high-road.

The influence of Ezra secured for the whole ecclesiastical order, from the priests down to the Nethinuim, an immunity from all three (Ezr 7:24); but the burden pressed heavily on the great body of the people, and they complained bitterly both of this and of the ἀγγαρήϊον, or forced service, to which they and their cattle were liable (Neh 9:37). They were compelled to mortgage their vineyards and fields, borrowing money at twelve per cent the interest being payable apparently either in money or in kind (Neh 5:1-11). Failing payment, the creditors exercised the power (with or without the mitigation of the year of jubilee) of seizing the persons of the debtors and treating them as slaves (Neh 5:5; comp. 2Ki 4:1). Taxation was leading at Jerusalem to precisely the same evils as those which appeared from like causes in the early history of Rome. To this cause may probably be ascribed the incomplete payment of tithes or offerings at this period (Neh 13:10; Neh 13:12; Mal 3:8), and the consequent necessity of a special poll-tax of the third part of a shekel for the services of the Temple  (Neh 10:32). What could be done to mitigate the evil was done by Nehemiah, but the taxes continued, and oppression and injustice no doubt marked the government of the province in a large degree. The miseries of an Oriental system of taxation have in modern times received their most revolting illustration in the history of Turkey over these same regions, the settled policy of whose government has ever been to grind the people by the utmost extent of extortion, peculation, and espionage, in all the grades of official administration.

IV. Under the Egyptian and Syrian kings the taxes paid by the Jews became yet heavier. The “farming” system of finance was adopted in its worst form. The Persian governors had been obliged to pay a fixed sum into the treasury. Now the taxes were put up to auction. The contract sum for those of Phoenicia, Judaea, and Samaria had been estimated at about 8000 talents. An unscrupulous adventurer (e.g. Joseph, under Ptolemy Euergetes) would bid double that sum, and would then go down to the province, and by violence and cruelty, like that of Turkish or Hindi collectors, squeeze out a large margin of profit for himself (Josephus, Ant. 12. 4, 1-5).

Under the Syrian kings we meet with an ingenious variety of taxation. Direct tribute (φόροι), an excise duty on salt, crown-taxes (στέφανοι, golden crowns, or their value, sent yearly to the king), one half the produce of fruit-trees, one third that of corn land, a tax of some kind on cattle: these, as the heaviest burdens, are ostentatiously enumerated in the decrees of the two Demetriuses remitting them (1Ma 10:29-30; 1Ma 11:35). Even after this, however, the golden crown and scarlet robe continue to be sent (13, 39). The proposal of the apostate Jason to farm the revenues at a rate above the average (460 talents, while Jonathan [11, 28] pays 300: only), and to pay 150 talents more for a license to open a circus (2Ma 4:9), gives us a glimpse of another source of revenue. The exemption given by Antiochus to the priests and other ministers, with the deduction of one third for all the residents in Jerusalem, was apparently only temporary (Josephus, Ant. 12:3, 3).

V. Roman taxation, in its pressure, if not absolutely heavier, was probably more galling, as being more thorough and systematic, more distinctively a mark of bondage. The capture of Jerusalem by Pompey was followed immediately by the imposition of a tribute, and within a short time the sum thus taken from the resources of the country amounted to 10,000 talents  (Josephus, Ant. 14:4, 4, 5). The decrees of Julius Caesar showed a characteristic desire to lighten the burdens that pressed upon the subjects of the republic. The tribute was not to be farmed. It was not to be levied at all in the sabbatic year. One fourth only was demanded in the year that followed (ibid. 14:10, 5, 6). The people, still under the government of Hyrcanus, were thus protected against their own rulers. The struggle of the republican party after the death of the dictator brought fresh burdens upon the whole of Syria, and Cassius levied not less than 700 talents from Judaea alone. Under Herod, as might be expected from his lavish expenditure in public buildings, the taxation became heavier. Even in years of famine a portion of the produce of the soil was seized for the royal revenue (ibid. 15:9, 1), and it was not till the discontent of the people became formidable that he ostentatiously diminished this by one third (ibid. 15:10, 4). It was no wonder that when Herod wished to found a new city in Trachonitis, and to attract a population of residents, he found that the most effective bait was to promise immunity from taxes (ibid. 17:2, 1), or that on his death the people should be loud in-their demands that Archelaus should release them from their burdens, complaining specially of the duty levied on all sales (ibid. 17:8, 4).

When Judea became formally a Roman province, the whole financial system of the empire came as a natural consequence. The taxes were systematically farmed, and the publicans appeared as a new curse to the country. SEE PUBLICAN. The portoria were levied at harbors, piers, and the gates of cities. These were the τέλη of Mat 17:24; Rom 13:7. In- addition to this, there was the κῆνσος, or poll-tax (Cod. D gives ἐπικεφάλαιον in Mar 12:15), paid by every Jew, and looked upon, for that reason, as the special badge of servitude. It was about the lawfulness of this payment; that the rabbins disputed, while they were content to acquiesce in the payment of the customs (Mat 22:17; Mar 12:13; Luk 20:20). It was against this apparently that the struggles of Judas of Galilee and his followers were chiefly directed (Josephus, Ant. 18:1, 6; War, 2, 8, 1). United with this, as part of the same system, there was also, in all probability, a property-tax of some kind. Quirinus, after the deposition of Archelalus, was sent to Syria to complete the work begun, probably, at the time of our Lord's birth-of valuing and registering property, and this would hardly have been necessary for a mere poll-tax. SEE CYRENIUS. The influence of Joazar, the high-priest, led the people generally (the followers of Judas and the Pharisee Sadduc were the  only marked exceptions) to acquiesce in this measure and to make the required returns (Ant. 18:1, 1); but their discontent still continued, and, under Tiberius, they applied for some alleviation (Tacitus, Ann. 2, 42). In addition to these general taxes, the inhabitants of Jerusalem were subject to a special house-duty about this period; Agrippa, in. his desire to reward the good-will of the people, remitted it (Josephus, Ant. 19:6,3). It can hardly be doubted that in this, as' in most other cases, an oppressive taxation tended greatly to demoralize the people. Many of the most glaring faults of the Jewish character are distinctly traceable to it. The fierce, vindictive cruelty of the Galileans, the Zealots, the Sicarii was its natural fruit. It was not the least striking proof that the teaching of our Lord and his disciples was more than the natural outrush of popular feeling-that it sought to raise men to the higher region in which all such matters were regarded as things indifferent-and, instead of expressing the popular impatience of taxation, gave, as the true counsel, the precept “Render unto Caesar the ‘things that are Caesar's,” “Tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom.” SEE TRIBUTE.

## Taxatio Ecclesiastica[[@Headword:Taxatio Ecclesiastica]]

             Anciently the first-fruits of all ecclesiastical benefices were paid to the pope. Innocent IV, in 1253, gave the same for three years to Henry III which occasioned a taxation made by Walter, bishop of Norwich, who was delegated to the task by the pope in the following year. It was sometimes called the Norwich Taxation, and sometimes Pope Innocent's Valor. In 1288 Nicholas IV granted the tenths to Edward I for six years towards defraying the expense of an expedition to the Holy Land; and in order to their collection a taxation by the king's precept was begun in that year, and finished, as to the province of Canterbury, in 1291, and as to York in the following year; the whole being superintended by John, bishop of Winchester, and Oliver, bishop of Lincoln. A third taxation, entitled nova taxatio, as to some part of the province of York was made in 1318 by virtue of a mandate directed by Edward II to the bishop of Carlisle, principally because the Scottish invasion had rendered the border clergy unable to pay the tax. Pope Nicholas's taxation is an important record, because all taxes were regulated by it until the valor beneficiorum of Henry  VIII was completed; and because the statutes of colleges founded antecedently to the Reformation were interpreted by this criterion, according to which their benefices under a certain value were exempted from the restriction respecting pluralities in the 21st Henry, c. 13. It was published in 1802 by the Record Commission, and the original rolls for many dioceses are still preserved in the Exchequer. In pursuance of an act of Parliament of Henry VIII, commissioners were appointed to inquire “of and for the true and just whole and yearly values of all the manors, lands, tenements, hereditaments, rents, tithes, offerings, emoluments, and other profits, etc., appertaining to any archbishopric, bishopric,” etc. The result of their inquiries was the Valor Ecclesiasticus, sometimes called the King's Books. It has been published by the Record Commission. In 1647 Parliament issued commissions for surveying all the Crown and Church lands in England, and copies of the surveys returned were deposited in most of the cathedrals, but the originals were destroyed in the great fire of London. In 1835 a report of the ecclesiastical commissioners for England and Wales was laid on the table of both houses of Parliament, which contained the results of their inquiry into the revenues of the Church of England. SEE FIRST-FRUITS.

## Taxes, Clergy Excepted From[[@Headword:Taxes, Clergy Excepted From]]

             By the favor of Christian emperors, the clergy were exempt from some of the taxes which were laid upon the rest of the Roman empire. They did not, however, claim this exemption as a divine right, but freely acknowledged it to be owing to the pious munificence and favor of the Christian princes. Baronius does the clergy great injustice in pretending that they claimed a freedom from tribute by the law of Christ; and that no emperor ever imposed any tax upon them except only Julian the Apostate, Yalens the Arian, and the younger Valentinian, who was wholly under the influence of his mother, Justina, an Arian empress (An. 378, 4:538). Bellarmine asserts (De Clericis, 1, 28) that the exemption of the clergy in political matters, whether relating to their persons or their goods, was introduced by human right only, and not by divine. The following is a table of the taxes levied in the empire showing the exemptions of the clergy:

1. Census Capitum (or personal tribute). Clergy exempted.

2. Jngatio, Juga, Capitatio, etc. (tax on lands, etc.). Clergy exempted in special cases.

3. Anruim Tiroenicum etc. (soldiers and horses furnished to the emperors). Clergy (probably) exemptedini special cases.

4. Chrysargyrum (or Lustral Tax). Clergy exempted.

5. Metatum (entertaining emperor or retinue). Clergy exempted.

6. Superiudicta et Extraordinaria (or special taxes). Clergy exempted.

7. Road and Bridge Tax. Clergy sometimes exempted.

8. Anyarise et Parlingariae (conveying corn for the army). Clergy sometimes exempted.

9. Denarismus, or Ulcise, and Descriptio Lucratiornm (tax paid to the curia of every city). Clergy exempt under Justinian. The clergy were also exempt from all civil personal offices; from all sordid offices (e.g. building and repairing roads, etc.), both predial and personal; and from all curial or municipal offices. In order to check the practice of rich men seeking to avoid taxes by taking orders, Constantine made a law that no rich plebeian who was qualified by his estate to serve in curia and bear civil offices in any city should become an ecclesiastic. The laws respecting exemption of the clergy were frequently changed, but the above is their general tenor. See Bingham, Christ. Antiq. bk. 5, ch. 3.

## Taxing[[@Headword:Taxing]]

             is the rendering, in the A. V., of a Greek word, which occurs in two passages, ἡ ἀπογραφή (Vulg. descriptio, Luk 2:2; professio, Act 5:37). The cognate verb ἀπογράφεσθαι in like manner is rendered by “to be taxed” in the A.V., while the Vulg. employs “ut describeretur universus orbis” in Luk 2:1, and “ut profiterentur singuli” in Luk 2:3. In Heb 13:23 (πρωτοτόκων ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς), where the idea is that of the registration of the first-born as citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem, the A. V. has simply “written,” the Vulg. “qui conscripti sunt.” Both the Latin words used in the two passages first cited; above are found in classical writers with the meaning of a registration or formal return of population or property (Cicero, v. 2, 3, 47; De Qf 1, 7; Sueton. Tiber. 30). The English word conveys to us more distinctly the notion of a tax or tribute actually levied, but it appears to have been used in the 16th century for the simple assessment of a subsidy upon the property of a given county (Bacon, Henry VII, p. 67), or the registration of the  people for the purpose of a poll-tax (Camden, Hist. of Elizabeth). This may account for the choice of the word by Tyndale in lieu of “description” and profession,” which Wycliffe, following the Vulg., had given. Since then “taxing” has kept its ground in most English versions with the exception of “tribute” in the Geneva, and “enrolment” in the Rhemish of Act 5:37. The word ἀπογραφή by itself leaves the question undetermined whether the returns made were of population or property. Josephus, using the words ἡ ἀποτίμησις τῶν οὐσιῶν (Ant. 18:1, 1) as an equivalent, shows that “the taxing” of which Gamaliel speaks included both. That connected with the Nativity, the first step towards the complete statistical returns, was probably limited to the former (Greswell, Harmony, 1, 542). In either case “census” would have seemed the most natural Latin equivalent; but in the Greek of the New Test., and therefore probably in the familiar Latin of the period, as afterwards in the Vulg., that word slides off into the sense of the tribute actually paid (Mat 22:17; Mat 17:24). SEE CENSUS.

Two distinct registrations, or taxings, are mentioned in the New Test., both of them by Luke. The first is said to have been the result of an edict of the emperor Augustus that “all the world (i.e. the Roman empire) should be taxed” (ἀπογράφεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην) (Luk 2:1), and is connected by the evangelist with the name of Cyrenius, or Quirinus. The second, and ‘more important (ἡ ἀπογραφή, Act 5:37), is referred to in the report of Gamaliel's speech, and is there distinctly associated, in point of time, with the revolt of Judas of Galilee. The account of Josephus (Ant, 18, 50, 1; War, 2, 8, 1) brings together the two names which Luke keeps distinct, with an interval of several years between them. Cyrenius comes as governor of Syria after the deposition of Archelaus, accompanied by Coponius as procurator of Judaea. He is sent to make an assessment of the value of property in Syria (no intimation being given of its extension to the οἰκουμένη), and it is this which rouses Judas and his followers to their rebellion. The chronological questions presented by these apparent discrepancies have been discussed, so far as they are connected with the name of the governor of Syria, under CYRENIUS SEE CYRENIUS. An account of the tumults caused by the taxing will be found under SEE JUDAS OF GALILEE .

There are, however, some other questions connected with the statement of Luk 2:1-3, which call for some notice. The truth of the statement has been questioned by Strauss (Leben Jesu, 1, 28) and De Wette (Comment. ad loc.), and others, who conclude, from various objections, that this  statement belongs to legend, not to history; that it was a contrivance, more or less ingenious, to account for the birth at Bethlehem (that being assumed in popular tradition as a preconceived necessity for the Messiah) of one whose kindred lived, and who himself had grown up at Nazareth; that the whole narrative of the infancy of our Lord, in Luke's Gospel, is to be looked upon as mythical. We summarize these objections, and under each we present, within brief limits, what appears to us a sufficient answer.

1. The foremost ground of objection is that neither Josephus nor any other contemporary writer mentions a census extending over the whole empire at this period (A.U.C. 750). An edict like this, causing a general movement from the cities where men resided to those in which, for some reason or other, they ‘were to be registered, must, it is said, have been a conspicuous fact, such as no historian would pass over.

On the other hand, it must be remembered that our history of this portion of the reign of Augustus is defective. Tacitus begins his Annals with the emperor's death. Suetonius is gossiping, inaccurate, and ill-arranged. Dion Cassius leaves a gap from A.U.C. 748 to 756, with hardly any incidents. Josephus does not profess to give a history of the empire. It might easily be that a general census, cir. A.U.C. 749-750, should remain unrecorded by them. If the measure was one of frequent occurrence, it would be all the more likely to be passed over. The testimony of a writer like Luke, obviously educated and well informed, giving many casual indications of a study of chronological data (Luk 1:5; Luke 3; Act 24:27), and of acquaintance with the Herodian family (Luk 8:3; Luk 23:8; Act 12:20; Act 13:1) and other official people (ch. 23-26) recognizing distinctly the later and more conspicuous ἀπογραφή, must be admitted as fair presumptive evidence, hardly to be set aside in the absence of any evidence to the contrary. How hazardous such an inference from the silence of historians would be, we may judge from the fact that there was undoubtedly a geometrical survey of the empire at some period in the reign of Augustus, of which none of the above writers take any notice (comp. the extracts from the Rei Agrarime Scriptores in Greswell, Harmony, 1, 537). It has been argued further that the whole policy of Augustus rested on a perpetual communication to the central government of the statistics of all parts of the empire. The inscription on the monument of Ancyra (Gruter. Corpus Inscript. 1, 230) names three general censuses in A.U.C. 726, 746,-767 (comp. Sueton. Octav. c. 28; Greswell, Harm. 1, 535), Dion Cass. (4, 13) mentions another in Italy in A.U.C. 757. Others in Gaul are  assigned to A.U.C. 727, 741,767. Strabo (6, 4, 2), writing early in the reign of Tiberius, speaks of μία τῶν καθ᾿ ἡμᾶς τιμήσεων, as if they were common things. In A.U.C. 726, when Augustus offered to resign his power, he laid before the senate a “rationarium imperii” (Sueton. Octav. c. 28). After his death, in like manner, a “breviarium totius imperil” was produced, containing full returns of the population, wealth, resources of all parts of the empire, a careful digest apparently of facts collected during the labors of many years (ibid. c. 101; Dion Cass. 55; Tacitus, Ann. 1, 11). It will hardly seem strange that one of the routine official steps in this process should only be mentioned by a writer who, like Luke, had a special reason for noticing it. A census, involving property-returns, and the direct taxation consequent on them, might excite attention. A mere ἀπογραφή would have little in it to disturb men's minds. or force itself upon a writer of history. There is, however, some evidence, more or less circumstantial, in confirmation of Luke's statement.

(1.) The inference drawn from the silence of historians may be legitimately met by an inference drawn from the silence of objectors. It never occurred to Celsus or Lucian or Porphyry, each questioning all that he could in the Gospel history, to question this.

(2.) A remarkable passage in Suidas (s.v. Απογραφή) mentions a census, obviously differing from the three of the Ancyran monument, and agreeing, in some respects, with that of Luke. It was made by Augustus, not as censor, but by his own imperial authority (δόξαν αὐτῷ; comp. ἐξῆλθε δόγμα, Luk 2:1). The returns were collected by twenty commissioners of high rank. They included property as well as population, and extended over the whole empire.

(3.) Tertullian, incidentally, writing controversially, not against a heathen, but against Marcion, appeals to the returns of the census for Syria under Sentius Saturninus as accessible to all who cared to search them, and proving the birth of Jesus in the city of David (Tertull. Adv. Marc. 4:19). Whatever difficulty the difference of names may present, SEE CYRENIUS, here is, at any rate, a strong indication of the fact of a census of population, cir. A.U.C. 749, and therefore in harmony with Luke's narrative.

(4.) Greswell (Harm. 1, 476; 4 6) has pointed to some circumstances mentioned by Josephus in the last year of Herod's life, and therefore coinciding with the time of the Nativity, which imply some special action of the Roman government in Syria, the nature of which the historian  carelessly or deliberately suppresses. When Herod attends the council at Berytus there are mentioned as present, besides Saturninus and the procurator, οἱ περὶ Πεδάνιον πρέσβεις, as if the officer thus named had come, accompanied by other commissioners, for some purpose which gave him for the time almost co-ordinate influence with the governor of Syria himself ( War, 1, 27, 2). Just after this again, Herod, for some unexplained reason, found it necessary to administer to the whole people an oath, not of allegiance to himself, but of good-will to the emperor; and this oath six thousand of the Pharisees refused to take (Josephus, Ant. 17:2, 4; War, 1, 29, 2). This statement implies, it is urged, some disturbing cause affecting the public tranquility, a formal appearance of all citizens before the king's officers, and lastly, some measure specially distasteful to the Pharisees. The narrative of Luke offers an undesigned explanation of these phenomena.

2. As a further objection, it is urged that Palestine was, at this time, an independent kingdom under Herod, and therefore would not have come under the operation of an imperial edict.

This objection admits of as satisfactory an answer as the foregoing. The statistical document already referred to included subject kingdoms and allies, no less than the provinces (Sueton. loc. cit.). If Augustus had any desire to know the resources of Judea, the position of Herod made him neither willing nor able to resist. From first to last we meet with repeated instances of subservience. He does not dare to try or punish his sons, but refers their cause to the emperor's cognizance (Josephus, Ant. 16:4, 1; 17:5, 8). He holds his kingdom on condition of paying a fixed tribute. Permission is ostentatiously given him to dispose of the succession to his throne as he likes best (ibid. 16:4, 5). He binds his people, as we have seen, by an oath of allegiance to the emperor (ibid. 17:2, 4). The threat of Augustus that he would treat Herod no longer as an ally, but as a subject (ibid. 16:9, 3), would be followed naturally enough by some such step as this, and the desire of Herod to regain his favor would lead him to acquiesce in it.

3. Another objection alleged is that if such a measure, involving the recognition of Roman sovereignty, had been attempted under Herod, it would have roused the same resistance as the undisputed census under Quirinus did at a later period. In reply to this, we may say that we need not wonder that the measure should have been carried into effect without any popular outbreak. It was a return of the population only, not a valuation of  property; there was no immediate taxation as the consequence. It might offend a party like the Pharisees; it was not likely to excite the multitude. Even if it seemed to some the prognostication of a coming change; and of direct government by the Roman emperor, we know that there was a large and influential party ready to welcome that change as the best thing that could happen for its country (Josephus, Ant. 17:11, 2).

4. The statement of Luke that “all went to be taxed, every one into his own city,” is said to be inconsistent with the rules of the Roman census, which took cognizance of the place of residence only, not of the place of birth.

On the other hand, this apparent inconsistency of what Luke narrates is precisely what might be expected under the known circumstances of the case. The census, though Roman in origin, was effected by Jewish instrumentality, and was in harmony, therefore, with Jewish customs. The alleged practice is, however, doubtful; and it has been maintained (Huschke, Ueber den Census, etc., in Winer, s.v. “Schatzung”) that the inhabitants of the provinces were, as far as possible, registered in their forum originis— not in the place in which they were only residents. It may be noticed incidentally that the journey from Nazareth to Bethlehem belongs to a time when Galilee and Judaea were under the same ruler, and would therefore have been out of the question (as the subject of one prince would certainly not be registered as belonging to another) after the death of Herod the Great. The circumstances of the Nativity indicate, if they do not prove, that Joseph went there only for personal enrolment, not because he was the possessor of house or land.

5. It is asserted that neither in the Jewish nor the Roman census would it have been necessary for the wife to travel with her husband in order to appear personally before the registrar (censitor). This objection is, perhaps, the most frivolous and vexatious of all. If Mary were herself of the house and lineage of David, there may have been special reasons for her appearance at Bethlehem. In any case, the Scripture narrative is consistent with itself. Nothing could be more natural, looking to the unsettled state of Palestine at this period, than that Joseph should keep his wife under his own protection instead of leaving her by herself, in an obscure village, exposed to danger and reproach. In proportion to the hopes he had been taught to cherish of the birth of a Son of David; in proportion, also, to his acceptance of the popular belief that the Christ was to be born in the city of David (Mat 2:5; Joh 7:42), would be his desire to guard  against the accident of birth in the despised Nazareth out of which “no good thing” could come (1, 46).

The literature connected with this subject is, as might be expected, very extensive. Every commentary contains something on it. Meyer, Wordsworth, and Alford may be consulted as giving the latest summaries. A very full and exhaustive discussion of all points connected with the subject is given by Spanheim, Dubiavtrng. 2, 3-9; and Richardus, Diss. de Censu Augusti, in Menthe, Thesaurus, 2, 428; comp. also Ellicott, Hulsean Lectures, p. 57.

## Taylor, Benjamin C., D.D[[@Headword:Taylor, Benjamin C., D.D]]

             a Reformed (Dutch) minister, was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, February 24, 1801. He graduated from Princeton College in 1819, and from the New Brunswick Theological Seminary in 1822; was licensed the latter year, and immediately became pastor at Greenbush and Blooming Grove, Rensselaer County, N.Y.; in 1825 at Aquackanock (now Passaic), N.J.; in 1828 at Bergeni, where he was made pastor emeritus in 1870, and died, Feb. 2,1881. He published several sermons and addresses, and a volume entitled Annals of the Classis and Township of Bergen (1856).

## Taylor, Charles C[[@Headword:Taylor, Charles C]]

             a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, died Feb. 2,1855, at Kalamazoo, Mich. In 1844 he went to Michigan and took charge of St. Andrew's Church, Ann Arbor; and in July, 1853, became rector of St. Luke's Church, Kalamazoo, where he labored until the last. He had frequently represented his diocese in the General Convention, and had for a long time been a member of the standing committee; he was a faithful and eloquent preacher. See Amer. Quar. Church Review, 1855, p. 161.

## Taylor, Chauncey[[@Headword:Taylor, Chauncey]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Williamstown, Vt.. Feb. 17, 1805. After preliminary study at Hinesburgh, he entered the University of Vermont, from which he graduated in 1831, and then studied theology with Rev. Ira Ingraham, of Brandon. Jan. 21,1835, was the date of his ordination, when he was installed pastor at Chittenden, and remained until 1837. One year, from 1838, he preached at James's Island, near Charleston, S. C.; from 1839 to 1841.he was acting pastor at Chittenden, Vt. The two years following he was without charge, living at one time in Winooski and at another in Milton. From 1843 to 1846 he was acting pastor at Alburgh. In the latter year he was reinstalled at Chittenden, where he remained until August, 1854, when he went to Langdon, N. H., and  served there as acting pastor for two years. Then he became a home missionary at Algona, Kossuth Co., Ia., beginning his ministry there in 1856 gathering a Church in 1858, and being, installed in 1867. After serving this congregation until July, 1873, he was dismissed, and never resumed the care of a parish. He died there Feb. 29, 1876. See Cong. Qua- Rev. 1877, p.426.

## Taylor, Cornelius H., D.D[[@Headword:Taylor, Cornelius H., D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in 1821. Soon after the completion of his theological studies he became pastor of the Church of Huron, O. From thence he removed to Illinois, and was installed pastor of the Church at Alton, where he labored ten years. In 1868 he received a call from the Third Presbyterian Church at Cincinnati, O. He was a leading man in the Church in all places where he labored. He died at Cincinnati, Feb. 25, 1875. See Praesbyteriain, March 13, 1875. (W. P. S.)

## Taylor, David[[@Headword:Taylor, David]]

             one of Wesley's early helpers, began to preach the Gospel in Cheshire and Derbyshire about the time that Wesley began his public labors. Many were saved through his instrumentality, among whom was John Bennett. He lived for a time in the family of lady Huntingdon (q.v.). On one occasion he was waylaid, with Charles Wesley, and severely wounded. He eventually erred with respect to marriage, not submitting to the mode prescribed by law, and his usefulness became neutralized thereby. He united with the Moravians, but soon left them and attended the meetings of the Quakers. He afterwards returned to his old friends the Methodists, and attempted to preach once more; “but, alas!” says Atmore, “his gifts were gone.” He died, in obscurity, about 1780. See Atmore, Meth. Memorial, s.v.; Smith, Hist. Wesl. Methodism, 1, 182, 191-196, 201.

## Taylor, Edward[[@Headword:Taylor, Edward]]

             a Congregational minister, was born (according to president Stiles) at Coventry, England, in 1642, and received an excellent education in his native country. Upon the restoration of Charles, he resolved not to conform, and sailed for the United States April 22, 1668, arriving at Boston July 5. On July 23 he entered Cambridge University, from which he graduated in 1671. Invited to preach at Westfield, he consented, and arrived there Dec. 3,1671. The paucity of population and the insecurity of  person and property delayed for a long time the formation of a Church; but this was done Aug. 27,1679, O. S., and Mr. Taylor was ordained as its pastor. He continued to labor here until his death, June 29,1729. He left in manuscript, A Commentary on the Four Gospels, theological treatises, sermons, and poems, none of which have been published. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1, 177.

## Taylor, Elisha E. L., D.D[[@Headword:Taylor, Elisha E. L., D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Delphi, N.Y., September 25, 1815. He graduated from Madison University, and from the theological seminary at Hamilton, became pastor in Pierrepont Street, Brooklyn, in 1865 secretary of the Baptist Church Edifice Fund, and died August 20, 1874. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. s.v.

## Taylor, Ellison[[@Headword:Taylor, Ellison]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in South Carolina, Feb. 19, 1788. He first received license to exhort, and afterwards, April 13, 1816, to preach. Soon after this he joined the traveling connection, and in due time was made deacon and elder. He died in 1826. Mr. Taylor possessed excellent talents, was uniformly acceptable, and greatly beloved by the friends of true religion. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1, 541.

## Taylor, Ezekiel Dunton[[@Headword:Taylor, Ezekiel Dunton]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Bristol, Vt., June 2, 1817-the youngest of five brothers, all ministers. His early education was received at St. Lawrence Academy, Potsdam, N. Y., and Western Reserve Preacher's Seminary. After leaving the latter institution he became principal of Shaw Academy, Euclid, O., and remained in that position until he began the study of theology, which he prosecuted under the direction of the Granud River Presbytery and with his brother Chauncey. From Jan. 1, 1845, to 1847, he was acting pastor at De Ruyter, N. Y.; and after one year's labor was ordained at West Stockholm, Dec. 9, 1847, where he remained three years, until 1850, at which time he was dismissed. His next field was at Heuveltou and De Peyster as acting pastor, at which places he preached one year (from 1850 to 1851); then at Chagrin Falls, O., four years, until 1855. At Clarendon he preached eighteen years, until 1873, from which time successively, until his death, he served at South Newbury, Parkman, and Troy. He died at his home in Troy, Dec. 19, 1878. (W. P. S.)

## Taylor, Fitch W[[@Headword:Taylor, Fitch W]]

             a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, died in Brooklyn, N. Y., July 24, 1865, aged sixty-two years. He was the oldest chaplain in the United States Navy, and served under commodore Reed in his expedition against the Malays; was in the Mexican War; and was chaplain of the flag-  ship “Hiartford,” in command of admiral Farragut, during the Rebellion. See Amer. Quar. Church Review, Oct. 1865, p. 499.

## Taylor, Francis[[@Headword:Taylor, Francis]]

             an English theologian of the 17th century, is the author of a Latin translation of Aben-Ezra's Commentary on and Rashi's Exposition of Lamentations (Lond. 1645): — Targum Hierosol. in quinque Libros Legis in Latinuma Conversum (1649): — Pirke Aboth cum Versione Latina a Phil. Aquino, Additis Notis Marginalibas (1651): — Targum, Prius et Posterius in Estheram, etc. (1655). Together with Arnold Boote, he published, Examen Praefationis Joh. Morini in Biblia Graeca de Textus Hebraici Corruptione et Graeci Auctoritate (Leyden, 1636). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Taylor, Henry[[@Headword:Taylor, Henry]]

             an English Baptist and Methodist minister, was born at Rossendale, Lancashire, and began to preach, in a local capacity, in the Methodist connection at an early period of his life. He soon after united with the Close-communion Baptists, and was for several years a respectable minister in that Church, and a pastor of a congregation in Birmingham. In 1788 he offered himself to the Methodist Conference, was accepted, and appointed to Liverpool. He was a popular preacher, especially in Sheffield, in 1796, where several persons were converted. Some circumstances coming to light, in 1797, which reflected upon his moral conduct, he was suspended by the district meeting until the next Conference. He retired to Liverpool, and was sent, before the Conference met, by an owner of possessions in the West Indies to teach school on his plantations. Taylor died on the passage across, in 1798. See Atmore, Meth. Memorial, s.v.; Smith, Hist. of Wesl. Meth. 2, 294.

## Taylor, Isaac (1)[[@Headword:Taylor, Isaac (1)]]

             a Dissenting minister, known as “Taylor of Ongar,” was born in London in 1759, and was for a time a successful engraver in that city. He removed to Lavenham, Suffolk, in 1786. He was minister of an Independent Church at Colchester, Essex, 1796-1810, and of another at Ongar, Essex, from 1811 until his death, Dec. 11, 1829. Besides other works, he published, Book of Martyrs for the Young (12mo): Bunyan Explained to a Child (2 vols. 12mo): — Child's Life of Christ (12mo): — Self-cultivation Recommended (12mo; Boston, 1820, 12mo): — The Glory of Zion: — and other single Sermons. For a fuller list of publications, see Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Taylor, Isaac (2), LL.D[[@Headword:Taylor, Isaac (2), LL.D]]

             a Christian philosopher, was born at Lavenham, Suffolk, Aug. 17,1787. He was designed by his father for an artist, began to study for a Dissenting minister, but became a member of the Established Church and settled down at Stanford Rivers as a literary recluse. In 1862 he received a civil service pension of one hundred pounds for his services to literature in the departments of history and philosophy. He died at his home, Stanford  Rivers, June 28, 1865. He published, among other works, Elements of Thought (Lond. 1823, 8rvo; N. Y. 1851, 12mo; 11th ed. 1867, 8vo): — The Process of Historical Proof Exemplified and Explained (ibid. 1828, 8vo; 1859, 8vo): — Balance of Criminality, or Mental Error Compared with Immoral Conduct (ibid. 1828,12mo): — Natural History of Enthusiasm (ibid. 1829, 8vo; Boston, 1830; 12mo; 10th ed. Lond. 1845,8vo): — New Model of Christian Missions (ibid. 1829. 8vo; new ed. 1866, 8vo): — Fanaticism (ibid. 1833, 8vo, N. Y. 1834, 12mo; 1866, fp. 8vo): — Spiritual Despotism (ibid. 1835, 8vo; 2d ed. 1835, 8vo; N. Y. 1835,12mo):Physical Theory of Another Life (Lond. 1836,12mo; N.Y. 1836, 1852, 1853, 1866, 12mo): — Home Education (ibid. 1838, fp. 8vo; 7th ed. 1867, 8vo; 2d Am. ed. N.Y. 1838, 16mo): — Ancient Christianity, and the Doctrines of the Oxford Tracts for the Times (ibid. 1839-40, in eight 8vo parts; 4th ed. with supp. and indexes, 1844,2 vols. 8vo): Man Responsible for his Dispositions, etc., a lecture (ibid. 1840,8vo): — Loyola and Jesuitism in its Rudiments (Lond. 1849, 1850, 1863, 8vo; N. Y. 1849, 1851, 12mo) : — Wesley and Methodism (Lond. 1851, 1863, 1865, 8voi N. Y. 1852, 12mo): — The Restoration of Belief (Lond. 1855, 8vo; Phila. 1855,12mo; Camb. 1864, 8vo): — Loicin Theology, and other essays (Lond. 1859, fp. 8vo; with a sketch of author's life and catalogue of his writings, N. Y. 1860,12mo): — The Liturgy and the Dissenters (Lond. 1860, 8vo): — The Spirit of the Hebrew Poetry (ibid. 1861; N. Y. 1861, 8vo; 1862, 8vo): — Considerations on the Pentateuch, etc. (ibid. 1863, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Chambers's Encyclop. s.v.

## Taylor, James A[[@Headword:Taylor, James A]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister was received on trial in the Ohio Conference in 1847, and appointed to Goshen Circuit; in 1848, to Madisonville; in 1850, to Gallipolis Circuit; and in 1851, to Jackson, which was his last appointment. He died Aug. 10,1851. He was a young man of undoubted piety, good mind, and remarkable zeal. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 4:665.

## Taylor, James Barnett, D.D[[@Headword:Taylor, James Barnett, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Barton-upon-Humber, England, March 19, 1804. He came to New York with his parents while an infant; removed to Virginia in 1817, having already, at the age of thirteen, made a profession  of religion; began to preach at the age of sixteen, and was formally licensed at twenty. He performed, for a year or two, missionary labor in the Meherran District, Virginia; was ordained May 2, 1826, at Sandy Creek, and, the same year, was called to the pastorate of the Second Church at Richmond, where he remained thirteen years. He was elected chaplain of the University of Virginia in 1839, and in 1840 became pastor of the Grace Street Church, Richmond, where he remained until 1844, and then entered upon his duties as corresponding secretary of the Southern Baptist Convention, which office he held with distinguished ability for twenty-six years. During thirteen of these years he was pastor of the Taylorsville Church, and was also in the Confederate army as colporteur and post- chaplain. For a short time he was editor of The Religious Herald. The Southern Baptist Missionary .Journal and Home and Foreign Journal were established by him. He wrote also a Life of Lot Carey, a Life of Luther Rice, Lives of Virginia Baptist Ministers, and had prepared, in part, a History of Virginia Baptists. After the war he took a deep interest in the spiritual welfare of the freedmen. He died December 22, 1871. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. page 1134. (J.C.S.)

## Taylor, James Brainerd[[@Headword:Taylor, James Brainerd]]

             a young Congregational minister of ardent piety and great promise, was born at Middle Haddam, Conn., April 15, 1801. His parents being members of the Protestant Episcopal Church, he was trained up in religious  associations, and while clerk in a store in New York city was converted, and joined the Church of Dr. Romeyn. He early became useful in all Christian activities. The departure of Dr. Scudder for India turned his attention to the ministry, and after a preparatory course of two years at Lawrenceville Academy, N. J., he went to Princeton College as a sophomore in 1823. On his graduation in 1826, he entered the Yale Theological Seminary, but he soon had symptoms of lung-disease, which compelled him to seek relief in a tour through the South. He was licensed to preach by the Middlesex Convocation at East Haddam, Oct. 8, 1828, but the state of his health was such that he resolved to spend the winter at the Theological Seminary in Richmond, Va. He died there March 29, 1829, leaving a bright example of the power of divine grace and the triumph of Christian hope. See his Memoir by Dr. Rice (N.Y. 1833).

## Taylor, Jane[[@Headword:Taylor, Jane]]

             daughter of the Rev. Isaac Taylor of Ongcar, and as a writer for youth the worthy rival of Mrs. Barbauld, was born Sept. 23,1783, in London, where her father then resided in the practice of his profession as an artist. Even from her third and fourth year, in connection with her sister Anne, who was two years older, she is said to have composed little tales and songs, which they would sing together; and Jane especially seemed to live in a fairy-land of her own imagination. Her father removed to Colchester in 1796. There Jane, in her fifteenth year, gave decided indications of personal piety. She was also one of a select society of young friends for the reading of original essays and the promotion of intellectual improvement. A visit to London in 1802 first brought her before the public. Her first contribution, The Beggar's Boy, appeared in the Minoo's Pocket-book for 1804. It was followed not long after by the two volumes of Original Poems for Infant Minds, Rhymes for the Nursery, etc., the joint production of Jane and her sisters, which quickly gained the favor of the public, were reprinted ill America, and translated into German. Few books have been found more agreeable to children, or more useful in the business of early education. In 1809 she contributed to The Associate Minstrels, and soon after engaged with her sisters in the more difficult task of composing Hymns for Children. This volume must be pronounced equal, if not superior, both in merit and popularity, to Dr. Watts's Divine Songs. Its success called forth a second volume adapted for Sunday- schools, the contents of which have been incorporated with almost every subsequent collection for that purpose, and are now continually sung by millions of  infant voices in different parts of the world. In 1814 she published Display, and in 1816 her Essays in Rhyme on Morals and Manners, which gained her a large increase of well-merited reputation. Her Contributions of Q. Q. to the Youth's Magazine were among her last and best literary efforts. They have since been republished in two vols. 12mo. She died at Ongar, April 13, 1824, confiding, calm, and happy in the Lord. See Memoirs and Remains, by her brother.

## Taylor, Jeremy, D.D[[@Headword:Taylor, Jeremy, D.D]]

             a distinguished Anglican divine, was born at Cambridge in 1613. He entered as a sizar in Caius College, Cambridge, in 1626, and became chaplain to archbishop Laud and to Charles I; was made fellow of All- Souls College, Oxford, in 1632; and was rector of Uppingham, Rutlandlshire, 1638; sequestered by Parliament in 1642; and after the defeat of the Royalists suffered frequent but short imprisonments. During the first year of the Protectorate, he kept a school in Wales in conjunction with William Nicholson, and officiated as chaplain to the earl of Carberry at Golden Grove, Carmarthenshire. In 1658 he settled in Ireland and preached alternately at Lisburn and Portmore. He returned to London in the spring of 1660, and signed the loyal Declaration of the Nobility and Gentry April 24, thirty-five days before the Restoration. He was consecrated bishop of Down and Connor in January, 1661, made a member of the Irish Privy Council in February, entrusted with the diocese of Dromore in March, and in the same year was elected vice-chancellor of the University of Dublin. He died at Lisburn, Aug. 13, 1667, and was interred in the choir of the cathedral at Dromore. His funeral sermon was preached by his chaplain, Dr. George Rust, who said of him: “His endowments were so many and so great as really made him a miracle. He was a rare humanist and deeply versed in all the polite arts of learning, and thoroughly concocted all the ancient moralists, Greek and Roman poets and orators. He had the good-humor of a gentleman, the eloquence of an orator, the fancy of a poet, the acuteness of a schoolman, the profoundness of a philosopher, the wisdom of a chancellor, the sagacity of a prophet, the reason of an angel, and the piety of a saint. He had devotion enough for a cloister, learning enough for a university, and wit enough for a college of virtuosi.” To sum up all his attainments, Thompson calls him, in his Biog. Hist., the “Homer of divines';” Hannah More, the “Shakspeare of the Church;” earl Shaftesbury, the “Spenser of English theological literature.” An account of his writings and the various editions would fill a volume. We  give an outline of his works, and simply the first editions': The Sacred Order and Offices of Episcopacy (Oxford, 1642, 4to): — A Discourse concerning Prayer (Lond. 1646, 4to): — New and Easy Institution of Grammar: Discourse of the Liberty of Prophesying (1647, 4to):The Great Exemplar of Sanctity and Holy Life (1649, 4to): — The Rule and Exercise of Holy Living (1650, 12mo): — The Rule and Exercise of Holy Dying (1651, 12mo): — A Discourse of the Office Ministerial (Lond. 1651; 8vo): — Sermons for all Sundays in the Year (ibid. 1653, 2 vols. fol.): — Manual of Daily Prayers (1655, 8vo): — Doctrine and Practice of Repentance (Lond. 1655, 8vo): — Polemical and Moral Discourses (1657, fol.):Discourses of the Nature, Offices, and Measures of Friendship (1662,12mo): — Offices or Forms of Prayer (1658, 8vo): — The Rule of Conscience (1660, 2 vols. fol.): The Worthy Communicant (1660, 8vo): — Rules and Advices to the Clergy of the Diocese of Down and Connor (Dublin, 1661, 8vo): — Discourse of Confirmation (1664, 8vo): — Dissuasives from Popery; addressed to the People of Ireland (ibid. pt. 1, 1864, 4to; pt. 2, 1867, 4to, some 8vo).: — Contemplations of the State of Man (1684, 4to and 8vo). There have also been published separately, Christian Consolations Taught from Religion (24mo): — Guide to Eternal Happiness (12mo): — Baptists Justified, with Notes by Dr. Anderson (12mo): — Reverence Due to the Altar; Preparation for the Sacrament (12mo): — Comforts of Piety (12mo): — Marriage Ring (Lond. 1838, 32mo): — Warning Vain (1848, 18mo): — Godly Fear (1867, 32mo): — Selections from his Prayers (1811, 8vo): — Beauties of Jeremy Taylor (Lond. 1845): — Selections from his Writings (in Sparks, Essays and Tracts in Theology, vol. 6:No. 11). There have been numerous editions of Dr. Taylor's works: Select Works (1819, 6 vols. 8vo, Longman); Select Works, by Bradley (2 vols.); Select Works, by T. S. Hulghes, D.D. (5 vols. 8vo); Practical Works, by George Croly, D.D. (2 vols. 8vo); Whole Works, with Essay Biographical and Critical, by Henry Rogers (1835,3 vols. imp. 8vo); Whole. Works, by Rev. J. R. Pitman, with life of the author and a critical examination of his writings; Life of Bishop Taylor, by bishop Heber; and also Life, by Rev. J. Wheeldon, in which the pure spirit of his writings is extracted and exhibited for the general benefit. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v. (W. P. S.)

## Taylor, John (1)[[@Headword:Taylor, John (1)]]

             “the Water Poet,” was born at Gloucester, England, in 1580, and was educated at a free school in that town. He went to London, where he was apprenticed to a waterman, and followed this occupation for the most of his life; hence his appellation of “the Water Poet.” He was also collector of the wine fees for the lieutenant of the Tower, and keeper of a public-house at Oxford and Westminster. He died in 1654. His productions, in prose and verse, number about 140, among which we notice, Urania, etc., with a Narration of the Thirteen Sieges and Six Sackings of Jerusalem, etc. (1615, 8vo): — Superbice Flagellum, or the Whip of Pride ( 1621, 8vo): — Against Cursing and Swearing, in prose and verse (Works, 1, 39-55): — The Life and Death, of the Most Blessed among Women, the Virgin Mary, etc. (1622, 8vo): — Verbum Sempiternum, an epitome of the Old Test. in verse (Works, pt. 3): — Salvator Mundi, an epitome of the New Test. in verse (with preceding, in 1693, 64mo, called The Thumb Bible ): — Book of Martyrs (1639, 18mo) ( Works, 3, 136-141): — The Church's Deliverances, from the year 1565 to 1630, in verse (Works, 3, 142-146): — A Swarm of Sectaries and Schismatiques (1641, 4to). For full list and description of works, see Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Taylor, John (2), D.D[[@Headword:Taylor, John (2), D.D]]

             a learned English Dissenter and educator, was born near Lancaster in 1694, and was educated at Whitehaven. He settled first at Kirkstead, Lincolnshire, where he preached to a small congregation and taught a grammar-school for nearly twenty years. In 1733 he was settled over a Presbyterian Church at Norwich, but in 1757 went to Warrington, in Lancashire, to superintend an academy, and died there, March 5, 1761. Among his publications are, The Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin (Lond. 1738 and later):A Paraphrase on Romans (ibid. 1745): — A Scripture Catechism with Proofs (ibid. 1745): — A Collection of Tunes, etc., with a Scheme for Supporting the Spirit and Practice of Psalmody (ibid. 1750): — The Scripture Doctrine of Atonement (1753): — A Hebrew-English Concordance (ibid. 1754, 2 vols. fol.);-The Lord's Supper Explained upon Scripture Principles (1754): — The Covenant of Grace in Defense of Infant Baptism (1755): — A Sketch of Moral Philosophy (1760). His greatest work is his Hebrew Concordance, adapted to the English Bible, in which every word in the Hebrew Bible, with all its forms and significations, is to be found. His Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin called forth the  celebrated answer of Edwards, in his treatise on Original Sin, which, whatever else may be said, it was not in the power of Taylor of Norwich to answer. In his Paraphrase on the Romans, with notes, he also found opportunity to broach freely his Arian sentiments, although the work also contains many valuable illustrations and comments on the Epistle.

## Taylor, John (3)[[@Headword:Taylor, John (3)]]

             an English divine, was born at Shrewsbury, and baptized at St. Alkmund's Church, June 22, 1704, and was educated at the expense of Mr. Owen, of Condover, at St. John's College, Cambridge, where he took his A.B. in 1727. He afterwards became both fellow and tutor of this college, and in March, 1732, was appointed librarian, which office he held but a short time, being; in 1734, appointed registrar of the university. In 1744 he was made chancellor of the diocese of Lincoln, and in April, 1751, was preferred to the rectory of Lawford, in Essex; while in January, 1753, he became archdeacon of Buckingham. He was made canon residentiary of St. Paul's in July, 1757, and removed to London, where he resided until his death, April 14,1766.

## Taylor, John (4)[[@Headword:Taylor, John (4)]]

             a Revolutionary patriot and professor of natural philosophy and mathematics in Queen's College. He was elected by the trustees at their first meeting in 1771, and Rev. Dr. Jacobus Rutsen Hardenbergh was chosen as president. The college went into operation at once, and before the war several students were graduated. When the war broke out, these two illustrious men threw themselves ardently into the cause of independence. Professor Taylor drilled the students as a military company, and they were quite expert in the use of arms. The irruption of the British troops who occupied New Brunswick broke up the college. An advertisement is still extant that the exercises of the college would be continued at a private house at the head of the Raritan during one of these years. Subsequently professor Taylor became colonel of the New Jersey State regiment; but he continued to discharge his professional duties for a time. In a letter to governor Livingston, Sept. 25, 1779, he speaks of “the necessity of attending the examination of the students; and as the trustees insist upon my fulfilling my engagements, I hope I shall be discharged from the regiment as soon as possible.” Of his subsequent life there is no public record accessible to the writer; but his name and relationship to the college  are important and interesting as showing the patriotism of both officers and students of the infant college, and the close connection between enlightened academic education and the spirit of independence in that period of New Jersey history. Among those whom Prof. Taylor drilled in the company of students the most eminent was the first graduate of the college, Simeon De Witt, who was Washington's chief “geographer to the army,” or topographical engineer, as the office is now termed. See Revolutionary Correspondence of N. J. p. 177; Hist. of Rutgers College. (W. J. R. T.)

## Taylor, John Lord, D.D[[@Headword:Taylor, John Lord, D.D]]

             a Congregational divine, was born at Warren, Connecticut, May 20, 1811. He graduated from Yale College in 1835 and at the Divinity School in 1839, having been a tutor in the college for two years; was ordained pastor of the South Church, Andover, Massachusetts, the last-mentioned year; became professor of theology and homiletics in Andover Theological Seminary in 1868, resigned in 1879, and died there, September 23, 1884. Besides many contributions to the literary journals, he wrote, a Memoir of lion. Samuel Phillips (1856): — Memorial of the Semi-Centennial Celebration of Andover Theological Seminary (1859).

## Taylor, John S[[@Headword:Taylor, John S]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Delaware County, Pa., Aug. 29, 1795; converted March 10, 1827; admitted on trial in the Philadelphia Conference in 1833, and appointed to Milford Circuit; in 1835, to Cambridge Circuit; in 1836-37, to Accomac Circuit; in 1838, to Northampton Circuit; in 183940, to Snow Hill Circuit; in 1841-42, to Dorchester Circuit; in 1843-48, to Mariners' Bethel, Philadelphia; in 1849, superannuated. He died Aug. 21,1849. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 4:423.

## Taylor, Jonathan[[@Headword:Taylor, Jonathan]]

             a minister of the Society of Friends, was a resident of Mount Pleasant, in the State of Ohio. He was much esteemed by the society of which he was a member. He was sent as a delegate to the societies in England and Ireland in the year 1831. During his journey he was attacked with inflammation of the lungs, and died at Kilnock, near Carlow, Ireland, June 11, 1831. See Annual Monitor, 1833, p. 57.

## Taylor, Joseph[[@Headword:Taylor, Joseph]]

             a Congregational missionary to India, was born in 1786; commenced his labors in India in 1812, laboring some time in the Bellary Mission, and removing thence to Belgaum, where he continued until 1852, when he retired to Bombay. Here he died, Nov. 19, 1859. See (Lond.) Cong. Year- book, 1861, p. 242.

## Taylor, Joseph van Sommern[[@Headword:Taylor, Joseph van Sommern]]

             a missionary of India, was born at Bellary, Southern India, in 1820, where his father was a missionary of the London Society. He was educated at the Bishop's College in Calcutta and at Glasgow, graduating at the latter place in 1845. In the same year, having been accepted by the London Missionary Society, he left England for Gujerat, where he labored for thirty-four years, the last twenty-one years in connection with the Presbyterian Church of Ireland. He died in 1881. Mr. Taylor, besides translating the Confession of  Faith into Gujerati, wrote two of the best grammars in that language. The natives of Gujerat are indebted to him for a History of the Christian Church, founded on that of Dr. Barth, as well as for a Book of Christian Practise and a Manual of Devotion. Several of the best tracts in the list of the Gujerat Tract and Book Society are from his pen. He also translated the Shorter Catechism, and was engaged at the time of his death on a translation of the Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation, which he left unfinished. (B.P.)

## Taylor, Joshua[[@Headword:Taylor, Joshua]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Princeton, N.J., Feb. 5, 1768. At the age of seventeen he was apprenticed to a  cabinetmaker, and continued in his employ three years, when the death of his mother awakened his mind to his spiritual condition. After a severe struggle against skepticism, he entered fully into communion with the Church in 1791; became an itinerant preacher, and was appointed to Flanders Circuit, N.J. The next year he went to New England, and labored in the circuits of Fairfield, Middletown, Granville, and Trenton, in Connecticut. In 1797 he was transferred to Maine, and appointed presiding elder of the newly formed district in that State. In 1798 he united with his duties as presiding elder the care of Readfield Circuit. In 1801 Mr. Taylor was appointed to the Boston District; in 1803 he was returned to the “District of Maine.” and in 1804 was stationed at Portland, Me. He located in 1806, continuing to preach in Portland and vicinity, and teaching a private school. In 1824 he was chosen one of the presidential electors of Maine, and cast his vote for John Q. Adams. From 1826 to 1848 he confined his labors principally to Cumberland. In the latter year he re- entered the Conference, was entered as superannuated, and was appointed chaplain to the almshouse, where he attended to the duties of his office till June, 1852, when he was disabled by paralysis. He died at his home in Portland, March 20, 1861. About 1802 he was engaged in a pamphlet controversy with a Rev. Mr. Ward, a Congregational minister who attacked Methodist doctrines. “The Methodist party was entirely satisfied with the result of the controversy.” See Zion's Herald, April 3, 1861.

## Taylor, Marshall William, D.D[[@Headword:Taylor, Marshall William, D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Lexington, Kentucky, July 1, 1847. In 1872 he entered the Lexington Conference. He was a delegate to the General Conference of 1884, which elected him editor of the South- western Christian Advocate, and held that position until his death, September 11, 1887. See Minutes of Annual Conferences (Spring), 1888, page 93.

## Taylor, Michael S[[@Headword:Taylor, Michael S]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Scott County, Ky., Oct. 28, 1798; licensed to preach September, 1824, and some time afterwards received on trial in the Kentucky Conference. He traveled about four years in the Kentucky Conference; was then transferred to the Illinois Conference, and thence to the Indiana; was subsequently retransferred to the Illinois Conference, and appointed presiding elder in the Wabash District, where he continued his labors for four years. In 1836 he was appointed presiding elder of the Quincy District. He died July 20,1838. In all the relations of life he was irreproachable. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1839, p. 661.

## Taylor, Nathaniel (1)[[@Headword:Taylor, Nathaniel (1)]]

             an English clergyman was assistant minister in Westminster in 1683, and appointed pastor of a congregation at Salter's Hall in 1695. He died in  1702, at the age of about forty. He published, Sermons (Lond. 1688, 4to): — Funeral Sermon (1691, 4to): — Preservative against Deism (1698, 4to): — Funeral Sermon (1699, 4to): — Discourse of Faith in Jesus Christ, etc. (1700, 4to): — Dr. William Sherlock's Case and Letter of Church Communion, etc., Considered (17028vo): — Practical Discourses (1703, 8vo). See Allibone. Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Taylor, Nathaniel (2)[[@Headword:Taylor, Nathaniel (2)]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Danbury, Conn., Aug. 27, 1722 (O.S.), He graduated at Yale College in 1745, and was ordained pastor, June 29, 1748, at New Milford, Conn., where he remained until his death, Dec. 9,1800. For twenty-sit years he was one of the Yale College board of trustees. His only publications were two occasional Sermons. In 1759 be was chaplain, under Col. N. Whiting, at and around Crown Point and Ticonderoga. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1, 467.

## Taylor, Nathaniel William, D.D[[@Headword:Taylor, Nathaniel William, D.D]]

             an eminent Congregational preacher am. divine, and the grandson of the preceding, was born at New Milford, Conn., June 23, 1786. He spent his early years on a farm, was prepared for college by Rev. Dr. Azel Backus, and graduated at Yale College in 1807, having had twice to relinquish his studies on account of disease of the eves. He was private tutor for a year in Albany and Montreal, studied theology four years with Dr. Dwight, and in 3812 succeeded Moses Stuart in the pastorate of the First Church, New Haven, where he labored with great success for ten years. Of his preaching, Dr. Dutton thus speaks: “The intellectual qualities of his preaching were thorough and profound, yet lucid and scriptural exposition and discussion of weighty themes; a marshalling of comprehensive forces of luminous and enkindled logic, to bear, with compacted and converging unity and climacteric power, on the one question in hand; a full and frank meeting of difficulties; bold, defiant, and powerful grappling with objections; fearless reference, in defense of scriptural doctrine and precept, to reason and common-sense; close ant pungent applications to conscience, and earnest and tender appeals to the heart.”

Dr. Taylor was considered one of the ablest preachers of his time, and in certain aspects was thought to have had no equal. After he became theological instructor, especially in times of revival, his labors were widely sought by the Church and freely given. In 1822 upon the formation of the theological department in Yale College, he  was chosen Dwight professor of didactic theology, which position he held until March 10, 1858, when he quietly and peacefully passed away from earth. It was as a teacher of theology that his influence has been most widely felt. In this field, he was an original investigator, and few men have left a deeper impress upon American divinity. In several important respects lie diverged from the traditional theology of New England. He held that the mind, however affected by sin in intellect, sensibility, or will, is yet a free agent, capable by intellect to perceive and understand the objects and motives of choice, capable by sensibility to feel their influence, and capable by will to choose or refuse any one of them; and that the power of will, by which it makes a given choice, is a power that could in the time and circumstances have chosen differently and oppositely. He repudiated the predicating of the words “predestinated” and “decreed” to God, and substituted the word “purposed.”

While depravity is universal to the race, it is not to be ascribed to any property, propensity, or disposition of the soul, prior to actual transgression, as sinful in itself, or as the necessary cause of sin, nor to a sinful nature corrupted in or derived from Adam, sin being traced to the constitutional propensity of man for natural good, as perverted by his own moral agency. “Sin comes in as an unavoidable result, so far as divine prevention is concerned, of such materials as God uses, and must use, in a moral universe to wit, free agents.” God, having created man moral and responsible, cannot prevent the entrance of sin without contradicting himself. He admitted and taught that sin is among the things which are according to the counsel of God's will, yet only in an indirect and remote sense, God preferring a moral system in which sin is necessarily incidental to the nonexistence of a moral system. As to the originality and soundness of Dr. Taylor's views concerning sin, much difference of opinion has prevailed. Some of his followers have claimed that they are original with him; others quote Whately, Woodward, and Dr. John Young as having enounced views in consonance with his. Dr. Pond charges him with reviving “the old Arminian deistical hypothesis,” while Dr. Dutton claims, on the contrary, that “time has fully proved that his mode was altogether best for the refutation of Arminianism.” Dr. Whedon says that while Dr. Taylor “vindicated the divine government by introducing into his system the Arminian view of sin, he overthrows his own work by admitting the principle of preordination.” At all events, the enunciation of Dr. Taylor's views gave rise to a prolonged and exciting controversy, which was carried on with unusual persistency and ability between himself and his colleagues, on the one hand, and Drs. Tyler, Woods, and other prominent  Congregational divines, on the other. Dr. Taylor never admitted that his opinions were heretical, judged by the standard theologians of New England, but labored hard to prove their substantial conformity to the latter.

Defended and enforced by his intense earnestness and eloquence, and by his powerful logic, his theology has won many adherents, and so it has been claimed has silently modified, and in a true sense rationalized, the Calvinistic theology. Dr. Taylor attached much importance to the truths of natural religion, and he also laid much stress upon true theories of mind. A correct mental philosophy he deemed fundamental, and elaborated with much care a system of his own. With Dwight and Edwards, he held that all motives find their ultimate ground of appeal ill the desire of personal happiness, and that the idea of right in its last analysis is resolved into a tendency to the highest happiness. As a teacher, Dr. Taylor won the admiration and affection of his pupils, near seven hundred being under his training, and inspired them with enthusiasm and pleasure in the pursuit of their studies. In his social and domestic relations, he was peculiarly attractive and lovely, and peculiarly beloved. As an author, Dr. Taylor is known principally by posthumous works. His controversial articles were contributed principally to the Monthly and Quarterly Christian Spectator and to the Spirit of the Pilgrims. Since his death there have appeared the following, edited by Noah Porter, D.D. Practical Sermons (N. Y. 1858, 8vo): — Lectures on the Moral Government of God (ibid. 1859, 2 vols. 8vo), his greatest and most celebrated performance: — Essays, Lectures, etc., upon Select Topics in Revealed Theology (ibid. 1859, 8vo). See the Congregational Quarterly, 1860, p. 245 sq. (by Dr. Dutton); Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Appleton's Cyclopaedia, s.v.; also the Christ. Quar. Spec. vols. 2, 4:5; Spirit of the Pilgrims, vols. 5, 6; New- Englander, Nov. 1859 (by Prof. Martin); Amer. Theol. Rev. 1859, p. 391 sq. (by Dr. Pond); Meth. Quar. Rev. 1859, p. 317, 667; 1860, p. 146, 656- 669 (by Dr. Whedon); Memorial of Nathaniel W. Taylor, D.D. (New Haven, 1858, 8vo), comprising sermons by Drs. Bacon, Dutton, and Fisher. SEE THEOLOGY; SEE TYLER, BENNET.

## Taylor, Oliver Alden[[@Headword:Taylor, Oliver Alden]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Yarmouth, Mass., Aug. 18, 1801. He graduated at Union College, 1825; entered the ministry November, 1828; and, spending the next eleven years in study and teaching, he became pastor at Manchester Sept. 18, 1839, and died Dec. 18, 1851. He published, Catalogue of the Andover Theological Seminars (1838): Piety  in Humble Life (1844, by the Mass. S. S. Society): — and numerous articles, original and translated, and some poems, in various periodicals. A memoir of his life by Rev. T. A. Taylor, his brother, was published in 1853, a second edition of which appeared in 1856. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 2, 725.

## Taylor, Richard Cowling[[@Headword:Taylor, Richard Cowling]]

             an eminent English antiquary, was born at Hinton, Suffolk, Jan. 18, 1789, and emigrated to the United States in July, 1830, settling in Philadelphia. He was a surveyor and geologist, and was greatly useful in developing the mineral resources of various parts of the country. He died Oct. 26, 1851. In addition to scientific works, he published Index Anasticus, or the Abbeys and other Monasteries, Alien Priories, Friaries, Colleges, Collegiate Churches, hospitals, etc., in the City of Norwich (Lond. 1821, fol.). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Taylor, Rowland, LL.D[[@Headword:Taylor, Rowland, LL.D]]

             an English clergyman and martyr, is supposed to have been a Yorkshireman; and after being educated at Cambridge, became the head of Border Hostle, near Caius College. He was presented by archbishop Cranmer to the rectory of Hadleigh, where lie attended faithfully to the spiritual needs of his parishioners. In 1553 he was summoned before Gardiner for resisting the popish mass at Hadleigh. He defended his cause with firmness, but was committed to the King's Bench Prison, where he remained till Jan. 22,1555, when he was sentenced to be burned. The execution took place Feb. 8,1555, on Aldham Common, near Hadleigh. See Fox, Book of Martyrs; Hook, Eccl. Biog. s.v.

## Taylor, Samuel[[@Headword:Taylor, Samuel]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Nova Scotia, Sept. 14, 1795; graduated at the Princeton Theological Seminary in 1825; was licensed to preach the same year, and shortly after was ordained and installed pastor of the Millersburg and Stoner Mouth churches of Bourbon Count', Ky. In 1831 became pastor of the Nicholasville and Cedar Creek churches, Ky.; in 1836, at Frankfort, Ind.; in 1845, Waveland, Ind.; in 1852, Washington, Ind.; in 1854,Waco, Texas. He died June 9,1855. Mr. Taylor was a close  student and a man of literary tastes. As a theologian he was acute, prolific, and systematic. He was for a number of years an active member of the- Board of Trustees. of Hanover College, Ind., and of the New Albany Theological Seminary, Ind. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 206.

## Taylor, Stephen, D.D[[@Headword:Taylor, Stephen, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Tyringham, Berkshire Co., Mass., Feb. 26, i796. He pursued. his preparatory studies at Lenox Academy; graduated at Williams College, with the highest honor, in 1816; was preceptor of the academy at Westfield, Mass., for one year, and tutor in Williams College 1817-19; studied theology in Andover Theological Seminary, and afterwards privately; was licensed to preach in 1824. and shortly after was ordained pastor of a church in Halifax Co., Va. In 1826 he became pastor of the Shockoe Hill Church, Richmond. Va.; in 1835 was appointed professor of ecclesiastical history in the Union Theological Seminary in Prince Edward Co.; in 1838 resigned, and shortly after became pastor of a church in Abingdon, Va.; in 1843, of the High Street Church in Petersburg, Va.; in 1847 returned to Richmond, and engaged in teaching; in 1850 became pastor of the Duval Street Church, Richmond, and continued in charge of it until his death, March 4, 1853. Mr. Taylor was an instructive preacher, an excellent pastor, and a learned tutor. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 4:673.

## Taylor, Thomas (1)[[@Headword:Taylor, Thomas (1)]]

             a learned Puritan divine, was born at Richmond, Yorkshire, in 1576; and was educated at Christ's College, Cambridge, of which he became fellow, and afterwards Hebrew lecturer. On leaving the university, he settled first at Watford, Hertfordshire; then at Reading, Berkshire; and in 1625 he obtained the living of St. Mary Aldermanbury, London, which he retained during the remainder of his life. He died early in 1632. His contemporaries unite in giving him a high character for learning, piety, and usefulness. Among his works are, Commentary on the Epistle of St. Paul written to Titus (Camb. 1612, 4to; 1616, 1619, best ed. 1658, fol.): — Treatise of Christian Religion (1616, 4too): — Exposition upon Parable of the Sowe, etc. (Lond. 1621, 4to; 1631, 1634): — Christ's Victory over the Dragon (1633, 4to): — Christ Revealed, or the Old Testament Explained, etc.  (1635, sm. 4to). Other works, with Life, appeared (Lond. 1653, fol.). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Taylor, Thomas (2)[[@Headword:Taylor, Thomas (2)]]

             “the Platonist,” was born in London, May 15,1758. He studied for three years at St. Paul's school, with the design of becoming a Dissenting minister, but afterwards entered Lubbock's banking house. Later he received the appointment of assistant secretary to the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures, and Commerce, which post he held several years. During the last forty years of his life he resided at Walworth (partially supported by an income of £100 from his friend W. Meredith). He died Nov. 1,1835. His works comprise sixty-three volumes, of which twenty-three are large quartos. Besides treatises on arithmetic and geometry, and a few minor essays, etc., his principal work was the translation of Plato, Aristotle, and other Greek and: Latin authors. The Works of Plato, viz. — his Fifty-five Dialogues and Twelve Epistles; Nine of the Dialogues by the late Floyer Sydenham, and the Remainder by Thomas Taylor, etc. (1304, 5 vols. 4to), was printed at the expense of the duke of Norfolk, who locked up nearly the whole edition in his house, where it remained till 1848, when it was sold. Of his translation of Aristotle (1806-12,10 vols. 4to) only fifty complete copies were struck off, the expense being defrayed by W. Meredith. His latest works were translations of Proclus, O Providence and Evil (1833, 8vo; 1841, 8vo); and Plotinus, On Suicide (1834, 8vo). His translations have been commended by some, but by others very severely criticized. For full catalogue of Taylor's works, see Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Taylor, Thomas House, D.D[[@Headword:Taylor, Thomas House, D.D]]

             a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born of English parents in Georgetown. S.C. Oct. 18, 1799. His early education was acquired at Guilford, Conn.; he graduated from South Carolina College, Columbia, as valedictorian of his class; studied theology under bishop White; was ordained deacon in 1821, and priest in 1826. For nine years he was rector of St. John's Church, Colleton, John's Island, S. C. In April, 1834, he became rector of Grace Church, New York city, where he remained until the close of his life. He died at West Park, on the Hudson, Sept. 9, 1867. Dr. Taylor was a fine scholar, a man of marked character, and retained the respect and affection of his people. He held several  positions of honor and trust. See American Quar. Church Rev. Jan. 1868, p. 665.

## Taylor, Timothy[[@Headword:Taylor, Timothy]]

             an English clergyman, was born at Hempstead, Hertfordshire, in 1609, and entered Queen's College, Oxford, in 1626. He became vicar of Almeley, Hertfordshire; subsequently a Presbyterian, and then an Independent. In 1668 he removed to Dublin, and became assistant to Samuel Mather, and afterwards to Nathaniel Mather, and died there in 1681. He wrote Defense of Sundry Positions and Scriptures alleged to Justify the Congregational Wy. (Lond. 2 pts. 4to: pt. 1, 1645; pt. 2, 1646). They were answered by Richard Hollingsworth in his Certain Queries (1646, 4to). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Taylor, Timothy Alden[[@Headword:Taylor, Timothy Alden]]

             a Congregational minister and author, was born at Hawley, Mass., Sept. 7, 1809. He graduated at Amherst College in 1835, and at the Andover Theological Seminary in 1838. He was ordained at Slatersville, R. I., 1839, where he preached until his death-cut off suddenly in the midst of his: usefulness, March 2,1858. Mr. Taylor was honest and unflinching in his attachment to his principles, earnest and faithful. He was a diligent student, and wrote much for the periodical press. He also published a Memoir of his brother, Rev. Oliver Alden Taylor (Boston, 12mo, 1853; 2d ed. 1856): — The Solace (32mo): — The Two Mothers (32mo): — Zion (32mo): — Zion's Pathway (12mo): — Bible View of the Death Penalty (8vo). . See Cong. Quarterly, 1859, p. 96; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Taylor, Veron D[[@Headword:Taylor, Veron D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Hinesburg, Vt., in ‘1798; received an academical education; studied theology privately; was licensed by the Addison Congregational Association, Vt., and ordained by a Congregational council in 1826. His fields of labor were as follows: Elizabeth town, N.Y.; Litchfield, South Farms, Conn.; Amenia, N. Y.; Galesburg, Mich.; Huntsburg and Dover, Ohio; and was Seaman's chaplain at Buffalo, N. Y., and Cleveland, Ohio. He died Sept. 6, 1864. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 228.

## Taylor, William Cooke, LL.D[[@Headword:Taylor, William Cooke, LL.D]]

             an Irish author, was born at Youghal in 1800, and was educated at Trinity College, Dublin. He went to London in 1829, where he remained until 1847, when he returned to Ireland, to serve the vice regal household in the capacity of statistician. He died in Dublin, Sept. 12,1849. In addition to many works on secular subjects, he wrote, Catechism of the Christian Religion (Lond. 1828, 12mo): — History of Mohammedanism and its Sects (1834, 12mo): — History of Popery (new ed. 1837,-8vo): — Illustrations of the Bible and Confirmations of Sacred History from the Monuments of Egypt (1838, 12mo): — History of Christianity from its Promulgation to its Legal Establishment in the Roman Empire (1844, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Taytazak[[@Headword:Taytazak]]

             SEE TAITAZAK.

## Tcheremissian Version[[@Headword:Tcheremissian Version]]

             SEE RUSSIA, VERSIONS OF.

## Tchu-chor[[@Headword:Tchu-chor]]

             the prayer-mill used by the Buddhist priests in Chinese Tartary. It is constructed in two forms.

(1.) One is a small wheel with flies, which move either by wind or water. On these flies are written prayers, and it is supposed that all the merit of their recitation is conferred upon him that sets the wheel in motion.

(2.) The other is a huge egg-shaped barrel, as large as a hogshead, upon an upright spindle, composed of endless sheets of paper pasted one over the other, and on each sheet is written a different prayer. At the bottom of this pasteboard barrel is a cord, which gives to it a rotary motion. The- lamas make this spin rapidly, and thus acquire the merit of the repetition of all the prayers written on all the papers at every rotation of the barrel. The lamas spend much of their time in plying the tchu-chor by way of interceding for the people. In return they receive from each person a small compensation for their trouble.

## Tchuwaschian Version[[@Headword:Tchuwaschian Version]]

             SEE RUSSIA, VERSIONS OF.

## Te Deum Laudamus[[@Headword:Te Deum Laudamus]]

             (i.e. “We praise thee, 0 God”). This hymn, which is written in honorem Sanctissinim Trinitatis, commonly called Hymnus SS. Ambrosii et A ugeusfini, and known as the Ambrosian Hymn, is erroneously ascribed to Ambrose. In a manuscript chronicle preserved at Milan, and erroneously ascribed to Decius (d. 553), bishop of Milan, we are told that at the baptism of Augustine, which Ambrose performed in the year 387, both the Baptist and the candidate spontaneously, as if inspired by the Holy Ghost, intoned this hymn. This tradition would seem to have been corroborated by a passage of a spurious (the 92d) sermon of Ambrose which treats of the baptism of Augustine. But, in truth, the tradition owes its origin to this passage. Augustine himself, who speaks, in his Confessions, of his conversion and baptism, does not mention anything of the kind. Some have  ascribed this hymn to Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria; others to Nicetius, about' the year 535; and a third class to Hilary of Poitiers. The whole tenor of this hymn proves its Eastern origin, and at a very early time. Indeed, the Codex Alexandrinus contains a morning hymn commencing Καθ᾿ ἑκάστην ἡμέραν εὐλογήσω σε καὶ αἰνήσω τὸ ὄνομά σου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα; and this circumstance, together with the fact of its great resemblance with the Te Deum, induced Daniel (Thesaur. Hymnol. 2, 289 sq.) to say, “The Te Deum is based upon an ancient Greek hymn which, extensively known in the East, has found many translators, which fact not only accounts for the variety-of readings, but also for the various authors to whom it is ascribed. Of these versions, the one which Ambrose made for' the service of the Milan Church met with the most approval and was finally adopted, and this explains why it was commonly called the Ambrosian Hymn.”

Even before the time of Charlemagne, this hymn was sung on special occasions in both churches of the East. The Roman Breviary uses it as one of the morning hymns to be sung throughout the year, with the exception of the Sundays in Advent, Lent, and the Feast of the Holy Innocents. Long before the Reformation, it was known in a German translation. In 1533 it was translated by Luther, “Herr Gött, dich loben wir,” and since that time it has been translated into German and English by different authors. We subjoin a few lines of the original:

“Te Deum landamus, te Dominum confitemur. Te seternum Patrem omnis terra veneratur. Tibi omnes angeli, tibi caeli et universae potestates, Tibi Chertubim et Seraphim incessabili voce proclamant: Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus Dominus Deus Sabaoth. Plenli Sunt celi et terra majestatis glorise tuae.” This beautiful and inspiring composition is read or chanted at the morning service of the Church of England after the reading of the first lesson. The rubric enjoins that it shall be said or sung daily throughout the year in the vernacular language. The ancient offices of the English Church gave this hymn the title of the “Psalm Te Deum” or the “Song of Ambrose and Augustine” indifferently. As used it may be considered as a responsory psalm, since it follows a lesson; and here the practice of the Church of England resembles that directed by the Council of Laodicea, which decreed that the psalms and lessons should be read alternately. The hymn consists of three equal parts-praise, confession of belief, and supplication. See Rambach, Anthologie christlichen Gesänge, 1, 87 sq.; Bassler, Auswahl altchristlicher Lieder, p. 44 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 1, 275 sq. (2d ed. p. 328 sq.); Tentzel, Exercitationes X de hymno Te Deun Laudamus (Lips.  1692); Bingham, Christ. Antiq. bk. 14:ch. 11:§ 9; and the monographs cited by Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 134. (B. P.)

## Te Igitur[[@Headword:Te Igitur]]

             (i.e. “Thee therefore”), the first two words of the canon of the Latin mass. This part of the eucharistic service is said to have been drawn up under the direction of Gregory the Great, though portions of it are doubtless of much earlier date. It was also called Obsecratio. This service, as distinct from the missal, was used, and is still used, by bishops, prelates, and other dignitaries; and as the canon is the most sacred part of the service, oaths upon the Te Igitur were regarded as especially solemn. The Te Igitur appears to have been used in the ordeal of compurgation.

## Teach[[@Headword:Teach]]

             (Heb. prop. לָמִל, but also many other words; Gr. prop. διδάσκω, but often other terms). Teaching is an important branch of the commission which Christ gave to his apostles before he left the earth. “Go,” said he, “teach all nations,” or, as we have it recorded by another of the evangelists, “Preach the Gospel to every creature.” In this way they were to make disciples, as the word μαθητεύσατε imports. It is one of the precious  promises of the new covenant that all its subjects shall be “taught of the Lord” (Isa 54:13). The Lord Jesus quoted these words in the days of his public ministry (Joh 6:45), and describes the effect of this teaching thus: “Every man, therefore, that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me,” which he afterwards explains to mean neither more nor less than believing on him. SEE PREACHING.

Teachers, or “doctors” (v.r.), are mentioned among divine gifts in Eph 4:11, and it is possible that the apostle does not mean such ordinary teachers (or pastors) as the Church now enjoys; but as he seems to reckon them among the extraordinary donations of' God, and uses no mark of distinction or separation between apostles, with which he begins, and doctors, with which he ends, it may be that he refers to the nature of the office of the Jewish doctors; meaning well-informed persons, to whom inquiring Christian converts might have recourse for removing their doubts and difficulties concerning Christian observances, the sacraments, and other rituals, and for receiving from Scripture the demonstration' that “this is the very Christ;” and that the things relating to the Messiah were accomplished in Jesus. Such a gift could not but be very serviceable in that infant state of the Church, which, indeed, without it, would have seemed, in this particular, inferior to the Jewish institutions. With this agrees the distinction (Rom 12:7) between doctors (teaching, διδάσκων) and exhorters, q. d. “he who gives advice privately, and resolves doubts, etc., let him attend to that duty; he who exhorts with a loud voice (παρακαλῶν), let him exhort” with proper piety. The same appears in 1Co 12:28, where the apostle ranges, 1st, apostles, public instructors; 2d, prophets, occasional instructors; 3d (διδάσκαλοι), doctors or teachers, private instructors. SEE GIFTS.

For monographs on our Lord as the Great Teacher, see Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 130 sq. SEE JESUS CHRIST.

## Teaching of the Twelve Apostles[[@Headword:Teaching of the Twelve Apostles]]

             is the title of a newly discovered writing belonging to the Patristic period. In the year 1883 Philoletheos Bryennios, metropolitan of Nicomedia, published. from the Jerusalem manuscript of the year 1056, and preserved at Constantinople, a hitherto unknown writing, bearing two titles, Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων and Διδαχὴ κυρίου διὰ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. An edition with critical emendations was published in 1884 by Hilgenfeld, in his Novum Testamentum Extra Canonem Receptun (Leipsic, 1884, 4:94-103), and from that time the republic of letters has been kept alive by translations, essays, etc.

I. Contents. — The "Teaching" comprises sixteen chapters, and may be divided into four parts: chapter 1-6, comprising the doctrinal and catechetical part, setting forth the whole duty of the Christian; chapter 7-10 and 14 contains the liturgical and devotional part, giving directions for Christian worship; chapter 11-13 and 14 contains the ecclesiastical and disciplinary part, concerning church officers, and chapter 16 the eschatological part, or the Christian's hope.

II. Theology of the Teaching. — God is the Creator (1:2), who made all things (10:3), and. is our Father in heaven (8:2). Nothing can happen without him (3:10); he is the giver of all good gifts, the author of our salvation, the object of prayer and praise (9 and 10), to whom belongs all glory through Christ Jesus (8:2; 9:4; 10:4). Christ is the Lord and Savior (10:2, 3), God's servant and God's son (9:2), and David's God (10:6), the author of the gospel (8:2; 15:4). He is spiritually present in his Church, and will visibly come again to judgment (16:l, 7, 8). Through him knowledge and eternal life have been made known to us (9:3; 10:2). The Holy Spirit is associated with the Father and the Son (7:1, 3); he prepares man for the call of God: (4:10), speaks through the prophets, and the sin against the Spirit shall not be forgiven (11:7).

The Teaching speaks of the Lord's Day as a day to be kept holy (14:1), and recognises only two sacraments, Baptism and the Eucharist (7:1-4; 9:10, 14).

Man is made in the image of God (5:2) but sinful, and needs forgiveness (8:2); he must confess his transgressions to receive pardon (4:14; 14:1, 2). There are only two ways, the way of life and the way of death.

III. Language of the Teaching. — The "Didache" is written in Hellenistic Greek, like the New Test. It is the common Macedonian or Alexandrian dialect, with "a strong infusion of a Hebrew soul and a Christian spirit." The "Didache" contains 2190 words, 504 are New Test. words, 497 are classical, and 479 occur in the Septuagint, 15 occur for the first time in the "Didache," but are found in later writers.

IV. Authenticity of the Teaching. — It is first quoted by Clement of Alexandria (Stromata, 1:20), who cites a passage from it as "Scripture." Eusebius (died A.D. 340) mentions it as "the so-called Teachings of the Apostles" (Hist. Eccl. 3:25), and so does Athanasius (died A.D. 373) (Epist. Fest. 39, in Opera, ed. Bened. 1:2, 963). The last mention of the "Teaching " is by Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople (died A.D. 828), who speaks of such a book as among the Apocrypha of the New Test.

V. Date, Place, and Authorship. — The most prevailing view as to the time when the Teaching was composed is between A.D. 80 and 120; but this date seems to us rather early. The majority of scholars assign the Teaching to Alexandria in Egypt, a minority to Palestine or Syria. Who the  author of the Teaching was is not known. From the work itself, it may safely be stated that he was a Jewish Christian.

VI. Scripture Quotations and Allusions in the Didache. — The author of the Teaching quotes not only the Old and New Tests., but also the Apocrypha of the Old Test., as the following table will exhibit:

1. QUOTATIONS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Zec 14:5Teaching 16:7.Mal 1:11; Mal 1:1414:3. 2. ALLUSIONS TO THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Exo 18:20; Deu 31:291:1.20:13-17; 5:17-22. Num 18:12-13; Num 18:15; Num 18:30 Deu 18:3-4 Ezekiel 45:303. Neh 10:35-37Deu 12:324:13.Job 4:104:6.Isa 66:2; Isa 66:53:8.Jer 21:81:1.Dan 4:274:6. 3. QUOTATIONS FROM, AND ALLUSIONS TO, THE OLD TESTAMENT

Apocrypha. Tob 4:74:6-8.151:2.Sir 2:43:10.4:54:8.314:5. 4. QUOTATIONS AND REMINISCENCES FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT

Mat 5:53:7.23, 2414:2.25, 261:539-41 (Luk 6:29-304.

44-46 (Luk 6:271:3.Mat 6:58:2.Mat 1:515:4.9-138:2.168:1.Mat 7:69:5.121:2.Mat 10:9-10 (comp. Luk 9:1-6; Luk 10:4-7)13:1, 2.Mat 12:311:7.Mat 18:15; Mat 18:1715:3.Mat 11:910:6.Mat 22:37-391:2.Mat 24:10-1416:4, 5.30, 316, 8.31, 351.42, 4410:5. 15:34Mat 28:19-207:1.Luk 6:27-301:3, 4, 5.Luk 12:3516:1. 5. ALLUSIONS AND PARALLELS TO THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Act 4:324:8.Rom 15:271Co 15:526:6" 16:22 (Maranatha)10:6.Eph 6:5; Eph 6:94:10, 11.1Th 4:16-1716:4-8." 5:222:1.2Th 2:8-1016:4.Heb 10:22 (συνέιδησις πουηρά)14:1.Heb 13:715:1.1Pe 2:111:4.Rev 1:810:2.1014:1.Rev 22:155:2. The absence of any reference to so many books of the New Test. accords with the view that we have before us a very early document; but it does not, of course, prove that the sacred writings were unknown to the writer, and still less does it furnish any argument for the view that they were not then known to the Church in general. The object of the writer was very limited; his intention was to furnish a manual or catechism for catechumens.

VII. Literature. — Although so recently discovered, this little tract has already been the subject of very numerous essays and expositions. In addition to the treatise mentioned above and De Romestin, Teaching of the Twelve Apostles (Lond. 1884, 8vo), the most complete and exhaustive work, giving, besides the original text, an English translation and literary matter, is the one published by Ph. Schaff, The Oldest Church Manual, called "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" (New York, 1885). (B.P.)

## Tears[[@Headword:Tears]]

             (דַּמְעָה, δάκρυα) are the well-known emblem and usual accompaniment of grief; and as grief is generally most violent when it is indulged for the dead, so in the two following passages the wiping away of tears is connected with the abolition of death: Isa 25:8, “And the Lord Jehovah shall wipe away the tear from off all faces;” Rev 7:17, “And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes.” Tears are wont to be  poured out on occasions of mortality: thus in Jer 31:15, “A voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation and bitter weeping, Rachel weeping for her children refused to be comforted for her children, because they were not;” again in Jer 22:10, “Weep ye not for the dead, neither bemoan him, but weep sore for him that goeth away, for he shall return no more, nor see his native country.” Tears are sometimes shed for national calamities: thus in Lam 1:2, “She weepeth sore in the night, and her tears are on her cheeks;” again in Num 14:1, “And all the congregation lifted up their voice ‘and cried, and the people wept that night.” In Gen 21:15-16, Hagar's pitiable case is thus described, “And the water was spent in the bottle, and she cast the child under one of the shrubs. And she went and sat her down over against him a good way off, as it were a bow- shot; for she said, Let me not see the death of the child. And she sat over against him, and lifted up her voice and wept.” Tears are often the symbol of divine judgments, as they are sometimes also of human oppressions. (See Ecc 4:1; Act 20:19; Jer 14:17.) They are sometimes the fruit of repentance and contrition. (See Heb 12:7 : Mat 26:15.) But commonly they are the result of natural affection deploring a beloved object, of which the examples are too obvious and numerous to cite. But whatever the causes of tears to the righteous, all these shall be abolished, which is what is meant by “God's wiping away all tears from their eyes.” For death, oppression, calamity, repentance, shall have no place in the heavenly region. Weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning. Those who sow in tears shall reap in joy. SEE GRIEF.

For the valley of tears (Psa 84:6), SEE BACA. For monographs on the tears of Christ over Jerusalem (Luk 19:41), see Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 53. Comp. Kiesling, De Lacrimis Vatum (Lips. 1747). SEE JESUS CHRIST. The so-called lachrymatories, or “tear-bottles,” supposed by some to have been used for collecting the tears of the mourners at the graves of the ancients (Thomson, Land and Book, i, 147), were rather vessels for perfumery or flowers (see the Penny Cyclop. s.v.).

## Teashur[[@Headword:Teashur]]

             SEE BOX-TREE.

## Tebah[[@Headword:Tebah]]

             (Heb. Te'bach, טֵבִח, slaughter, as often; Sept. Ταβέκ; Josephus, Ταβαῖος, Ant. 1, 6, 5; Vulg. tebee), the oldest of the four sons of Nahor by his concubine Reumah (Gen 22:24). B.C. cir. 2050.

## Tebaliah[[@Headword:Tebaliah]]

             (Heb. only in the prolonged form Tebacya'hu, טְבִלְיָהוּ, purified [Fürst, protected] by Jehovah; Sept. Ταβελίας v.r. Ταβλαϊv; Vulg. Tabelias), third of the four sons of Hosah “of the children of Merari” (1Ch 26:11). B.C. 1014.

## Tebeth[[@Headword:Tebeth]]

             (Heb. Tebeth', טֵבֵת, apparently of Assyrian origin, Tibituo), the tenth month (Est 2:16) of the sacred year of the Hebrews, corresponding in the main to January. Jerome has the following comment upon Eze 29:1 : “Decimus mensis, qui Hebrseis appellatur Tebeth, et apud Egyptios [with whom it was the fifth month] Τύβι [or Τωβί, Coptic Tobi]; apud Romanos. Januarius.” In Arabic it is called Tubah, in Greek Τυβί or Τήβ, and in Sanskrit Tapas. SEE CALENDAR, JEWISH.

## Tebul Yom[[@Headword:Tebul Yom]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Teen[[@Headword:Teen]]

             (Chinese, heaven), a word generally used by the early Roman Catholic missionaries to denote the Supreme Being; but, to render it more evidently descriptive of a person, the Inquisition ordered the addition to it of the word Choo, “Lord?” Thus Teen-Choo meant “Lord of heaven,” and came to be the recognized appellative of God by Romish converts. The Protestant missionaries rejected Teen, and substituted Shin or Shang-te.

## Teenah[[@Headword:Teenah]]

             SEE FIG.

## Tefft, Benjamin Franklin, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Tefft, Benjamin Franklin, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal divine, was born near Utica, N.Y., August 20, 1813. He graduated from Wesleyan University, Connecticut, in 1835, became successively teacher and preacher in New England until 1843, thereafter professor in Indiana Asbury University, in 1846 editor of The Ladies' Repository, from 1852 to 1862 teacher and pastor in New York and Maine, from 1862 to 1865 engaged in United States commissions abroad and at home, in 1866 pastor at Portland, Maine, in 1873 editor of the Northern Border, having assumed the position of a local preacher, and died at Bangor, Maine, September 17, 1885. He published several works, the latest of which was an elaborate volume on Evolution. See Alumni Record of Wesleyan University, 1883, pages 9, 645.

## Tehaphnehes[[@Headword:Tehaphnehes]]

             (Eze 30:18). SEE TAHPANHES.

## Tehinnah[[@Headword:Tehinnah]]

             (Heb. Techinnah', תְּחַנָּה, supplication, as often; Sept. Θανά v.r. Θαιμάν; Vulg. Tehinna), a name occurring in the obscure list of the descendants of Judah (1Ch 4:12) as the last-named of the three sons of Eshton (q.v.), and grandson of Chelub (q.v.); with the added epithet “the father of the city of Nahash” (Abi-Ir-Nachash), and the statement “These are the men of Rechah” (q.v.). From all this, we can only gather that Tehinnah was probably related to the family of David. B.C. cir. 1083. SEE NAHASH.

## Tehoroth[[@Headword:Tehoroth]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Teil-tree[[@Headword:Teil-tree]]

             is properly the linden-tree, or Tilia Europcaus of botanists. It is mentioned in the A. V., in Isa 6:13, “as a teil tree, and as an oak;” but as in the Hebrew the word is אֵלָה, elâh, usually rendered “oak,” by many supposed to be the terebinth, or “turpentine-tree,” there is no reason for giving it a different signification in this from what it has in other passages. SEE OAK.

## Teind[[@Headword:Teind]]

             the name given in the law of Scotland to TITHES SEE TITHES (q.v.).

## Tekel[[@Headword:Tekel]]

             (Chald. Tekel', תְּקֵל, weighed, as immediately explained in the context; Sept. θεκέλ; Vulg. thecel), the second of the ominous words in the sentence of the Babylonian king (Daniel 5, 25,27). SEE MENE.

## Tekeleth[[@Headword:Tekeleth]]

             SEE BLUE.

## Tekke Turcoman Version[[@Headword:Tekke Turcoman Version]]

             SEE JAGHATAI TURKI VERSION.

## Tekoa[[@Headword:Tekoa]]

             (Heb. id. תְּקוֹע[once with h directive, תְּקוֹעָה, 2Sa 14:2], a stockade; Sept. Θεχωέ and Θεχουέ, Josephus Θεκωά and Θεκωέ; Vulg. Thecue; A.V. “Tekoah” in 2 Samuel 14), a town in the tribe of Judah (2Ch 11:6, as the associated places show; and inserted in its place in Jos 15:59-60 in the Sept. [see Keil, ad loca.]), on the range of hills which rise near Hebron, and stretch eastward towards the Dead Sea. These hills bound the view of the spectator as he looks to the south from the summit of the Mount of Olives. Jerome (in. Amos, Poem.) says that Tekoa was six Roman miles from Bethlehem, and that as he wrote (in Jer 6:1) he had that village daily before his eyes (“Thekoam quotidie oculis cernimus”). In his Onomasticon (s.v. Ecthei, Ε᾿κθευκέ) he represents Tekoa as nine miles only from Jerusalem; but elsewhere he agrees with Eusebius in making the distance twelve miles. In the latter case he reckons by the way of Bethlehem, the usual course in going from the  one place to the other; but there may have been also another and shorter way, to which he has reference in the other computation. Some suggest (Bachiene,Paldstina, 2, 60); that an error may have crept into Jerome's text, and that we should read twelve there instead of nine. In 2Ch 20:20 (see also 1Ma 9:33) mention is made of “the wilderness of Tekoa,” which must be understood of the adjacent region on the east of the town (see infra), which in its physical character answers so entirely to that designation. It is evident from the name (derived from

תָּקִע, to strike,” said of driving the stakes or pins into the ground for securing the tent), as well as from the manifest adaptation of the region to pastoral pursuits, that the people' who lived here must have been occupied mainly as shepherds, and that Tekoa in its best days could have been little more than a cluster of tents, to which the men returned at intervals from the neighboring pastures, and in which their families dwelt during their absence.

The Biblical interest of Tekoa arises, not so much from any events which are related as having occurred there as from its connection with various persons who are mentioned in Scripture. It is not enumerated in the Hebrew catalogue of towns in Judah (Jos 15:49), but is inserted in that passage by the Sept. The “wise woman” whom Joab employed to effect a reconciliation between David and Absalom was obtained from this place (2Sa 14:2). Here, also, Ira, the son of Ikikesh, one of David's thirty “mighty men” (גַּבֹּרַים), was born, and was called on that account “the Tekoite” (2Sa 23:26). It was one of the places which Rehoboam fortified, at the beginning of his reign, as a defense against invasion from the south (2Ch 11:6). Some of the people from Tekoa took part in building the walls of Jerusalem after' the return from the Capitivity (Neh 3:5; Neh 3:27). In Jer 6:1, the prophet exclaims, “Blow the trumpet in Tekoa and set up a sign of fire in Beth- haccerem” — the latter probably the “Frank Mountain,” the cone-shaped hill so conspicuous from Bethlehem. It is the sound of the trumpet as a warning of the approach of enemies, and a signal-fire kindled at night for the same purpose, which are described here as so appropriately heard and seen, in the hour of danger, among the mountains of Judah. But Tekoa is chiefly memorable as the birthplace of the prophet Amos, who was here called by a special voice from heaven to leave his occupation as “a herdman” and “a puncturer of wild figs,” and was sent forth thence to testify against the sins of the kingdom of. Israel (Amo 7:14).  Accustomed to such pursuits, he must have been familiar with the solitude of the desert, and with the dangers there incident to a shepherd's life. Some effect of his peculiar training amid such scenes may be traced, as critics think (De Wette, Einl. ins Alte Test. p. 356), in the contents and style of his prophecy. Jerome (ad Amos 1, 2) says, “…etiam Amos prophetam qui pastor de pastoribus fuit et pastor non in locis cultis et arboribus ac vineis consitis, ant certe inter sylvas et prata virentia, sed in lata eremi vastitate, in qua versatur leonum feritas et interfectio pecorum, artis suce usum esse sernzonibus.” Comp. Amo 2:13; Amo 4:1; Amo 6:12; Amo 7:1; and see the striking remarks of Dr. Pusey, Introd. to Amos.

In the genealogies of Judah (1Ch 2:24; 1Ch 1:5), Ashur, a posthumous son of Hezron and a brother of Caleb, is mentioned as the father of Tekoa, which appears to mean that he was the founder of Tekoa, or at least the owner of that village. See Rediger in Gesen. Thesaur. 3, 1518.

The common people among the Tekoites displayed great activity in the repairs of the wall of Jerusalem under Nehemiah. They undertook two lengths of the rebuilding (Neh 3:5; Neh 3:27). It is, however, specially mentioned that their “lords” (אֲדֹנֵיהֶם) took no part in the work.

Tekoa is known still as Tekû'a, and, though it lies somewhat aside from the ordinary route, has been visited and described by several recent travelers. Its distance from Beit-Lahm agrees precisely with that assigned by the early writers as the distance between Tekoa and Bethlehem. It is within sight also of the Frank Mountain,” beyond question the famous Herodium, or site of Herod's Castle, which Josephus (War 4:9, 5) represents as near the ancient Tekoa. It lies on an elevated hill, which spreads itself out into an irregular plain of moderate extent. Its “high position” (Robinson, Bibl. Res. i, 486) “gives it a wide prospect. Towards the north-east the land slopes down towards Wady Khureitin; on the other sides the hill is surrounded by a belt of level table-land; beyond which are valleys, and then other higher hills. On the south, at some distance, another deep valley runs off south-east towards the Dead Sea. The view in this direction is bounded only by the level mountains of Moab, with frequent bursts of the Dead Sea, seen through openings among the rugged and desolate intervening mountains.” In the spring there are often encampments of shepherds there, consisting of tents covered with the black goatskins so commonly used for that purpose; they are supported on poles and turned up in part on one  side, so as to enable a person without to look into the interior. Flocks pasture near the tents and on the remoter hillsides in every direction. There are horses and-cattle and camels also, though these are not so numerous as the sheep and goats. A well of living water, on the outskirts of the village, is a center of great interest and activity, the women coming and going with their pitchers, and men filling the troughs to water the animals which they have driven thither for that purpose. The general aspect of the region is sterile and unattractive; though here and there are patches of verdure, and some of the fields, which have yielded an early crop, may be seen recently ploughed up, as if for some new species of cultivation. Fleecy clouds, white as the driven snow, float towards the Dead Sea, and their shadows, as they chase each other over the landscape, seem to be fit emblems of the changes in the destiny of men and nations, of which there is so much to remind one at such a time and in such a place. Various ruins exist at Tekoa, such as the walls of houses, cisterns, broken columns, and heaps of building-stones. Some of these stones have the so-called “beveled” edges which are supposed to show a Hebrew origin. There was a convent here at the beginning of the 6th century, established by St. Tabus, and a Christian settlement in the time of the Crusaders; and undoubtedly most of these remains belong to modern times rather than ancient. Among these should be mentioned a baptismal font, sculptured out of a limestone block, three feet nine inches deep, with-an internal diameter at the top of four feet, and designed evidently for baptism as administered in the Greek Church. It stands in the open air, like a similar one at Jufna, near Beitin, the ancient Bethel. See more fully in the Christian Review (N. Y.), 1853, p. 519.

Near Tekû'a, among the same mountains, on the brink of a frightful precipice, are the ruins of Khureitun, possibly a corruption of Kerioth (Jos 15:25), and in that case perhaps the birthplace of Judas the traitor, who was thence called Iscariot, i.e. “man of Kerioth.” ‘It is impossible to survey the scenery of the place and not to feel that a dark spirit would find itself in its own element amid the seclusion and wildness of such a spot. High up from the bottom of the ravine is an opening in the face of the rocks which leads into an immense subterranean labyrinth, which many suppose may have been the Cave of Adullam, in which David and his followers sought refuge from the pursuit of Saul. It is large enough to contain hundreds of men, and is capable of defense against almost any attack that could be made upon it from without, When a party of the Turks fell upon Tekû'a and sacked it, A.D. 1138, most of the inhabitants,  anticipating the danger, fled to this cavern, and thus saved their lives. It may be questioned (Robinson, 1, 481) whether this was the actual place of David's retreat; but it illustrates, at all events, that peculiar geological formation of the country which accounts for such frequent allusions to “dens and caves” in the narrations of the Bible. It is a common opinion of the natives that some of the passages of this particular excavation extend as far as to Hebron, several miles distant, and that all the cord at Jerusalem would not be sufficient to serve as clue for traversing its windings. SEE ODOLLAM.

One of the gates of Jerusalem in Christian times seems to have borne the name of Tekoa. Arculf, at any rate, mentions the “gate called Tecuitis” in his enumeration of the gates of the city (A.D. 700). It appears to have led down into the valley of the Kedron, probably near the southern eind of the east wall. But his description is not very clear. Possibly to this Jerome alludes in the singular expression in the Epit. Paulat (§ 12) “…revertar Jerosolymam et per Thecuam atque Amos, rutilantem montis Oliveti crucem aspiciam.” The Church of the Ascension on the summit of Olivet would be just opposite a gate in the east wall, and the “glittering cross” would be particularly conspicuous if seen from beneath its shadow. There is no more prima facie improbability in a Tekoa gate than in a Bethlehem, Jaffa, or Damascus gate, all which still exist at Jerusalem. But it is strange that the allusions to it should be so rare, and that the circumstances which made Tekoa prominent enough at that period to cause a gate to be named after it should have escaped preservation. See, in addition to the above authorities, Keland. Palaest. p. 1028; Schubert, Reisen, p. 24; Raumer, Palistina, p. 219. Turner, Tour, 2, 240; Irby and Mangles, p. 344; Tristram, Land of Israel, p. 402; Schwarz, Palest. p. 114; Thomson, Land and Book, 2. 424; Porter in Murray's Handbook, p. 251; Badeker, Palestine, p. 252.

## Tekoa (2)[[@Headword:Tekoa (2)]]

             The present Khu-bet Tekua is archeologically described in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (3:314, 368).

## Tekoite[[@Headword:Tekoite]]

             (Heb. with the art. hat-Tekoi', הִתְּקוֹעי[in 2Sa 23:26; Neh 3:27, הִתְּקֹעַי], patrial from Tekoa; Sept. ὁ Θεκωίτης and ὁ Θεωϊv v.r. Θεκωνίτες and Θεκά; Vulg. Thecuites; Thecuenus, and de Thecua), an inhabitant of Tekoa (q.v.), an epithet of Ira the son of Ikkesh, one of David's warriors (2Sa 23:26; 1Ch 11:28; 1Ch 27:9). The name survived the Captivity (Neh 3:5; Neh 3:27).

## Tel-abib[[@Headword:Tel-abib]]

             [many Tel'-abib] (Chald. Tel-Abib', תֵּלאּאָבַיב, corn-hill; Sept. Μετέωρος; Vulg. Ad acerum novarum frugum), was probably a city of Chaldsea or Babylonia (Ezra 3:15), not of Upper Mesopotamia, as generally imagined (Calmet, ad loc.; Winer. ad loc.). The whole scene of Ezekiel's preaching and visions seems to have been Chaldea proper; and the river Chebar, as already observed, SEE CHEBAR, was not the Khabbfr, but a branch of the Euphrates. Ptolemy has in this region a Thelbencane and a Thal-atha (Geog. 5, 20); but neither name can be identified with Telabib, unless we suppose a serious corruption. Thiluta and Thelsaphata of Ammian. Marc. (24, 2; 25:8) have likewise been compared; but they are equally uncertain. The element “Tel,” in Tel-abib, is undoubtedly “hill.” It is applied in modern times by the Arabs especially to the mounds or heaps which mark the site of ruined cities all over the Mesopotamian plain, an application not very remote from the Hebrew use, according to which “Tel” is “especially a heap of stones” (Gesenius, ad loc.). It thus forms the first syllable in many modern as in many ancient names throughout Babylonia, Assyria, and Syria (see Assemani, Bibl. Orient. III, 2, 784).

## Tel-haresha[[@Headword:Tel-haresha]]

             (Neh 7:61). SEE TEL-HARSA.

## Tel-harsa[[@Headword:Tel-harsa]]

             (Heb. [for Chald.] Tel-charsha', חִרַשָׁא תֵּלאּ, hill of the artificer [ Gesenius, of the wood; Fürst, of the Magus],; Sept. Θελαρησά v.r. Θελαρσά; Vulg. Thelharsa), one of the Babylonian towns, or villages, from which some Jews, who “could not show their father's house, nor their seed, whether they were of Israel,” returned to Judaea with Zerubbabel (Ezra 2, 59; Neh 7:61 [A.V. “Tel-haresha]). It probably was in the low country near the sea, in the neighborhood of Tel-melah and Cherub, places which are associated with it. Herzfeld's conjecture (Gesch. Isr. 1, 452) that the name is connected with the river Haran, in Susiana (Ammian. Marc. 23:p. 325, Bip.) is very precarious.

## Tel-melah[[@Headword:Tel-melah]]

             (Heb. Tel-me'lach, תֵּלאּמֵלִח, salt hill; Sept. Θελμελέχ and Θελμελέθ, v.r. Θελμεχέλ and Θερμελεθα; Vulg. Thelmala) is joined with Tel-harsa and Cherub as the name of a place where the Jews returned who had lost their pedigree after the Captivity (Ezr 2:59; Nehemiah 3:61). It is perhaps the Thelme of Ptolemy (5, 20), which some wrongly read as Theane (ΘΕΑΜΗ for ΘΕΛΜΗ), a city of the low salt tract near the Persian ‘Gulf,' whence probably the name (Gesen. Lex. Heb. s.v.). Cherub, which may be pretty surely identified with Ptolemy's Chiripha (Χιριφά), was in the same region. Herzfeld (Gesch. Tsr. 1, 452) insists that it designates the province of Melitene according to Ptolemy (6,3), adjoining Susiana west of the Tigris; but Ptolemy (5, 7, 5) and Pliny (6, 3) know only a Melitene on the border of Cappadocia and Armenia Major.

## Tela Stragula[[@Headword:Tela Stragula]]

             a term used to designate the upper covering for the holy table when not being used for the sacrifice. It is commonly called the altar protector.

## Telah[[@Headword:Telah]]

             (Heb. Te'lach, תֶּלִח, bleach [Gesenins] or vigor [Furst]; Sept. Θαλέ v.r. Θαλεές; Vulg. Thale), son of Resheph and father of Tahar, in the lineage between Ephraim and Joshua (1Ch 7:25). B.C. ante 1658.

## Telaim[[@Headword:Telaim]]

             [some Tela'im] (Heb. with the art. hat Telaim. הטְּלָאַים, the young lambs [ in Isa 40:11]; Sept. ἐν Γαλγάλοις; Vulg. quasi agnos), a place where Saul collected and numbered his forces before his campaign against the Amalekites (1Sa 15:4). It is strange that both the Sept. version and Josephus (Ant. 6:7,2) read Gilgal, which was in the valley of the Jordan, near Jericho, and certainly not a fitting place to marshal an army to war with the Amalekites, seeing it would have to march through the wild passes of the wilderness of Judah (Ewald, Gesch. 3, 50). The Targum  renders it “lambs of the Passover,” according to a curious fancy, mentioned elsewhere in the Jewish books. (Yalkut on 1Sa 15:4, etc.), that the army met at the Passover, and that the census was taken by counting the lambs. This is partly endorsed by Jerome in the Vulg. A similar fancy is found in the midrash in reference to the name Bezek (1Sa 11:8), which is taken literally as meaning “broken pieces of pottery,” whereby, as by counters, the numbering: was effected. Bezek and Telaim are considered by the Talmudists as two of the ten numberings of Israel, past' and future. It is probably identical with TELEM SEE TELEM (q.v.), the southern position of which (Jos 15:24) would be suitable for an expedition against Amalek; and a certain support is given to this by the mention of the name (Thailam or Thelam) in the Sept. of 2Sa 3:12.

## Telassar[[@Headword:Telassar]]

             (Heb. Telassar', תְּלִשָּׂר[in Isaiah], fully תְּלִאשָּׂר. [in Kings], Assyrian hill; Sept. Θαεσθέν, Θεεμάθ v.r. Θαλασσάρ, Θαιμάδ; Vulg. Thelassar, Thalassar) is mentioned in 2Ki 19:12 (A.V. “Thelassar”) and in Isa 37:12 as a city inhabited by “the children of Eden,” which had been conquered and was held in the time of Sennacherib by the Assyrians. In both passages it is connected with Gozan (Gauzanitis), Haran (Carrhae, now Harran), and Rezeph (the Razappa of the Assyrian inscriptions), all of which belong to the hill country above the Upper Mesopotamian plain, the district from which rise the Khabfr and Belik rivers. SEE GOZAN; SEE HARAN; SEE MESOPOTAMIA.

It is quite in accordance with the indications of locality which arise from this connection to find Eden joined in another passage (Eze 27:23) with Haran and Asshur. Telassar, the chief city of a tribe known as the Beni-Eden, must have been in Western Mesopotamia, in the neighborhood of Harran and Orfa. The name is one which might have been given by the Assyrians to any place where they had built a temple to Asshur, and hence perhaps its application by the Targums to' the Resen of Gen 10:12, which must have been on the Tigris, near Nineveh and Calah. SEE RESEN. Ewald (Gesch. 3, 301, Note 3) identifies it with a heap of ruins called Teleda, southwest from Racca, the Theleda of the Peut. Tab. (11, c), not far from Palmyra. It is in favor of this that in that case the places mentioned along with it in the passages cited stand in the order in which they would naturally be' attacked by a force invading the territory from the east, as would the Assyrians (Thenius,  Exeget. Hanldbuch; ad loc.). Havernick's identification (Ezekiel p. 476) with the Thalatha (Θαλαθά) of Ptolemy (5, 20, 4) would place it too far south. The Jerusalem Targum (on Gen 14:1) and the Syriac take it from Ellassar (q.v.), in the territory of Artemitia (Ptolemy, 6:176; Strabo, 16:p. 744). Layard thinks (Nineveh, 1, 257) that it may be the present Tel Afer, or perhaps Arban (Nin. and Bab. p. 283), although no name like it is found there now.

## Teleioi[[@Headword:Teleioi]]

             (τέλειοι or τελειούμενοι, the perfect), a name of early Christians, which had relation to the sacred mysteries, and denoted such as had been initiated. Baptism was denominated τελετή); to join the Church was styled ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ τέλειον, to attain to perfection; the participation of the eucharist, which followed immediately on baptism, was called τελετὴ τελετῶν, perfection of perfections; and the absolution granted in the eucharist was called τὸ τέλειον, the perfection of a Christian. The word is, however, used frequently in the New Test., not indeed in this sense, but in relation to Christian perfection.

## Teleion[[@Headword:Teleion]]

             SEE TELEIOI.

## Teleioteroi[[@Headword:Teleioteroi]]

             (τελειώτεροι, more perfect), one of the different classes of catechumens among the ancients; the perfect ones, or the proficients, who were the immediate candidates for baptism.

## Telem[[@Headword:Telem]]

             (Heb. id. טֶלֶם, oppression [Gesenius; but Fürst, place of lambs]), the name of a town and also of a man.

1. (Sept. Τελέμ v.r. Μαινάμ; Vulg. Telem.) One of the cities which are described as “the uttermost of the tribe of Judah towards the coast of Edom southward” (Jos 15:24, where it is mentioned between the southern Ziph and Bealoth). It is not again mentioned except we regard it as identical with TELAIM SEE TELAIM (q.v.) a theory which seems highly probable (Reland, Palest. p. 1029). Telem is mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome as a city of Judah, but they appear to have been ignorant of its  site (Onomast. s.v. “Talem” ). The Sept. (Vat.) in Jos 19:7 adds the name Θαλχά, between Remmon and Ether, to the towns of Simeon. This is said by Eusebius (Onomast.) and Jerome to have been then existing as a very large village called Thella, sixteen miles south of Eleutheropolis. The Sept. of 2Sa 2:12, in both MSS., exhibits a singular variation from the Hebrew text. Instead of “on the spot” (תִּחְתָּיו; A.V. incorrectly “on his behalf”), they read “to Thailam (or Thelam) where he was.” If this variation should be substantiated, there is some probability that Telem or Telaim is intended. David was at the time king, and quartered in Hebron, but there is no reason to suppose that he had relinquished his marauding habits; and the south country, where Telem lay, had formerly been a favorite field for his expeditions (1Sa 27:8-11). The opinion of Wilton that a trace of the ancient Telem is found in the Arab tribe Dhulldm, which gives its name to a district lying south-east of Beersheba, is not altogether improbable, especially as the Arabic and Hebrew words are cognate (The Negeb, p. 87; comp. Robinson, Bibl. Res. 2, 102). Rabbi Schwarz (Palest. p. 100) thinks Telem was different from Telaim, and he states that there is still “a district south of Madura called Tulam,” doubtless referring to the above Dhullam. He also cites a reference from the Midrash (Koheleth, 5, 10) to a certain Menahem Talmia, as if a resident of Telem. If a more precise-location of the town be sought, it may perhaps be found in the “small site with foundations, called Sudeid,” mentioned by Dr. Robinson as lying in the above region (Bibl. Res. 1, 102), six miles south-east of Tel Arad. SEE TOCHEN.

2. (Sept. Τελλήμ v.r. Τελήμ and Τελμήν; Vulg. Telem). One of the Temple porters who renounced his Gentile wife after the Captivity (Ezr 10:24). B.C. 458.

## Telemachus[[@Headword:Telemachus]]

             an Asiatic monk and martyr who is justly renowned for the act of daring self-devotion by which he caused the gladiatorial combats at Rome to be abolished. In the year 404, in the midst of the spectacles of the amphitheatre, Telemachus rushed into the arena and tried to separate the gladiators. The spectators stoned him to death, but the emperor Honorius proclaimed him a martyr, and soon after abolished the gladiatorial combats. Some doubt has been thrown upon the story on account of the absence from the Theodosian Code of any edict by Constantine in existence, and no evidence can be produced to show that there were any gladiatorial fights  after this period, although we know that the combats of wild beasts continued till the fall of the Western Empire. See Smith, Dict. of Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Teleology[[@Headword:Teleology]]

             (τέλος, an end, and λόγος, discourse) is the doctrine or general philosophical discussion of the subject of causes. It may be ultimate, reaching to God, or proximate, contemplating the more immediate purpose. The word teleology is applied to the argument from design in proof of the Deity. Also, when a natural philosopher assigns the purpose or end of any natural arrangement, as the offensive or defensive weapons of an animal, he is said to give a teleological explanation. “Existences must be considered as standing in relation, not merely to causae efficientes (to their immediate causes), but also to causae finales; indeed, the cause efficientes themselves must be conceived as moved by the cause finales, or, in other words, by the eternal rational ends meant to be subserved by created objects, which ends, although in one respect yet awaiting realization in the future, must in another respect be supposed to be already operative. We cannot fully understand realities unless we look forward to the results intended finally to be attained. Present actualities thus acquire a double significance and receive a double explanation. The whole of modern speculation has a teleological character” (Martensen, Christ. Dogmat. p. 78 sq.).

## Telepta (or Tella), Council of[[@Headword:Telepta (or Tella), Council of]]

             properly ZELLA SEE ZELLA (q. v).

## Telesphorus[[@Headword:Telesphorus]]

             pope, is said to have been of Grecian family, and to have occupied the see of Rome from A.D. 128 to 139. Our knowledge of him is altogether legendary. An interpolated passage in the Chronicon of Eusebius and a discourse smuggled into the works of Ambrose make the statement that Telesphorus had made the regulations of fasting more strict, that he had extended the fast before Easter to cover seven weeks, and that he directed three masses to be said and the Gloria in Excelsis to be sung in the night before Christmas. He is reputed to have energetically contended against the heretical teachings of Marcion and Valentine, and to have died a martyr's  death. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; comp. Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Teletarches[[@Headword:Teletarches]]

             (τελετάρχης), a Greek term for a consecrator.

## Teletarchikos[[@Headword:Teletarchikos]]

             (τελεταρχικός), a Greek term signifying consecrating. Telete, a term in the Latin Church for the holy eucharist. SEE TELEIOI.

## Telinga[[@Headword:Telinga]]

             (or TELOOGOO) Version. The Telinga language is spoken within twenty- three miles of Madras, and prevails for about five hundred miles along the coast, from the vicinity of Pulicat to the borders of Orissa. The superficial extent of the entire region in which this language is predominant has been estimated at 118,610 square miles. The natives are Hindus and number about 10,000,000. The Telinga language is also diffused to a greater, or less extent through various countries of Southern India, in which the Tamul and Canarese are the proper vernacular languages. This diffusion in part arises from the early conquests, dating from the 14th century, achieved by the people of Telinga in the South. Like the Romans, they endeavored to secure their conquests and to keep the natives in subjection by the  establishment of military colonies; and the Telinga language is still spoken by the descendants of the Telinga families who were deputed by the kings of Vidianagara to found these colonies. The roaming tendencies of the Telinga people also serve to account, in part,' for the diffusion of the language. On this subject the missionaries have remarked that “in intelligence, migratory habits, secular prosperity, and infrequency of return to their native land this people are in relation to other parts of India what the Scotch are in relation to England and the world.” Benjamin Schultze, the laborious Danish missionary, was the first who engaged in a Telinga version of the Bible. He commenced his translation in 1726, immediately after his completion of the Tamul version (q.v.). He translated from the Greek and Hebrew texts, and finished the Telinga version of the New Test. in 1727, and of the Old Test. in 1732, the whole bearing the title Biblia Telagica ex Hebraico et Grceco Textu, adhibitis multis allis Versionibusi in Linguam Telugicam Translata a Benjamino Schultzio Missionario ad Indos Orientales A o. 1732. From some cause hitherto unexplained, this work was never printed; and Marsch. in the Bibliotheca Sacra, 2, 202,.says: “Quo vero tempore in publicum prodituri sint Biblia Telugice impressa, divinue providentise reservatum manebit.” Schultze died in 1760 at Halle, and it has been thought that his Telinga MSS. may still be preserved in that city. In 1805 the Serampore missionaries commenced another version of the Scriptures in this language, and in 1809 they had translated the whole of the New Test. and part of the Old. Owing to various causes of delay, the New Test. was not printed till 1818, and in 1820 the Pentateuch was published.

While the Serampore version was in progress, the Rev. Augustus Desgranges, of the London Missionary Society, had commenced another version and carried it on to the close of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Mr. Desgranges, who had been stationed at Vizagapatam since 1805, had the assistance of the Rev. George Cran, also stationed there, and of Anunderayer, a Telinga Brahmin of high caste who had been converted to Christianity. In 1808 Mr. Cran died, and, two years later, Mr. Desgranges. On examination it was found that the first three gospels were the only portions of the translation that were in a state of readiness for the press. Of these one thousand copies were printed at Serampore in 1812, under the care of Anunderayer.

In the meantime another version of the Telinga New Test. had been commenced. Rev. Messrs. Pritchett and Lee, agents of the London  Missionary Society, arrived at Vizagapatam a short time prior to the decease of Mr. Desgranges. Mr. Lee undertook a translation of the book of Genesis, but the preparation of the version afterwards devolved almost exclusively on Mr. Pritchett, who betook himself, in the first place, to the translation of the New Test. In 1819 Mr. Pritchett's New Test. was issued by the Madras Bible Society. He now commenced the translation of the Old Test., but in 1820 he was stopped, in the midst of his work, by death.

In 1823 another version of the Scriptures was offered to the Calcutta Bible Society by the Rev. J. Gordon, also of the London Missionary Society. It was very difficult to decide upon the relative merits of Mr. Pritchett's and Mr. Gordon's translation; but finally Mr. Gordon's prevailed, and the committee of the Madras Society resolved upon adopting his version, requesting him, before he sent it to the press, to compare it carefully with Mr. Pritchett's translation. Mr. Gordon's important labors were closed by death in 1827. After his decease, it was found that Mr. Pritchett's version was, after all, more correct than had been expected, and, after introducing certain emendations, an edition of two thousand copies of the New Test. was printed in 1828, accompanied by two thousand copies of Mr. Gordon's version of Luke. An edition of three thousand copies of the Old Test., based upon the versions of Pritchett and Gordon, was issued from the Madras press in 1855, together with large editions of particular portions of the Teloogoo Scriptures both of the Old and of the New Testament. From the different reports we learn the following facts. The report for 1856 states that “an entirely new translation of the whole Bible, executed by C. P. Brown, Esq., has been deposited by that gentleman with this auxiliary with a view to future publication; and extracts from Genesis, Proverbs, Psalms, Malachi, Mark, and Ephesians are in press, and will be circulated for the opinions and criticism of the Teloogoo scholars.” That for the year 1858 states that the Teloogoo revision committee appointed in 1857 had completed a new translation of Paul's epistles to the Romans, Colossians, and Philemon, and of the general epistles of James, John, and Jude, together with the four gospels and Acts, all of which were ready for the press. In 1863 we read: “The Old Test. has been published for the first time, the New Test. newly translated and a revised edition recently published.” In 1866 the report states that the “Madras auxiliary has taken up the question of a revision of the Teloogoo Old Test., and has appointed a committee for that purpose, on the same plan as that of the Tamil revision committee. The version of the Teloogoo New Test. now in use  was adopted in 1858, and, after revision by a committee appointed for the purpose of bringing the Rev. Messrs. Hay and Wardlaw's translation into accordance with the textus receptus and the rules of the society, was published in 1860.” As to the revision of the Old Test., we learn from the report for 1867 that “a committee has been formed by the Rev. John Hay, who has already revised the books of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua. The remainder of the work is in progress.” At present, according to the last report for 1879, the following parts are printed and circulated: the entire Bible according to the Vizagapatam version, the book of Genesis according to the revised version, and the Pentateuch and New Test. published in 1858. See The Bible in Every Land, and the Annual Reports of the British and Foreign Bible Society. (B. P.)

## Teller, Romanus[[@Headword:Teller, Romanus]]

             a Lutheran divine, was born Feb. 21, 1703, at Leipsic, where he also died, April 5, 1750, as doctor and professor of theology-and pastor of St. Thomas's. He wrote, Dissertation. Sacrar. ad Caussas Hermeneut. Spectantium Decas (Lips. 1740):D. Hollaz: Examnen Theol. A croam. denuo edidit et Animadverss. auxit; Demonstratt. Homilet. — theologicae (ibid. 1728); new edition, Institut. Theologicae Homilet. Methodo Scientiis Sacris Digna Adornatae (ibid. 1741). In connection with Baumgarten, Brucker, and Dietelmaier, he published, Bibel, d. i. vollstdndige Erklarung der heiligen Schrift aus dem Englischen (ibid. 1748, 19 vols). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 1, 107, 186, 297; 2, 59,798; Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 413. (B. P.)

## Teller, Wilhelm Abraham[[@Headword:Teller, Wilhelm Abraham]]

             a leading theologian of the “enlightenment” party of Germany in the last century, was born in 1734 at Leipsic, where his father was then professor and pastor. In 1755 he was made catechist and bachelor of theology, and began with his earliest literary production to display his sympathy with the liberal school of theologians. He turned his attention more immediately to the criticism of the text of the Old Test. after the manner of Michaelis. In 1756 he published a Latin translation of Kennicott's dissertation on Hebrew text-criticism. In 1761 he was made general superintendent and professor at Helmstedt. In 1764 he issued his Lehrbuch des christlichen Glaubens, which revealed the advanced theological views to which he had  attained, and alarmed the faculties and consistories. Its position was that of the first stage of rationalistic “enlightenment,” and its most noticeable trait a revulsion against the authority of traditional beliefs.

The excitement occasioned by its appearance was such that the whole edition was confiscated. in Electoral Saxony, and that he retained his position at Helmstedt with serious difficulty. ‘From this unpleasant situation he was extricated by an appointment to Cologne on the Spree as' provost and member of the high consistory, where was the very heart of the party of progress, and where he-felt free to publish to the world his views without reserve. He did this in a Wörterbuch d. Neuen Testaments (1772, and afterwards in six editions), whose preface contained an appeal to preachers that they should expound not only the words, but also, and much more, the ideas, of Scripture, because the latter contains not only Hebrew and Greek forms of expression, but also Hebrew and Greek forms of thought. A further opportunity of showing his independence occurred in 1792 in connection with the trial of a preacher named Schulz, of Gielsdorf, for departure from the standards of the Lutheran Church. The opinion of the high consistory having been required, Teller voted for acquittal on the grounds that under the Lutheran form of Church government every person is constituted his own judge in matters pertaining to the faith, and that all such matters must be determined by Scripture. Schulz was acquitted, but the members of the chamber were afterwards fined and provost Teller was suspended for three months because of this action. The latter nevertheless proceeded, in the same year, to publish a more complete statement of his views in the work Die Religion der Vollkomomeneren, whose theme was the perfectibility of Christianity.

In 1798 he received an address from Jews resident in Berlin demanding admission into the Christian Church without the imposition on them of a Christian creed; but the high consistory negatived the request, though with regret, and with a promise to impose on the petitioners no new disabilities. Teller died Dec. 9, 1804. His more important works have been mentioned above. He was not popular as a preacher, but his sermons were printed in a third edition as early as 1792. He published the Neues Magazin für Predier, whose tenth volume appeared in 1801, which was also well received, even among Roman Catholic clergyman. In addition to original work, he edited. Turretin's Tract. de Scipt. Sac. Interpretatione; and he was an important contributor to the Allemn. deutsche Bibliothek. See Nicolai, Geddchtnissschrift auf Teller (1807); Summarische Lebensnachr., appended to Troschel's  memorial discourse; Herzog, Real Encyklop. s.v.; Hagenbach, Hist. of Church in 18th and 19th Cent. 1, 347, 366, 371, 499.

## Tellier, Michael le[[@Headword:Tellier, Michael le]]

             a Jesuit and father confessor to Louis XIV, was born at Vire, in Normandy, in 1643. He entered the Order of Jesuits in his eighteenth year, and at first devoted himself to historical studies, whose fruit was an edition of Quintus Curtius in 1678; but he eventually engaged in theology, becoming one of the most violent opponents of the Jansenists. In 1672, 1675, and 1684 he published fulminations against the Mons (properly Amsterdam) version of the Bible by De Sacy and other Port-Royalists. He co-operated with father Bouhours in his translation of the Scriptures, however, and zealously defended the Jesuit missionaries to China against the well-founded complaints raised against them. In. 1699 he issued a Histoire des Cinq Propositions de Jansenius under the name of Dumas, and in 1705 he assailed; Quesnel (q.v.) as a rebel and heretic. He now became provincial of his order, and in 1709 confessor to the king. In the latter capacity he succeeded in inducing the king to procure from pope Clement XI the condemnation of the New Test. with Quesnel's notes. The bull Unigenitus, which occasioned so much controversy in France, and was forcibly executed by the king, is to be charged primarily upon Tellier. His dominion ended, however, in 1715, on the death of Louis, and he was removed first to Amiens and afterwards to La Fleche. He died at the latter place in 1719. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Tema[[@Headword:Tema]]

             (Heb. Teyma', תֵּימָא[in Job 6:19 more concisely Tema', תֵּמָא] = the Arab. teyma, “a deser-t” [but Gesen.=Teman, i.e. the South]; Sept. Θαιμάν, Vulg. Thema [but in Isaiah Auster]), the name of a person and of a tribe or district.

1. The ninth son of Ishmael (Gen 25:15; 1 Chronicles i,30). B.C. post 2020.

2. The tribe descended from him mentioned in Job 6:19, “The troops of Tema looked, the companies-of Sheba waited for them,” and by Jeremiah (Jer 25:23), “Dedan, Tema, and Buz;” and also the land occupied by this tribe: “The burden upon Arabia. In the forest in Arabia shall ye lodge, O ye traveling companies of Dedanim. The inhabitants of the land of Tema brought water to him that was thirsty, they prevented with their bread him that fled” (Isa 21:13-14).

The name and the tribe appear to have been known to classic writers. Ptolemy mentions the city of Themme (Θέμμη) among those of Arabia Deserta, and apparently in the centre of the country (Geogr. 5, 19). Pliny states that “to the Nabataei the ancients joined the Thimanei” (Hist. Nat. 6:32). It may be questioned, however, whether he refers to the Biblical Teman or Tema.

There can be little doubt that the Themme of Ptolemy is identical with the modern Teima, an Arab town of some five hundred inhabitants, situated on the western border of the province of Nejd. Wallin, who visited it in 1848, thus describes it: “Teima stands on a mass of crystalline limestone, very slightly raised above the surrounding level. Patches of sand, which have encroached upon the rock, are the only spots which can be cultivated. The inhabitants, however, have considerable date plantations, which yield a great variety of the fruit, of which one kind is esteemed the best flavored in all Arabia. Grain is also cultivated, especially oats of a remarkably good quality, but the produce is never sufficient for the wants of the inhabitants. The greater portion of the gardens are watered from a copious well in the middle of the village. The hydraulic contrivance by which water is raised for distribution through channels among the plantations is the same as is used through Mesopotamia as well as in Nejd, viz. a bucket of camel-skin hung to the end of a long lever moving upon an upright pole fixed in the ground” (Journal R. G. S. 20:332). Arab writers state of Teima that “it is a  town in the Syrian desert, and that it is commanded by the castle called El- Ablalk [or El-Ablak el-Fard], of Es-Semawal [Samuel] Ibn-'Adiya the Jew, a contemporary of Imra-el-Keys” (A.D. cir. 550); but according to a tradition it was built by Solomon, which points at any rate to its antiquity (comp. El-Bekri, in Mardsid. 4:23). Wallin says no remains of the castle now exist, nor does even the name “live in the memory of the present inhabitants. A small ruined building, constructed of hewn stone, and half buried in sand and rubbish, appeared to me to be too inconsiderable to admit of its being identified with the celebrated old castle” (ut sup. p. 333). This fortress seems, like that of Dumat-el-Jendel, to be one of the strongholds that must have protected the caravan route along the northern frontier of Arabia- and they recall the passage following the enumeration of the sons of Ishmael; “These [are] the sons of Ishmael, and these [are] their names, by their towns, and by their castles; twelve princes according to their nations” (Gen 25:16).

It seems probable that the ancient Arab tribe of BeniTeim of whom Abulfeda speaks (Hist. Anteislam. ed. Fleischer, p. 198), were connected with this place, and were the more recent representatives of the children of Tema. Forster would further identify the tribe of Tema with the Beni- Temim, who had their chief stations on the shores of the Persian Gulf; but his proof does not seem satisfactory (Geog. of Arabia, 1, 289 sq.). It is interesting to find memorials of the nation founded by this son of Ishmael, not merely referred to by classic and Arab geographers, but existing to the present day, in the very region where we naturally look for them (see D'Anville, Geog. Ancienne, 2, 250; Abulfeda, Descript. Arab. p. 6 sq.; Seetzen, in Zach, Monatl. Correspondenz, 18:374). Like other Arab tribes, the children of Tema had probably a nucleus at the town of Teima, while their pasture-grounds extended westward to the borders of Edom, and eastward to the Euphrates, just as those of the Beni Shummar do at the present time.

## Temani[[@Headword:Temani]]

             (Gen 36:34) or

## Temanite[[@Headword:Temanite]]

             Heb. Teymani', תֵּימָנַי; Sept. Θαιμανί or Θαιμανίτης) is the title (1Ch 1:45; Job 2:11 sq.) of a descendant of Teman or an inhabitant of that land. SEE TEMAN. Tem'eni [some Te'meni or Teme'ni] (Heb. Teymeni', תֵּימְנַי, Temaznite (Geseni or fortunate [Fürst]; Sept, Θαιμάν, Vulg. Themani), second-named of the four sons of Ashur (q.v.), the “father” of Tekoa by his wife Naarah (1Ch 4:6). B.C. cir. 1618.

## Temneh[[@Headword:Temneh]]

             (or Timneh) Version. Temneh is the language spoken in the Ruiah country, near Sierra Leone, in West Africa. At present there exists a translation of the New Test., Genesis, and Psalms. The Gospel of St. Matthew, translated by the Rev. C. F. Schlenker, was printed only in 1866, the other parts now published having been added since that time. Comp. Reports of the British and Foreign Bible Society. (B. P.)

## Temper[[@Headword:Temper]]

             the disposition of the mind, the sum of our inclinations and tendencies, whether natural or acquired. The word is seldom used by good writers without an epithet, as a good or a bad temper. Temper must be distinguished from passion. The. passions are quick and strong emotions, which by degrees subside. Temper is the disposition which remains after these emotions are past, and which forms the habitual propensity of the soul. See Evans, Practical Discourses on the Christian Temper; and the various articles SEE FORTITUDE, SEE HUMILITY, SEE LOVE, SEE PATIENCE, etc. Temperance (ἐγκράτεια, self-restraint), that virtue which a man is said to possess who moderates and restrains his sensual appetite. It is often, however, used in a much more general sense, as synonymous with moderation, and is then applied indiscriminately to all the passions. “Temperance,” says Addison, “has those particular advantages above all other means of health, that it, may be practiced by all ranks and conditions at any season or in any place. It is a kind of regimen into which every man may put himself without interruption to business, expense of money, or loss of time. Physic, for the most part, is nothing else but the substitute of exercise or temperance.” In order to obtain and practice this virtue, we should consider it,

1. As a divine command (Php 4:5; Luk 21:34; Pro 23:1-3);

2. As conducive to health;

3. As advantageous to the powers of the mind;

4. As a defense against injustice, lust, imprudence, detraction, poverty, etc.;

5. The example of Christ should be a most powerful stimulus to it. e . z

## Temperance Reform[[@Headword:Temperance Reform]]

             As an organized movement, the temperance reformation is of very modern origin. For ages, indeed, wise men have deplored the miseries of the habit at whose extinction it aims; yet it is but recently that the enormous magnitude of those evils seems to have been fully apprehended, the true basis of reform recognized, and united and persistent effort made for the suppression of the gigantic mischief.

I. The Habit of Drunkenness. — An interesting fact lies at the foundation of the habit of indulgence in intoxicants. Man discovered, long ago, that his mental state is affected by the action of certain drugs, and that they have power, not only to lend increased enjoyment to social hours, but to lessen pain, cheer the desponding, and, for a brief period, lift even the despairing out of the depths. Thus Homer describes the effects of nepenthe (Odyssey, bk. 4):

“Meantime, with genial joy to warm the soul, Bright Helen mixed a mirth-inspiring bowl, Tempered with drugs of sovereign use, to assuage The boiling bosom of tumultuous rage; To clear the cloudy front of wrinkled Care, And dry the tearful sluices of Despair. Charmed with that potent draught, the exalted mind All sense of woe delivers to the wind. Though on the blazing pile his father lay, Or a loved brother groaned his life away; Or darling son, oppressed by ruffian force, Fell breathless at his feet, a mangled corpse; From morn to eve, impassive and serene, The man, entranced, would view the deathful scene.”  This is a true portrait, and fits our own times as accurately as it did those of Homer. This state, which we have been accustomed to characterize by the term intoxication, or drunkenness, is in reality a combination of two effects, narcosis and exhilaration. Not only when the victim has become visibly drunk, but from the moment when the dose begins its impression, the circulation loses force, the blood cools, physical strength declines, the nerves are less sensitive, mental acumen is dulled, and every power of mind and body is lessened. But at the very time when the drug is working this result, there is a mental exhilaration, a delusive lifting-up of the spirits, which cheats the victim with a false consciousness of augmented powers. He never before felt so strong, or realized that he was so intellectual, so wise, so witty; he never before had so much confidence in his own powers, or contemplated himself generally with so much satisfaction. This delusion continues, and even increases, while he is sinking rapidly into utter imbecility, mental and physical. There are various substances which have less or more of this strange potency. Those chiefly used for the deliberate purpose of producing these effects are alcohol, opium, the hemp poison (Cannabis Indica), tobacco, the coca-leaf, the betel-nut, and the thorn- apple. While the general effect of these substances is the same, there is some variety in their action. Alcohol benumbs the body more rapidly than opium and Indian hemp, and tends more to noise and violence at first, and a paralytic stagger afterwards. The thorn-apple produces temporary delirium as the final symptom. The coca-leaf, tobacco, and the betel-nut are milder forms of the intoxicating principle, and seem to be used chiefly to allay mental and physical disquiet, and super induce a feeling of ease and comfort.

But continued indulgence tends to the formation of a tyrannical habit, whose force grows out of the fact that repeated druggings produce an abnormal condition of the brain and of the whole nervous system. The novice experiences his dreamy joys for a brief space, and then comes out of them in a condition more or less morbid, according to the power of the dose. He generally recovers his usual condition in a day or two, and perhaps has no desire to repeat his experience; but if he repeats it again and again, it will not be long before he finds himself in the clutches of a new appetite, and burdened by a new and pressing want. Now, when the force of the last dose of the drug has been spent, he is in a condition of unrest, mental and physical, which may be only a slight degree of uneasiness, or amount to direst agony, according to the stage which he has reached in his  downward road. From this disquiet, or distress, he knows of only one method of quick relief, and that is another dose of the same drug. And so the drug-becomes the tyrant and he the slave. As the coils of the serpent tighten about him, he sinks, mentally, morally, socially. At last he cares only for his drug, or rather is driven to it by the lash of remorse and horror, which come upon him whenever he is not under the spell. He cares not for poverty, rags, and dirt. for cold and hunger. He cares less for his wife and children than a tiger does for his mate or a wolf for his cubs. The pity of the good, the scorn of the brutal, the prayers and tears of those who love him the wrath of the living God, have no power to move him, and in passive and hopeless shame and despair, alternating with brief seasons of attempted reform, he goes down to his doom.

II. Extent and Evils of Intoxication. — Thus the Asiatic peoples bear the burden of evil caused by indulgence in opium and the hemp intoxicant. Thus Europe and America groan under the woes inflicted by alcohol. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1879, there were 156,122 retail dealers in ardent spirits in the various states and territories of the Union, and the total receipts from the taxes levied on distilled liquors were over $52,000,000. This is an increase over the previous year of 1082 in the number of dealers, and $2,000,000 in the receipts. The same year, 327,000,000 gallons of malt liquors paid into the Treasury over $10,000,000, making the total receipts from taxes on alcoholic liquors $63,000,000. The increased consumption of malt liquors the same year was 25,000,000 gallons. The total annual outlay in the United States for distilled and malt liquors cannot be less than $700,000,000. In England, during the year ending Sept. 30, 1878, there were 156,589 licensed venders of intoxicating liquors, and, as the report of the committee of the House of Lords shows, the drinking habits of the people cost them the sum of $718,000,000.

But this enormous waste, which swallows up so large a part of the earnings of the people, is only the beginning of woes. Vice, crime, pauperism, public evils, and public burdens of every kind multiply in direct proportion to the prevalence of the alcoholic habit. What are usually called the dangerous classes in our cities are its creation. It is a prolific source of political corruption. Powerful in votes and money, and with an instinctive dread of integrity in public men, the liquor interest gravitates to the wrong side of every public question. By its aid bad men are exalted to office, the laws are imperfectly administered, life and property are rendered insecure, and taxes  increase. In all Christian lands, the liquor habit and the liquor interest are recognized more and more clearly as the direct antagonists of morals; religion, and every element of the welfare of men and nations. On these grounds the temperance reform bases its argument.

III. History of the Temperance Movement. — The first efforts to stay this tide of death date back many years. In all nations-even in ancient times- there were persons who abstained, generally through religious motives, from the intoxicating drinks of their day. Such were the Nazarites among the Jews, and the Vestals among the Romans. All through the ages, excess has been condemned by the thoughtful, while the moderate use of intoxicants was long deemed allowable, if not necessary. Thus the colonies of Massachusetts and Connecticut, as long ago as 1639, passed laws designed to lessen the excessive use of distilled liquors.

John Wesley was the pioneer of the modern reform. In the year 1743 he prepared the “General Rules” for the guidance of his societies, and in warning his people against the sins of the times he names drunkenness, buying or selling spirituous liquors, or drinking them, unless in cases of extreme necessity. This is one of the rules which, as he declares, “we are taught of God to observe, even in his written Word;” and the rule stands to-day, in the exact words of Wesley, in the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Wesley was equally outspoken in the pulpit. In his sermon On the Use of Money is the following passage:

“Neither may we hurt our neighbor in his body; therefore we may not sell anything which tends to impair health. Such is, eminently, all that liquid fire commonly called drams, or spirituous liquors. It is true these may have a place in medicine . . . although there would rarely be occasion for them, were it not for the unskillfulness of the practitioner; therefore such as prepare and sell them only for this end may keep their conscience clear... But all who sell them in the common way to any that will buy are poisoners general. They murder his majesty's subjects by wholesale, neither does their eye pity or spare. They drive then to hell like sheep; and what is their gain? Is it not the blood of these men? Who, then, would envy their large estates and sumptuous palaces? A curse is in the midst of them; the curse of God cleaves to the stones, the timber, the furniture of them. The curse of God is in their gardens, their walk, their groves; a fire that burns to the nethermost hell. Blood, blood  is there; the foundation, the floor, the walls, the roof, are stained with blood. And canst thou hope, O thou man of blood! though thou art clothed in scarlet and fine linen, and farest sumptuously every day-canst thou hope to deliver down thy fields of blood to the third generation ? Not so, for there is a God in heaven; therefore thy name shall soon be rooted out.” These bold words were uttered at a time when the use of intoxicating liquors was universal, both in England and America. Thus John Wesley leaped at once to a position which other reformers did not reach in almost a hundred years. Indeed, in regard to another matter, somewhat akin to alcoholic indulgences, he at once advanced to a position towards which his followers in our own day are feebly struggling, but which no Church, as such, has yet reached. He strongly counseled his people not to use snuff or tobacco, and, in regard to his preachers, made it a positive rule that none of them was “to use tobacco for smoking, chewing, or snuff, unless it be prescribed by a physician.”

In 1651 the people of East Hampton, on Long Island, resolved, at a town meeting, that no one should retail liquor but such as were regularly authorized to engage in the business, and even then not to furnish “above half a pint at a time among four men.” Something like a prohibitory law is said to have been passed by the Virginia colony in 1676, but what the novel experiment amounted to cannot now be ascertained. The practice of providing liquor on funeral occasions generally prevailed; and it was not until about the year 1760 that an earnest combined effort was made by the various churches to abolish it; and even this small reform was not accomplished till many years afterwards.

On Feb. 23, 1777, the Continental Congress, then in session in Philadelphia, passed unanimously the following resolution: “Resolved, That it be recommended to the several legislatures of the United States immediately to pass laws the most effective for putting an immediate stop to the pernicious practice of distilling grain, by which the most extensive evils are likely to be derived if not quickly prevented.” This, however, seems to have been a war measure rather than an attempt at reform. It makes no mention of present effects, but is prompted by the fear of some future evil, probably a scarcity of grain, caused by the gathering of farm laborers into the army, and the consequent lessened production.  In 1789 two hundred farmers of Litchfield, Conn., united in a pledge not to use distilled liquors in their farm-work the ensuing season. In 1790 a volume of sermons, the authorship of which has been attributed to Dr. Benjamin Rush, an eminent patriot and philanthropist of Philadelphia, and a signer of the Declaration of Independence, made a powerful impression in regard to the evils of the alcoholic vice, and the physicians of the city united in a memorial to Congress, in which they compare “the ravages of distilled spirits upon life” to those of “plague or pestilence,” only “more certain and extensive,” and pray the Congress to “impose such heavy duties upon all distilled spirits as shall be effectual to restrain their intemperate use.”

In 1794 Dr. Rush published an essay entitled A Medical Inquiry into the Effects of Ardent Spirits upon the Body and Mind, in which he argues that the habitual use of distilled liquors is useless, pernicious, and universally dangerous, and that their use as a beverage ought to be wholly abandoned. Still the blow was aimed at distilled spirits only, and the true ground of reform was not yet reached.

In 1808 a society was formed in Saratoga County, N. Y., which seems to have been the first permanent organization founded for the purpose of promoting temperance. It was called “The Union Temperate Society of Moreau and Northumberland.” The members pledged themselves not to drink any distilled spirits or wine, nor offer them to others, under a penalty of twenty-five cents. The penalty for being intoxicated was fifty cents. All this looks ridiculous now; but it was a bold movement for those days, and the projectors of it were, no doubt, duly abused as madmen and fanatics.

Still, the day was dawning. Religious bodies began to awake. In 1812 the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church adopted a report which urged all the ministers of that denomination to preach on the subject, and warn their hearers “not only against actual intemperance, but against all those habits and indulgences which may have a tendency to produce it.” The General Association of Connecticut, the same year, adopted a report prepared by Rev. Lyman Beecher, which recommended entire abstinence from all distilled liquors. Thus they reached, in 1812, the position which John Wesley occupied and inculcated in his “General Rules” in 1743. The same year (1812), the Consociation' of Fairfield County, Conn., published an appeal which goes one step further. It says, “The remedy we would suggest, particularly to those whose appetite for drink is strong and  increasing, is a total abstinence from the use of all intoxicating liquors.” This, they admit, “may be deemed a harsh remedy,” but they apologize for it on the ground that “the nature of the disease absolutely requires it.” The consociation, at the same time, made a practical beginning of reform by excluding all spirituous liquors from their meetings. In 1813 the Massachusetts Society for the Suppression of Intemperance was formed in Boston. The society, however, aimed only to suppress “the too free use of ardent spirits and-its kindred vices,” and therefore accomplished little. Still, all these movements called public attention to the evil, and kept men thinking. The spell of indifference was broken, the discussion became more earnest and thorough, and appeals, sermons, and pamphlets began to issue from the press. Foremost among these writers was Rev. Justin Edwards, pastor of the Church at Andover, Mass., who afterwards occupied a still more prominent place in the reform movement. In 1823 Dr. Eliphalet Nott, president of Union College, published a volume of Sermons on the Evils of Intemperance, which greatly aided the reform. In January, 1826, Rev. Calvin Chapin published in the Connecticut Observer a series of articles in which he took the ground that the only real antidote for the evils deprecated is total abstinence, not only from distilled spirits, but from all intoxicating beverages. His position, however, was generally regarded as extreme, and he had few immediate converts to his opinions. In February, 1826, chiefly through the instrumentality of Dr. Edwards, a few friends of the reform met in the city of Boston, and organized the American Temperance Society. The pledge was still the old one-abstinence from ardent spirits-but the movement was nevertheless an advance, inasmuch as the object of the society was to inaugurate a vigorous campaign throughout the country. In April, Rev. William Collier established in Boston the first newspaper devoted to the cause. It was called The National Philanthropist, and was published weekly. This same year (1826), Lyman Beecher published his famous Six Sermons on Temperance, which in burning eloquence and powerful condensations of truth have not been surpassed by anything since written on the subject. The reform was now fairly begun. In 1827 there were state societies in New Hampshire, Vermont, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Illinois, while two hundred and twenty local societies, scattered through these and other states, enrolled an aggregate of thirty thousand members. Men of the highest character and position were identified with the reform, such as Dr. Justin Edwards, Dr. Day (president of Yale College), Genesis Lewis Cass, Edward C. Delavan, and eminent physicians, such as Drs. Massey, Hosack, and Sewell. About  this time L. M. Sargent published his Temperance Tales, thus bringing into the battle a new and powerful weapon.

The reform made rapid progress. In 1831 there were state societies in all but five states, while the local organizations numbered 2200. In 1832 Genesis Cass, the secretary of war, abolished the spirit ration in the army, and issued an order prohibiting the sale of distilled liquors by sutlers. This action, however, seems to have been repealed by some one of his successors in office, as we find Genesis McClellan, thirty years afterwards, issuing an equivalent order in reference to the Army of the Potomac. The secretary of the navy also issued, in 1832, an order offering the men extra pay and rations of coffee and sugar instead of the spirit ration. In 1833 there were 5000 local societies, with more than a million of members, of whom it was estimated that 10,000 had been intemperate, 4000 distilleries had been closed and 1000 American vessels sailed without liquor.

This year (1833) is notable for another advanced step. Experience was daily demonstrating the insufficiency of a reform which interdicted distilled liquors only. Not a few drunkards signed the pledge against such beverages and kept it, and were drunkards still. Public opinion was steadily moving towards the true ground total abstinence from all intoxicating drinks. Mr. Luther Jackson, of the city of New York, prepared a pledge of this character, and secured a thousand signatures. To him belongs the honor of inaugurating a new era in the history of the reform. In May, 1833, the first National Temperance Convention was held in the city of Philadelphia. Four hundred and forty delegates, representing nineteen. states and one territory, counseled together three days. Two important conclusions were embodied in their resolutions-first, that the traffic in distilled liquors as a beverage is morally wrong; second, that it is expedient that the local societies should accept, as soon as practicable, the total-abstinence pledge. A permanent society was formed, which, under the name of the American Temperance Union, accomplished much for the cause. The contest from this time assumed a twofold direction-one line of argument and effort aiming to dissuade the people from all use of intoxicants, and the other taking the shape of an attack upon the traffic and the laws which sanction it. Public sentiment was fast approaching the conclusion that instead of being protected by law, under- the pretence of regulating it, the traffic should be prohibited by law. The Grand Jury of the city and county of New York put on record their deliberate judgment that three fourths of the crime and pauperism are caused by the drinking habits of the people, and added, “It is  our solemn impression that the time has now arrived when our public authorities should no longer sanction the evil complained of by granting licenses.” Several state conventions the same year adopted resolutions of the same tenor as those of the National Convention.

In 1834 Rev. Albert Barnes, of Philadelphia, published two sermons on the iniquities of the traffic; and Samuel Chipman made a personal inspection of the almshouses and jails in the state of New York, and published a report, showing how largely the alcoholic vice was responsible for crowding them with inmates. In 1835 Rev. George B. Cheever, then the youthful pastor of a church in Salem, Mass., published, under the title of Deacon Giles's Distillery, what purported to be a dream. Daemons were represented as working in the deacon's distillery, and manufacturing “liquid damnation,” “murder,” “suicide,” etc., for the human employer. The stinging satire took effect. Mr. Cheever was assaulted in the streets of Salem, and was also prosecuted for slander by a certain rum-distilling deacon, who thought he recognized his own portrait in the deacon Giles of the dream. Mr. Cheever was convicted and imprisoned for a few days, but on his release returned at once to the attack in another dream concerning Deacon Jones's Brewery, in which devils are described as making beer, and, as they dance about the caldron, chanting the spell of the-witches in Shakespeare's Macbeth

“Round about the caldron go;

 In the poisoned entrails throw;

 Drugs that in the coldest veins

Shoot incessant pains;

Herbs that, brought from hell's black door,

 Do their business slow and sure

Double, double toil and trouble:

Fire, burn; and caldron, bubble.”

The assault and the prosecution called universal attention to the affair; the dreams were published everywhere; and produced great effect. About the same time another local excitement aided the general cause. Mr. Delavaal exposed the methods of the Albany brewers, whom he charged with procuring water for their business from a foul pond covered with green scum and defiled with the putrid remains of dead cats and dogs. Eight brewers brought suits against him; claiming damages to the amount of three hundred thousand dollars, but did not succeed in recovering a dime.  In 1836 a second National Temperancet Convention, attended by four hundred delegates, and presided over by Chancellor Walworth, was held at Saratoga, N. Y. The most important business done was the passing of a resolution that henceforth the pledge should be total abstinence from all that intoxicates. This resolution, though offered by Dr. Edwards, supported by Lyman Beecher, and adopted unanimously by the convention, was not approved by all who claimed to be friends of the cause. Not a few, whose temperance zeal consisted in an ardent desire to reform other people from rum and brandy, while they themselves drank wine without scruple, fell out of the ranks of the reform, and were seen no more. Societies disbanded in every direction, prominent workers under the old pledge became silent when the new one was adopted, and once more the cry of “fanaticism” filled the air, this time with some new voices in the chorus. Still, not until this hour had the reform planted itself on the right ground and grasped the true weapons of its warfare. The people rallied around the new banner, and the work went on with more efficiency than ever before. In January, 1837, the Journal of the American Temperance Union, edited by Rev. John Marsh, was established, and did valiant service till 1865, when it was superseded by the National Temperance Advocate.

In 1838 began the legislative war against the traffic a contest which has see many victories and defeats, and will probably see many more before the final victory. In response to growing public sentiment, the license laws of several states were made more stringent. Massachusetts passed a law prohibiting the sale of alcoholic liquors in less quantity than fifteen gallons. In 1839 Mississippi followed with a “one gallon law,” and Illinois ‘adopted what would now be termed “local option.” The universal agitation on the subject created general alarm among those interested in the manufacture and sale of alcoholic drinks, and they, too, began to organize and collect funds to be used at the polls and in legislative halls to arrest the reform. Still the good cause advanced. Temperance organizations, temperance journals, lectures, and labors of every kind were multiplying. Good news of progress came from England, and from father Mathew, a Catholic priest in Ireland, who had given himself to reform work and had achieved marvelous successes.

In 1840 the “Washingtonian” movement began in Baltimore. Six hard drinkers, who had met for a night's carousal, suddenly resolved to reform, signed a total-abstinence pledge, and formed a society for active labor. They held meetings, recited the simple story of their former errors, and  how they were rescued, and invited the most hopeless victims of the vice to join them. Wonderful results followed, the work spread, and in the space of two or three years it is estimated that one hundred and fifty thousand inebriates had signed the pledge. Immense good was done, and yet the movement soon began to wane. The demand for reformed drunkards as lecturers became so great as to bring into the field a crowd of irresponsible men; some without sufficient intelligence for their position, others lacking in principle. These made a trade of the business; they sneered at all workers who had no drunken experiences to relate, abused the churches, and sought to outdo each other in extravagant descriptions of their past lives. Soon that which began as an agonizing struggle for life became a merry popular amusement; the funniest lecturer got the most invitations and the best pay; and the movement, powerful as it was at one time, broke down under the load of the ignorant, unprincipled, and foolish operators who, for their own profit, piled their weight upon it. Still, bitterly as the friends of temperance were disappointed by the collapse of the Washingtonian episode, the general cause continued to advance. In the, ten years ending in 1840, while the population of the United States had grown from 12,000,000 to 17,000,000, the consumption of distilled liquors had fallen from 70,000,000 to 43,000,000 gallons. In thirty years the number of distilleries had fallen from 40,000 to 10,306.

In 1842 the order of the Sons of Temperance was founded in the city of New York. This order is the oldest of the compact organizations which not only pledge their members to total abstinence, but unite them on a plan of mutual systematic relief in times of sickness. During the thirty-eight years of its existence the order has varied greatly in numerical strength. In 1850 it numbered 232,233 members. Suffering severely during the late war, the “Sons” in 1866 numbered only, 54,763. Since that date they are again making progress, and now number about 100,000 members. The Independent Order of Rechabites, a society of similar character, established in England in 1835, was introduced into the United States in 1842, and spread with considerable rapidity. In 1845 another order, the Templars of Honor and Temperance, was established in New York City. This fraternity was originally designed to be a branch of the Sons of Temperance, whose members should pass through various degrees, and be known to each other everywhere by signs and passwords; but it was organized as an independent society. They number about 17,000 members.  The discussion in regard to the morality of the license system went on with vigor. In 1845 the matter was by law submitted to the people of Connecticut and Michigan, and the vote was Strongly against license. In 1846 the question was submitted to the people (of the state of New York (the city of New York being excepted); several whole counties voted “no license,” and five sixths of the towns and cities gave large majorities in the same direction. In 1846 Maine passed a prohibitory law, which, with many changes, made from time to time to render it more stringent and effective, has remained for thirty-four years the will of the people and the policy of the state, and it is today in full and successful operation, the glory of the commonwealth and the strong defense of its citizens.

For the next ten years (1846 to 1856) the question of license or no license was agitated in almost every part of the Union, but to give the history of the struggle in the several states would require a volume. Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, Delaware, Michigan, Indiana, Iowa, Minnesota, Kansas, and Nebraska passed prohibitory laws-some of them more than once. In most of these states, if not all, the question was submitted in some form to the popular vote, and the prohibitory principle received emphatic endorsement. In New Jersey, also, the popular voice was strongly in its favor, but the liquor interest succeeded in thwarting the will of the people. In two states, Pennsylvania and Illinois, a small majority appeared against prohibition. The legislative reform was resisted at every step, fiercely, desperately, and by the use of the most unscrupulous means. After the prohibitory law had been strongly approved by a direct popular vote, and passed by' both Houses of the Legislature of New York, in 1854 governor Horatio Seymour vetoed it on trivial grounds. Gov. Seymour of Connecticut in 1853 did the same thing under similar circumstances. In both cases the people at the next election carried their point by defeating those who had temporarily defeated them. In several states the law was declared unconstitutional by the courts. In New York it was set aside in 1856 on the ground that it destroyed the value of property, to wit, of the liquors already in the hands of the dealers. In several of the states the law was passed, submitted to the people for their approval, approved by large majorities, and then declared unconstitutional by the courts, because thus submitted to the people. An attempt was made in 1846 by the liquor interest to settle the question once for all for the whole country. With Daniel Webster and Rufus Choate as their counsel, the dealers in alcohol carried their case into  the Supreme Court of the United States; but the unanimous decision of, the court was that each state has a constitutional right to regulate or even totally suppress the liquor traffic.

In 1849 the first Civil Damage Law, as it has been called, was passed in Wisconsin, prohibiting the retail trade in intoxicating liquors, unless the vender first gave bonds “to support all paupers, widows, and orphans, and pay the expenses of all civil and criminal prosecutions, growing out of or justly attributable to such traffic.” Several other states followed the example of Wisconsin, and these laws have been found to be of considerable practical value.

This same year, 1849, the cause received a new impulse from the presence and labors of father Mathew, the Irish apostle of temperance, who came to America in June, and spent sixteen months of hard work, chiefly among the Irish Catholics. Crowds greeted him everywhere, and large numbers took the pledge at his hands. It is not surprising that a reaction followed this swift success. Many pledged themselves by a sudden impulse, moved thereto by the enthusiasm of assembled multitudes, with little, clear, intelligent, fixed conviction of the evils inseparable from the habits which they were renouncing. The pope, their infallible teacher both in regard to faith and morals, had never pronounced moderate drinking a sin, either mortal or venial; and even occasional drunkenness had been treated in the confessional as a trivial offence. The retail traffic, especially in the cities was more largely in the hands of Irish Catholics than any other class of people. Moreover, the Catholic Church wanted donations of land from city authorities, and subsidies from the public treasury for the support of its sectarian institutions, and it could obtain what it wanted only by a political alliance with the liquor interest. For these reasons the Catholic clergy as a body, seem to have made no vigorous effort to hold the ground which the venerable father Matthew won; and the laity, of course, have felt no obligation to be wiser than their teachers.

During the period named, while the battle was raging in reference to the legalizing of the traffic, and year after year went on as fiercely as ever, the liquor interest received powerful reinforcements from an unexpected quarter. During the twenty years previous to 1840 the immigration from Germany numbered 155,000 persons. During the twenty years between 1840 and 1860 the German immigration numbered 1,330,000. This vast multitude brought with them their predilection for beer and Sunday  holidays. Under their auspices the manufacture of beer became a great business interest, and, especially in the towns and cities, saloons sprang up without number, until, in some places, there was a saloon for every score of legal voters. The distillers, brewers, and dealers of all sorts, uniting their forces, became a power in the political arena which no party dared to leave out of its calculations, and before which every mean and mercenary demagogue hastened to fall on his knees.

The temperance cause is so pure, its logic so complete, so utterly unanswerable, that it might have routed all its enemies had the contest gone on without interruption. But while the line of battle, notwithstanding local repulses and temporary defeats, was steadily advancing, its progress was stayed by another overmastering appeal to the patriotism of the people. The series of events which preceded the late civil war were culminating in an agitation which swept all the streams of popular enthusiasm into its mighty current. The same principles and convictions which made men the foes of the alcoholic curse made them feel keenly the national peril; while those who were coining their ill-gotten gains out of the blood of their neighbors could be expected to care little for the life of the nation. Thus, while the true patriot laid aside all else to save his country from the awful peril of the hour, the selfish and traitorous liquor interest had the better chance to plot for the accomplishment of its own sordid ends. Still, while the popular demand for better laws in regard to the traffic in alcohol almost ceased for a time to be felt in current politics, the moral reform made some progress. In 1856 the American Juvenile Temperance Society was founded in the city of New York and the next year a monthly paper for children, called the Juvenile Temperance Banner, was established. In January, 1859, four young men, who had met one Sunday evening in a liquor saloon in San Francisco, suddenly resolved to change their evil course, formed a society which they called the “Dashaways,” and inaugurated an extensive movement on the Pacific coast much like the Washingtonian campaign of 1840.

The next year a similar reform organization, originating in Chicago, spread through the state under the name of the Temperance Flying Artillery. In 1862 the spirit ration in the United States navy, which was made optional in 1832, totally ceased by order of Congress; and coffee was substituted for whiskey in the army of the Potomac. The friends of the cause were everywhere active in their benevolent labors among the soldiers and sailors during the war.  The fifth National Convention, held at Saratoga in August, 1865, organized the National Temperance Society and Publication House, whose headquarters are at 58 Reade Street, New York, and which, by its two periodicals, the National Temperance Advocate and the Youth's Temperance Banner, and its numerous volumes and tracts, has been an efficient instrument in enlightening and stirring the public mind. In April, 1866, Congress voted to banish the liquor traffic from the Capitol and the public grounds at Washington, and the next winter a Congressional Temperance Society, Hon. Henry Wilson president, was organized. In 1868 the “Friends of Temperance” and the “Vanguard of Freedom,” the one a society of white people and the other of the freedmen, were organized in the South. In July, 1868, the sixth National Convention met in Cleveland, Ohio. Its most important resolution declares that the temperance cause “demands the persistent use of the ballot for its promotion.” In 1869 women began to form associations for the suppression of the traffic. The first were organized in Rutland, Vt.; Clyde, O.; and Jonesville and Adrian, Mich. This was the beginning of a tidal- wave of enthusiasm which culminated in the Ohio crusades, and crystallized in the establishment of the Woman's National Christian Temperance Union. The churches were actively at work. “Bands of Hope” were formed among the children. The iniquities of the license system, and the wisdom of separate political action on the part of temperance men, were everywhere discussed; and the liquor-dealers, in alarm, were busy organizing leagues and collecting funds, because, as they confessed,” of the damage being done to the liquor business.”

In January, 1873, the Hon. Henry Wilson introduced in the United States Senate a bill providing for a Commission of Inquiry, whose aim was to secure a thorough investigation of the evils of the alcoholic habit, and ascertain what measures are most efficient in removing or lessening those evils. This bill has been repeatedly brought forward in Congress, backed by memorials from all parts of the country, but has been defeated every time by the influence or the liquor interest. The guilty alone fear the light. In August, 1873, the seventh National Convention was held at Saratoga. It declared again that the legal suppression of the traffic is the only effective policy, and that the time had arrived “fully tit introduce the temperance issue into state and national politics,” but counseled the friends of the cause to cooperate with existing political parties “where such will endorse the policy of prohibition.”  In the winter of 1873-74 a novel movement began which, under the name of the Woman's Crusade, attracted universal attention. In the town of Hillsborough, Highland Co., 0., the liquor trade was doing its deadly work, and at the same time the enemies of that traffic were earnest in their labors to lessen its ravages. At a public meeting, Dr. Dio Lewis, of Boston, told how a drunkard's wife, forty years ago, after long and fervent prayer, gathered a band of Christian women and waited upon the liquor-dealer, imploring him to give up his dreadful business, and how their prayers were answered.

The next day seventy-five Christian women, led by Mrs. E. J. Thompson, a daughter of ex-governor Trimble, began a systematic visitation of the drug- stores, hotels, and saloons of Hillsborough, and continued it till victory crowned their efforts. In eight days all the saloons were closed. The work spread from town to town and from city to city, in not a few encountering fierce opposition, but moving on in triumph, and accomplishing great and permanent good. This wonderful movement spread into other states, reclaiming thousands of inebriates, closing thousands of saloons, and giving a mighty impulse to all forms of temperance work.

At this present time (January, 1880) the reform seems to be even more prominently before the public mind than it was before the war. The iniquities of the traffic have been urged upon the attention of the legislatures of the states, and the laws are constantly changing, generally for the better, occasionally for the worse, as Israel or Amalek prevails, so that it is almost impossible to classify them. Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Ohio, and North Carolina prohibit the traffic in all intoxicating liquors. Iowa prohibits the traffic in distilled liquors, but not in wine and beer. Rhode Island, Connecticut, Illinois, Kentucky, Minnesota, Missouri, Arkansas, Texas, and the District of Columbia are under Local Option laws. The people of Kansas are to vote this fall (1880) on a proposed amendment to the State Constitution, which, if adopted, will prohibit both the manufacture and the sale of alcoholic intoxicants. Some of the states, as New York, Ohio, and Illinois, have Civil Damage laws, which make the dealers responsible before the courts for mischief done by means of their wares. Nevada has no law on the subject. In many of the states special laws give particular counties or towns the power to prohibit, by popular vote, the trade in alcohol. Experience has given ample demonstration that where prohibitory legislation is fully sustained by public sentiment the liquor traffic can be stamped out as thoroughly as any other form of crime. All  through the land the active friends of temperance, with scarcely an exception, are fixed in the conviction that the common traffic in alcoholic drinks is a crime against society, and that to license it is to commit another crime against the public: welfare. This conviction grows more intense from year to year, and from this position it may be safely predicted that there will be no retreat.

During the last decade the field of battle bas become as broad as the national domain, and new and powerful forces have come into the contest. Previous to 1860, there were only about half a score of local temperance societies among our Catholic population. Now there are probably a thousand, with an aggregate of 200,000 members. The Woman's National Christian Temperance Union, which grew out of the Ohio crusade movement, and was organized in 1874, has spread its network of societies over more than half the United States, and, by its conventions, publications, and earnest labors, is wielding a powerful influence. . The Independent Order of Good Templars, which originated in Central New York in 1851, leads all the other compact temperance organizations in numbers and continued success. It now has about 400,000 members in the United States, and perhaps 300,000 more chiefly in England and her colonies. The friends of temperance are organized, more or less thoroughly, in every state of the Union. Forty-one newspapers, the organs of the various temperance bodies, are disseminating information on all sides.

All the great religious denominations among us have given emphatic utterance to their sentiments, not only endorsing fully the principle of total abstinence, but some of them declaring, as did the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1872, that they “regard the manufacture, sale, or the using of intoxicating drinks morally wrong;” recommend the use of unfermented wine on sacramental occasions; and record their conviction that the traffic in alcoholic beverages should be suppressed by the strong arm of the law. There probably is not in Christendom any other body of people so large, and so free from the use of intoxicants, as the evangelical Protestants of the United States. The agitation among us cannot cease till the right is victorious.

IV. The Temperance Cause in Foreign Countries. The first temperance society in the British Isles was formed in New Ross, Ireland, in August, 1829. A society was formed at Greenock, Scotland, in October of the same  year. Early in 1830 a society was organized at Bradford, England. The reform began, as in America, in opposition to the use of distilled spirits only; but in 1833 a society was formed at Preston, England, on the principle of total abstinence from all intoxicating drinks. The British Association for the Promotion of Temperance was formed at Manchester in September. 1835, on this basis; and the new pledge in a few years wholly superseded the old. This organization afterwards changed its name to that of “The British Temperance League.” It is still laboring, with accumulating power. The United Kingdom Alliance was formed in 1853, and is still in vigorous operation and doing excellent service. Its specific aim is the “total legislative suppression of the traffic in intoxicating beverages.” The form of law which the Alliance is laboring to secure is one giving “the rate-payers of each parish and township a power of local veto over the issue of licenses.” A bill, drawn up by Sir Wilfred Lawson, in accordance with this aim,' has been offered in Parliament every year since 1863 without success, but not without encouraging gains. The Alliance, meanwhile, is spending a hundred thousand dollars annually in advocating the measure. The Scottish Temperance League, formed in 1844, combines both branches of the work- the reform of the victim and the legal suppression of the traffic. The temperance sentiment of the Scottish people found expression, in 1854, in what is called the “Forbes McKenzie Act,” a law which closes all public- houses in Scotland during the whole of the Sabbath, and on other days of the week from 11 P.M. to 8 A.M. The League has an income of about $35,000, maintains a vigorous Publication House, and keeps eight or ten lecturers constantly in the field. The Irish Temperance League was organized in Belfast in 1859, for “the suppression of drunkenness by moral suasion, legislative prohibition, and all other lawful means.” It has an income of about $10,000, publishes a journal, and employs agents to labor throughout the island. The women of Great Britain have also organized a Christian Temperance Association, meeting for that purpose at Newcastle- on-Tyne in April, 1876, and they are engaging heartily in the good work.

In Sweden a temperance society was formed in Stockholm in 1831, and some five hundred more in various parts of the kingdom during the next ten years. King Oscar himself became a member, and also caused tracts and papers to be regularly distributed in the army and the navy. Great benefits have followed among the people, and the reform is still progressing. In Australia, Madagascar, India, and China the reform has begun its work, which, we trust, will never cease, in all its broad field, till the enormous  vice and crime at whose extinction it aims shall be found no more among men.

V. Literature. — Many valuable works have been published which treat of the matters that form the basis of the temperance movement, among them the following: Beecher [Lyman], Six Sermons on Temperance (1823); Nott, Lectures on Temperance (1857); Permanent Temperance Documents (1837-42): Bacchus (Lond.); Anti-Bacchus (ibid.); Carpenter, Physiology of Intemperance; Wilson, Pathology of Drunkenness; Pitman, Alcohol and the State; Richardson, Alcohol, and Temperance Lesson Book; Farrar, Talks on Temperance; Lee, Text-book of Temperance; Crane, Arts of Intoxication; Hargreaves, Our Wasted Resources; Lizars, Alcohol and Tobacco; The Prohibitionist's Text-book; Bacchus Dethroned; Hunt, Alcohol as a Food and Medicine; Patton, Bible Wines, o0 Laws of Fermentation; Richardson, Action of Alcohol on the Body and on the Mind; Edmunds, Medical Use of Alcohol; Richardson, Medical Profession and Alcohol, and Moderate Drinking; Storey, Alcohol, its Nature and Effects; The Centennial Temperance Volume. (J. T. C.)

## Temple[[@Headword:Temple]]

             a word used to designate a building dedicated to the worship of a deity. In this article we treat only of the series of edifices erected for that purpose at Jerusalem, and in doing so we present the reconstructions hitherto the latest and most approved, with strictures, however, upon their defects. SEE PALACE.

I. Names. — The usual and appropriate Heb. term for this structure is ןהֵיכָּל, heykâl, which properly denotes a royal residence, and hence the sacred name יַהֹוָה, Jehovah, is frequently added; occasionally it is also qualified by the epithet קדֶשׁ, kâdesh, sanctuary, to designate its sacredness. Sometimes the simpler phrase יְהוָה בֵּית, beyth yehovadh, house of Jehovah, is used; and in lieu of the latter other names of the Deity, especially אֵֹלהַי, elohim, God, are employed. The usual Greek word is ναός, which, however, strictly denotes the central building or fane itself; while the more general term ἱερόν included all the associated structures, i.e. the surrounding courts, etc.  The above leading word הֵיבָּלis a participial noun from the root הָכִל, to hold or receive, and reminds us strongly of the Roman templum, from τέμενος, τέμνω, locus liberatus et effatus. When an augur had defined a space in which he intended to make his observations, he fixed his tent in it (tabernaculum capere), with planks and curtains. In the arx this was not necessary, because there was a permanent auguraculum. The Sept. usually renders היכל, “temple,” by οικος or ναός, but in the Apocrypha and the New Test. it is generally called τὸ ἱερόν. Rabbinical appellations are בֵּית הִמַּקְדָּשׁ, beyfh ham-Mikdash, the house of the sanctuary, הִבְּחַירָה בֵּית, the chosen house, בֵּית הָעֹלָמַים, the house of ages, because the ark was not transferred from it, as it was from Gilgal after 24, from Shiloh after 369, from Nob after 13, and from Gibeon after 50 years. It is also called מָעוֹן, a dwelling, i.e. of God.

In imitation of this nomenclature, the word temple elsewhere in Scripture, in a figurative sense, denotes sometimes the Church of Christ (Rev 3:12): “Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God.” Paul says (2Th 2:4) that Antichrist “as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.” Sometimes it imports heaven (Psa 11:4):

“The Lord is in his holy temple; the Lord's throne is in heaven.” The martyrs in heaven are said to be “before the throne of God, and to serve him day and night in his temple” (Rev 7:15). The soul of a righteous man is the temple of God, because it is inhabited by the Holy Spirit (1Co 3:16-17; 1Co 6:19; 2Co 6:16).

II. History of the Temple and its Several Successors. — The First Temple. After the Israelites had exchanged their nomadic life for a life in permanent habitations, it was becoming that they should exchange also their movable sanctuary or tabernacle for a temple. There elapsed, however, after the conquest of Palestine, several centuries during which the sanctuary continued movable, although the nation became more and more stationary. It appears that the first who planned the erection of a stone-built sanctuary was David, who, when he was inhabiting his house of cedar, and God had given him rest from all his enemies, meditated the design of building a temple in which the ark of God might be placed, instead of being deposited “within curtains,” or in a tent, as hitherto. This design was at first encouraged by the prophet Nathan; but he was afterwards instructed to tell  David that such a work was less appropriate for him, who had been a warrior from his youth, and had shed much blood, than for his son, who should enjoy in prosperity and peace the rewards of his father's victories. Nevertheless, the design itself was highly approved as a token of proper feelings towards the Divine King (2Sa 7:1-12; 1Ch 17:1-14). SEE DAVID.

We learn, moreover, from 1 Kings 5 and 1 Chronicles 22 that David had collected materials which were afterwards employed in the erection of the Temple, which was commenced four years after his death, in the second month (comp. 1Ki 6:1; 2Ch 3:2). This corresponds to May, B.C. 1010. We thus learn that the Israelitish sanctuary had remained movable more than four centuries subsequent to the conquest of Canaan. “In the fourth year of Solomon's reign was the foundation of the house of the Lord laid, in the month Siv; and ill the eleventh year, in the month Bul, which is the eighth month, was the house finished throughout all the parts thereof, and according to all the fashion of it. So was he seven years in building it.” SEE SOLOMON.

The workmen and the materials employed in the erection of the Temple were chiefly procured by Solomon from Hiram, king of Tyre, who was rewarded by a liberal importation of wheat. Josephus states (Ant. 8, 2) that duplicates of the letters which passed between Solomon and king Hiram were still extant in his time, both at Jerusalem and among the Tyrian records. He informs us that the persons employed in collecting and arranging the materials for the Temple were ordered to search out the largest stones for the foundation, and to prepare them for use on the mountains where they were procured, and then convey them to Jerusalem. In this part of the business Hiram's men were ordered to assist. Josephus adds that the foundation was sunk to an astonishing depth, and composed of stones of singular magnitude, and very durable. Being closely mortised into the rock with great ingenuity, they formed a basis adequate to the support of the intended structure. Josephus gives to the Temple the same length and breadth as are given in 1 Kings, but mentions sixty cubits as the height. He says that the walls were composed entirely of white stone; that the walls and ceilings were wainscoted with cedar, which was covered with the purest gold; that the stones were put together with such ingenuity that the smallest interstices were not perceptible, and that the timbers were joined with iron cramps. It is remarkable that after the Temple was finished, it was not consecrated by the high-priest, but by a layman, by the king in person, by means of extemporaneous prayers and sacrifices. SEE SHECHINAH.

The Temple remained the center of public worship for all the Israelites only till the death of Solomon, after which ten tribes forsook this sanctuary. But even in the kingdom of Judah it was from time to time desecrated by altars erected to idols. For instance, “Manasseh built altars for all the host of heaven in the two courts of the house of the Lord. And he caused his son to pass through the fire, and observed times, and used enchantments, and dealt with familiar spirits and wizards; he wrought much wickedness in the sight of the Lord to provoke him to anger. And he set a graven image of the grove that he had made in the house,” etc. Thus we find also that king Josiah commanded Hilkiah, the high-priest, and the priests of the second order to remove the idols of Baal and Asherah from the house of the Lord (2Ki 23:4; 2Ki 23:13): “And the altars that were on the top of the upper chamber of Ahaz which the kings of Judah had made, and the altars which Manasseh had made in the two courts of the house of the Lord, did the king beat down, and brake them down from thence, and cast the dust of them into the brook Kidron.” In fact, we are informed that, in spite of the better means of public devotion which the sanctuary undoubtedly afforded, the national morals declined so much that the chosen nation became worse than the idolaters whom the Lord destroyed before the children of Israel (2Ki 21:9) a clear proof that the possession of external means is not a guarantee for their right use. It appears also that during the times when it was fashionable at court to worship Baal the Temple stood desolate, and that its repairs were neglected (2Ki 12:6-7). We further learn that the cost of the repairs was defrayed chiefly by voluntary contribution, by offerings, and by redemption money (2Ki 12:4-5). The original cost of the Temple seems to have been defrayed by royal bounty, and in great measure by treasures collected by David for that purpose. There was a treasury in the Temple in which much precious metal was collected for the maintenance of public worship. The gold and silver of the Temple were, however, frequently applied to political purposes (1Ki 15:18 sq.; 2Ki 12:18; 2Ki 16:8; 2Ki 18:15). The treasury of the temple was repeatedly plundered by foreign invaders: for instance, by Shishak (1Ki 14:26); by Jehoaoh, king of Israel (2Ki 14:14); by Nebuchadnezzar (2Ki 24:13); and, lastly, again by Nebuchadnezzar, who, having removed the valuable contents, caused the Temple to be burned down (2Ki 25:9 sq.), summer, B.C. 588. The building had stood since its completion 415 years (Josephus has 470, and Rufinus 370, years). Thus terminated what the later Jews called בית הראשון, The first house. SEE JERUSALEM.

2. The Second Temple. — In the year B.C. 536 the Jews obtained permission from Cyrus to colonize their native land. Cyrus commanded also that the sacred utensils which had been pillaged in the first Temple should be restored, and that for the restoration of the Temple assistance should be granted (Ezra 1, 6; 2Ch 36:22 sq.). The first colony which returned under Zerubbabel and Joshua having collected the necessary means, and having also obtained the assistance of Phoenician workmen, commenced in the second year after their return the rebuilding of the Temple, spring, B.C. 535. The Sidonians brought rafts of cedar-trees from Lebanon to Joppa. The Jews refused the co-operation of the Samaritans, who, being thereby offended, induced the king Artachshashta (probably Smerdis) to prohibit the building. It was only in the second year of Darius Hystaspis (summer, B.C. 520) that the building was resumed. It was completed in the sixth year of this king, winter, B.C. 516 (comp. Ezr 5:1; Hag 1:15). According to Josephus (Ant. 11:4, 7), the Temple was completed in the ninth year. of the reign of Darius. The old men who had seen the first Temple were moved to tears on beholding the second, which appeared like nothing in comparison with the first (Ezra 3, 12; Haggai 2, 3 sq.). It seems, however, that it was not so much in dimensions that the second Temple was inferior to the first as in splendor, and in being deprived of the ark of the covenant, which had been burned with the Temple of Solomon. SEE CAPTIVITY.

After the establishment of the Seleucidse in the kingdom of Syria, Antiochus Epiphanes invaded Egypt several times. During his first expedition, B.C. 171, the renegade Menelaus (q.v.) procured the death of the regular high-priest Onias III (q.v.) (2Ma 4:27 sq.); during his second campaign, on retiring for winter-quarters to Palestine, Antiochus slew certain other persons, B.C. 170; and, finally, he pillaged and desecrated the Temple, and subdued and plundered Jerusalem, June, B.C. 168. He also ordered the discontinuance of the daily sacrifice. In December of the same year he caused an altar for sacrifice to Jupiter Olympius to be placed on the altar of Jehovah in the Temple (7, 2, 5). This was “the abomination that maketh desolate.” At the same time, he devoted the temple on Mount Gerizim, in allusion to the foreign origin of its worshippers, to Jupiter. Ξενιός. The Temple at Jerusalem became so desolate that it was overgrown with vegetation (1Ma 4:38; 2Ma 6:4). Three years after this profanation (Dec. 25, B.C. 165) Judas Maccabseus, having defeated the Syrian armies in Palestine, cleansed the  Temple, and again commenced sacrificing to Jehovah upon the altar there. He repaired, the building, furnished new utensils, and erected fortifications against future attacks (1Ma 4:43-60; 1Ma 6:7; 1Ma 13:53; 2Ma 1:18; 2Ma 10:3). Forty-five days after cleansing the sanctuary, Antiochus died. Thus were fulfilled the predictions of Daniel: from “the casting down some of the host and stars,” i.e. slaying some of the pious and influential Jews by Antiochus, especially from the death of Onias, B.C. 171, to the cleansing of the sanctuary, B.C. 165, was six years (of 360 days each) and 140 days, or 2300 days (Dan 8:8-14); from the reduction of Jerusalem, B.C. 168, to the cleansing of the sanctuary, B.C. 165, was three years and a half, i.e. “a time, times, and a half,” or 1290 days (7, 25; 12:7, 11); and from the reduction of Jerusalem, B.C. 168, to the death of Antiochus, which occurred early in B.C. 164, forty-five days after the purification of the Temple, 1335 days. As to the 140 days, we have no certain date in history to reckon them; but if the years are correct, we may well suppose the days to be so (Dan 8:12; Josephus, Ant. 12:7, 6; War, pref. 7; 1, 1, 1; 1Ma 1:46-47; 1Ma 4:38-61; 2Ma 5:11-27; 2Ma 6:1-9). SEE ANTIOCHUS. Alexander Jannaeus, about B.C. 106, separated the court of the priests from the external court by a wooden railing (Josephus, Ant. 13:13, 5). During the contentions among the later Maccabees, Pompey attacked the temple from the north side, caused a great massacre in its courts, but abstained from plundering the treasury, although he even entered the holy of holies, B.C. 63 (ibid. 14,4). Herod the Great, with the assistance of Roman troops, stormed the Temple, B.C. 37; on which occasion some of the surrounding halls were destroyed or damaged. SEE PALESTINE.

3. The Third Temple. — Herod, wishing to ingratiate himself with the Church-and-State party, and being fond of architectural display, undertook not merely to repair the second Temple, but to raise a perfectly new structure. As, however, the Temple of Zerubbabel was not actually destroyed, but only removed after the preparations for the new Temple were completed, there has arisen some debate whether the Temple of Herod could properly be called the third Temple. The reason why the Temple of Zerubbabel was not at once taken down in order to make room for the more splendid structure of Herod is explained by Josephus as follows (Ant. 15:11, 2): “The Jews were afraid that Herod would pull down the whole edifice and not be able to carry his intentions as to its rebuilding into effect; and this danger appeared to them to be very great, and the vastness of the undertaking to be such as could hardly be  accomplished. But while they were in this disposition the king encouraged them, and told them he would not pull down their Temple till all things were gotten ready for building it up entirely. As Herod promised them this beforehand, so he did not break his word with them, but got ready a thousand wagons that were to bring stones for this building, and chose out ten thousand of the most skilful workmen, and bought a thousand sacerdotal garments for as many of the priests, and had some of them taught the arts of stone-cutters, and others of carpenters, and then began to build; but this not till everything was well prepared for the work.” The work was actually commenced in the nineteenth year of the reign of Herod-that is, the beginning of B.C. 21. Priests and Levites finished the Temple itself in one year and a half. The out-buildings and courts required eight years. However, some building operations were constantly in progress under the successors of Herod, and it is in reference to this we are informed that the Temple was finished only under Albinus, the last procurator but one, not long before the commencement of the Jewish war in which the Temple was again destroyed. It is in-reference also to these protracted building operations that the Jews said to Jesus, “Forty and six years was this Temple in building” (Joh 2:20). SEE HEROD.

Under the sons of Herod the Temple remained apparently in good order, and Herod Agrippa, who was appointed by the emperor Claudius its guardian, even planned the repair of the eastern part, which had probably been destroyed during one of the conflicts between the Jews and Romans of which the Temple was repeatedly the scene (Josephus, Ant. 17:10). During the final struggle of the Jews against the Romans, A.D. 70, the Temple was the last scene of the tug of war. The Romans rushed from the Tower of Antonia into the sacred precincts, the halls of which were set on fire by the Jews themselves. It was against the will of Titus that a Roman soldier threw a firebrand into the northern out-buildings of the Temple, which caused the conflagration of the whole structure, although Titus himself endeavored to extinguish the fire (War, 6:4). Josephus remarks,” One cannot but wonder at the accuracy of this period thereto relating; for the same month and day were now observed, as I said before, wherein the holy house was burned formerly by the Babylonians. Now the number of years that passed from its first foundation, which was laid by king Solomon, till this its destruction, which happened in the second year of the reign of Vespasian, are collected to be one thousand one hundred and thirty, besides seven months and fifteen days; and from the second building of it, which was done by Haggai in the second year of Cyrus the king, till its  destruction under Vespasian there were six hundred and thirty-nine years and forty-five days.” The sacred utensils, the golden table of the shew- bread, the book of the law, and the golden candlestick were displayed in the triumph at Rome. Representations of them are still to be seen sculptured in relief on the triumphal arch of Titus (see Fleck, Wissenschaftliche Reise, 1, 1, plate 1-4; and Reland, De Spoliis Templi Hierosolymitani in Arcu Titiano, ed. E. A. Schulze [Traj. ad Rh. 17751). The place where the Temple had stood seemed to be a dangerous center for the rebellious population, until, in A.D. 136, the emperor Hadrian founded a Roman colony under the name AElia Capitolina on the ruins of Jerusalem, and dedicated a temple to Jupiter Capitolinus on the ruins of the Temple of Jehovah. Henceforth no Jew was permitted to approach the site of the ancient Temple, although the worshippers of Jehovah were, in derision, compelled to pay a tax for the maintenance of the Temple of Jupiter (see Dion Cassius [Xiphil.], 69, 12; Jerome, Ad Jes. 2, 9; 6:11 sq.; Eusebius, Hist. Ecc 4:6; Demonstratio Evangelica, 8:18). Under the reign of Constantine the Great some Jews were severely punished for having attempted to restore the Temple (see Fabricii Lux Evangelii, p. 124).

The emperor Julian undertook, in 363, to rebuild the Temple; but, after considerable preparation and much expense, he was compelled to desist by flames which burst forth from the foundations (see Ammianus Marcellinus, 23:1; Socrates, ‘Hist. Eccles. 3, 20; Sozomen, 5, 22; Theodoret, 3, 15; Schröckh, Kirchengeschichte, 6:385 sq.). Repeated attempts have been made to account for these igneous explosions by natural causes; for instance, by the ignition of gases which had long been pent up in subterraneous vaults (see Michaelis, Zerstr. kl. Schrift. 3, 453 sq.). A similar event is mentioned by Josephus (Ant. 16:7, 1), where we are informed that Herod, while plundering the tombs of David and Solomon, was suddenly frightened by flames which burst out and killed two of his soldiers. Bishop Warburton contends for the miraculousness of the event in his discourse Concerning the Earthquake and Fiery Eruption which Defeated Julian's Attempt to Rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem. See also Lotter, Historia Instaurationis Templi lierosolymitani sub Juliano (Lips. 1728, 4to); Michaelis (F. Holzfuss), Diss. de Templi Hi. erosolymitani Juliani Mandato per Judaeosfrustra Tentata Restitutione (Hal. 1751, 4to); Lardner, Collection of Ancient Jewish and Heathen Testimonies, 4:57 sq.; Ernesti, Theol. Bibl. 9:604 sq. R. Tourlet's French translation of the works  of Julian (Paris, 1821), 2, 435 sq., contains an examination of the evidence concerning this remarkable event. See also Jost, Geschichte der Israeliten, 4:211, 254 sq.; and id., Allgemeine Geschichte desjüdischen Volkes, 2, 158. SEE JULIAN.

A splendid mosque now stands on the site of the Temple. This mosque was erected by the caliph Omar after the conquest of Jerusalem by the Saracens in 636. Some think that Omar changed a Christian church which stood on the ground of the Temple into the mosque which is now called El Aksa, the outer, or northern, because it is the third of the most celebrated mosques, two of which, namely, those of Mecca and Medina, are in a more southern latitude. SEE MOSQUE.

III. Situation and Accessories of the Temple. —

1. The site of the Temple is clearly stated in 2Ch 3:1 : “Then Solomon began to build the house of the Lord at Jerusalem in Mount Moriah, where the Lord appeared unto David, his father, in the place that David had prepared in the threshing-floor of Ornan (or Araunah) the Jebusite.” In south-eastern countries the site of the threshing-floors is selected according to the same principles which might guide us in the selection of the site of windmills. ‘We find them usually on the tops of hills which are on all sides exposed to the winds, the current ‘of which is required in order to separate the grain from the chaff. It seems that the summit of Moriah, although large: enough for the agricultural purposes of Araunah, had no level sufficient for the plans of Solomon. According to Josephus (War 5, 5), the foundations of the Temple were laid on a steep eminence, the summit of which was at first insufficient for the Temple and altar. As it was surrounded by precipices, it became necessary to build up walls and buttresses in order to gain more ground by filling up the interval with earth. The hill was also fortified by a threefold wall, the lowest tier of which was in some places more than three hundred cubits high; and the depth of the foundation was not visible, because it had been necessary in some parts to dig deep into the ground in order to obtain sufficient support. The dimensions of the stones of which the walls were composed were enormous; Josephus mentions a length of forty cubits. It is, however, likely that some parts of the fortifications of Moriah were added at a later period. As we shall eventually see, the position and dimensions of the present area of the Haran reasonably correspond to the requirements of the several ancient accounts of the Temple. There can be little doubt, looking  at the natural conformation of the rocky hill itself, that the central building always occupied the summit where the Mosque of Omar now stands. Tile theory of Fergusson (in Smith's Dict. of the Bible, and elsewhere) that it was situated in the extreme south-west corner of the present platform has not met with acceptance among archaeologists. SEE MORIAH.

The Temple was in ancient warfare almost impregnable, from the ravines at the precipitous edge of which it stood; but it required more artificial fortifications on its western and northern sides, which were surrounded by the city of Jerusalem; for this reason there was erected at its north-western corner the Tower of Antonia, which, although standing on a lower level than the Temple itself, was so high as to overlook the sacred buildings, with which it was connected partly by a large staircase, partly by a subterraneous communication. This tower protected the Temple from sudden incursions from the city of Jerusalem, and from dangerous commotions among the thousands who were frequently assembled within the precincts of the courts; which also were sometimes used for popular meetings. SEE ANTONIA.

2. Many savants have adopted a style as if they possessed much information about the archives of the Temple; there are a few indications from which we learn that important documents were deposited in the Tabernacle and Temple. Even in Deu 31:26, we find that the book of the law was deposited in the ark of the covenant; and according to 2Ki 22:8, Hilkiah rediscovered the book of the law in the house of Jehovah. In 2 Maccabees 2, 13 we find a βιβλιοθήκη mentioned, apparently consisting chiefly of the canonical books, and probably deposited in the Temple. In Josephus (War, 5, 5) it is mentioned that a book of the law was found in the Temple. It appears that the sacred writings were kept in the Temple (Ant. 5, 1, 17). Copies of political documents seem to have been deposited in the treasury of the Temple (1Ma 14:49). This treasury, ὁ ἱερὸς θησαυρός, was managed by an inspector, γαζυφύλαξ, גזבר, and it contained the great sums which were annually paid in by the Israelites, each of whom paid a half-shekel, and many of whom sent donations in money and precious vessels, ἀναθήματα. Such costly presents were especially transmitted by rich proselytes, and even sometimes by pagan princes (2 Maccabees 3, 3; Josephus, Ant. 14:16, 4; 18:3, 5; 19:6, 1; War, 2, 17, 3; 5, 13, 6; Cont. Apion. 2, 5; Philo, Opp. 2, 59 sq., 569). It is said especially that Ptolemy Philadelphus was very liberal to the Temple, in order to prove his gratitude for having been permitted to procure the Sept. translation  (Aristeas, De Translat. LXX, p. 109 sq.). The gifts exhibited in the Temple are mentioned in Luk 21:5; we find even that the rents of the whole town of Ptolemais were given to the Temple (1Ma 10:39). There were also preserved historical curiosities (2Ki 11:10), especially the arms of celebrated heroes (Josephus, Ant. 19:6, 1): this was also the case in the Tabernacle.

The Temple was of so much political importance that it had its own guards (φύλακες τοῦ ἱεροῦ), which were commanded by a στρατηγός. Twenty men were required for opening and shutting the eastern gate (Josephus, War, 6:5, 3; Cont. Apion. 2, 9; Ant. 6:5,3; 17:2, 2). The στρατηγός had his own secretary (Ant. 20, 6, 2; 9, 3), and had to maintain the police in the courts (comp. Act 4:1; Act 5:24). He appears to have been of sufficient dignity to be mentioned together with the chief priests. It seems that his Hebrew title was הִר הִבִּיַת אַישׁ, the man of the mountain of the house (Middoth, 1, 2). The priests themselves kept watch on three different posts, and the Levites on twenty-one posts. It was the duty of the police of the Temple to prevent women from entering the inner court, and to take care that no person who was Levitically unclean should enter within the sacred precincts. Gentiles were permitted to pass the first enclosure, which was therefore called the Court of the Gentiles; but persons who were on any account Levitically unclean were not permitted to advance even thus far. Some sorts of uncleanness, for instance that arising from the touch of a corpse, excluded only from the court of the men. If an unclean person had entered by mistake, he was required to offer sacrifices of purification. The high-priest himself was forbidden to enter the holy of holies under penalty of death on any other day than the Day of Atonement (Philo, Opp. 2, 591). Nobody was admitted within the precincts of the Temple who carried a stick or a basket, and who wanted to pass merely to shorten his way, or who had dusty shoes (Middoth, 2, 2).

IV. General Types of the Temple. — There is perhaps no building of the ancient world which has excited so much attention since the time of its destruction as the Temple which Solomon built at Jerusalem, and its successor as rebuilt by Herod. Its spoils were considered worthy of forming the principal illustration of one of the most beautiful of Roman triumphal arches, and Justinian's highest architectural ambition was that he might surpass it. Throughout the Middle Ages it influenced to a considerable degree the forms of Christian churches, and its peculiarities  were the watchwords and rallying-points of all associations of builders. Since the revival of learning in the 16th century its arrangements have employed the pens of numberless learned antiquarians, and architects of every country have wasted their science in trying to reproduce its forms.

But it is not only to Christians that the Temple of Solomon is so interesting; the whole Mohammedan world look to it as the foundation of all architectural knowledge, and the Jews still recall its glories and sigh over their loss with a constant tenacity, unmatched by that of any other people to any other building of the ancient world.

With all this interest and attention, it might fairly be assumed that there was nothing more to be said on such a subject-that every source of information had been ransacked, and every form of restoration long ago exhausted, and some settlement of the disputed points arrived at which had been generally accepted. This is, however, far from being the case, and few things would be more curious than a collection of the various restorations that have been proposed, as showing what different meanings may be applied to the same set of simple architectural terms.

When the French expedition to Egypt, in the first years of this century, had made the world familiar with the wonderful architectural remains of that country, every one jumped to the conclusion that Solomon's Temple must have been designed after an Egyptian model, forgetting entirely how hateful that land of bondage was to the Israelites, and how completely all the ordinances of their religion were opposed to the idolatries they had escaped from forgetting, too, the centuries which had elapsed since the Exode before the Temple was erected, and how little communication of any sort there had been between the two countries in the interval. Nevertheless, as we shall presently see, the Egyptian monuments remarkably confirm, in many respects, the ancient accounts of the Temple at Jerusalem.

The Assyrian discoveries of Botta and Lavard have within the last twenty years given an entirely new direction to the researches of the restorers, and this time with a very considerable prospect of success, for the analogies are now true, and whatever can be brought to bear on the subject is in the right direction. The original seats of the progenitors of the Jewish races were in Mesopotamia. Their language was practically the same as that spoken on the banks of the, Tigris. Their historical traditions were consentaneous, and, so far as we can judge, almost all the outward symbolism of their  religion was the same, or nearly so. Unfortunately, however, no Assyrian temple has yet been exhumed of a nature to throw much light on this subject, and we are still forced to have recourse to the later buildings at Persepolis, or to general deductions from the style of the nearly contemporary secular buildings at Nineveh and elsewhere, for such illustrations as are available. These, although in a general way illustrative, yet by no means, in our opinion, suffice for all that is required for Solomon's Temple. For some architectural features of that erected by Herod we must doubtless look to Rome. Of the intermediate Temple erected by Zerubbabel we know very little, but, from the circumstance of its having been erected under Persian influences contemporaneously with the buildings at Persepolis, it is perhaps the one of which it would be most easy to restore the details with anything like certainty. Yet we must remember that both these later temples were essentially Jewish, i.e. Phoenician, in their style; and we may there, fore presume that the original type, which we know was copied in plan, was likewise imitated in details to a very great degree. There are, however, two sources of illustration with which the Temple was historically connected in a very direct manner, and to these we therefore devote a brief attention before considering the several edifices in detail.

1. The Tabernacle erected by Moses in the desert was unquestionably the pattern, in all its essential features, of its Solomonic successor. In the gradually increasing sanctity of the several divisions, as well as in their strikingly proportionate dimensions, we find the Temple little more than the Tabernacle on an enlarged scale, and of more substantial materials. This is so obvious that we need not dwell upon it. SEE TABERNACLE.

2. The Egyptian Temples, in their conventional style, evince, notwithstanding their idolatrous uses, a wonderful relation to both the Tabernacle and the Temple. As will be seen from the accompanying plan of the Temple of Denderah, which is one of the simplest and most symmetrical as well as the best preserved of its class, there is a striking agreement in the points of the compass, in the extra width of the porch, in the anterior holy place, in the interior shrine, in the side-rooms, in the columnar halls; and in the grander Egyptian temples, such as the earlier portions of those at Luxor and Karnak, we have the two obelisks at the portal like the pillars Jachin and Boaz. These coincidences cannot have been accidental. Nor is this general adoption of a plan already familiar to  the Hebrews inconsistent with the divine prescription of the details of architecture (Exo 25:9; 1Ch 28:12). SEE EGYPT.

V. Detailed Description of Solomon's Temple. —

1. Ancient Accounts. — The Temple itself and its utensils are described in 1Ki 6:7 and 2Ch 3:4. According to these passages, the Temple was 60 cubits long, 20 wide, and 30 high. Josephus, however (Ant. 8:3, 2), says, “The Temple was 60 cubits high and 60 cubits in length, and the breadth was 20 cubits; above this was another stage of equal dimensions, so that the height of the whole structure was 120 cubits.” It is difficult to reconcile this statement with that given in 1 Kings, unless we suppose that the words ισος τοῖς μέτροις, equal in measures, do not signify an equality in all dimensions, but only as much as equal in the number of cubits; so that the porch formed a kind of steeple, which projected as much above the roof of the Temple as the roof itself was elevated above its foundations. As the Chronicles agree with Josephus in asserting that the summit of the porch was 120 cubits high, there remains still another apparent contradiction to be solved, namely, how Josephus could assert that the Temple itself was 60 cubits high, while we read in 1 Kings that its height was only 30 cubits. We suppose that in the book of Kings the internal elevation of the sanctuary. is stated, and that Josephus describes its external elevation, which, including the basement and an upper story (which may have existed, consisting of rooms for the accommodation of priests, containing also vestries and treasuries), might be double the internal height of the sanctuary. The internal dimension of the “holy” which was called in preference הֵיכָל, was 40 cubits long, 20 cubits wide, and 30 cubits high. The holy was separated from the “holy of holies” (דְּבַיר) by a partition, a large opening in which was closed by a suspended curtain. The holy of holies was on the western extremity of the entire building, and its internal dimensions formed a cube of 20 cubits. On the eastern extremity of the building stood the porch, אוּלָם, πρόναος. At the entrance of this pronaos stood the two columns called Jachin and Boaz, which were 35 cubits high.

The Temple was also surrounded by a triple יָצַיע, story of chambers, each of which stories was five cubits high, so that there remained above ample space for introducing the windows, somewhat in the manner of a clear-  story to the sanctuary. Now the statement of Josephus, who says that each of these stories of chambers (עְלִעוֹת) was 20 cubits high, cannot be reconciled with the Biblical statements, and may prove that he was no very close reader of his authorities. Perhaps he had a vague kind of information that the chambers reached half-way up the height of the building, and, taking the maximum height of 120 cubits instead of the internal height of the holy, he made each story four times too high. The windows which are mentioned in 1Ki 6:4 consisted probably of latticework. The lowest stair of the chambers was five cubits, the middle six, and the third seven cubits wide. This difference of the width arose from the circumstance that the external walls of the Temple were so thick that they were made to recede one cubit after an elevation of five feet, so that the scarcement in the wall of the Temple gave a firm support to the beams which supported the second story, without being inserted into the wall of the sanctuary; this insertion being perhaps avoided not merely for architectural reasons, but also because it appeared to be irreverent. The third story was supported likewise by a similar scarcement, which afforded a still wider space for the chamber of the third story. These observations will render intelligible the following Biblical statements: “And against the wall of the house he built stories round about, both of the Temple and of the oracle; and he made chambers round about. The nethermost story was five cubits broad, and the middle was six cubits broad, and the third was seven cubits broad; for without in the wall of the house he made narrowed nests (מַגְרָעוֹת, narrowings or rebatements) round about, so that the beams should not be fastened in the walls of the house. The house, when it was in building, was built of stone made ready before it was brought thither; so that there was neither hammer,: nor axe, nor any tool of iron heard in the house while it was building. The door of the middle story was in the right side of the house; and they went up with winding stairs into the middle story, and out of the middle into the third. So he built the house, and finished it; and covered the house with beams and boards of cedar. And then he built chambers against all the house, five cubits high; and they rested on the house with timber of cedar” (1Ki 6:7). From this description it may be inferred that the entrance to these stories was from without; but some architects have supposed that it was from within; which arrangement seems to be against the general aim of impressing the Israelitish worshippers with sacred awe by the seclusion of their sanctuary.  In reference to the windows, it should be observed that they served chiefly for ventilation; since the light within the Temple was obtained from the sacred candlesticks. It seems, from the descriptions of the Temple, to be certain that the דְּבַיר, oracle, or holy of holies, was an adytum without windows. To this fact Solomon appears to refer when he spake, “The Lord said that he would dwell in the thick darkness” (1Ki 8:12).

The דַּבַיר, oracle, had perhaps no other opening than the entrance, which was, as we may infer from the prophetic visions of Ezekiel (which probably correspond with' the historic Temple of Solomon), six cubits wide. From 1Ki 7:10, we learn that the private dwellings of Solomon were built of massive stone. We hence infer that the framework of the Temple also consisted of the same material. The Temple was, however, wainscoted with cedar wood, which was covered with gold. The boards within the Temple were ornamented by beautiful carvings representing cherubim, palms, and flowers. The ceiling of the Temple was supported by beams of cedar wood (comp. Pliny, Hist. Nat. 16:69). The wall which separated the holy from the holy of holies probably consisted not of stone, but of beams of cedar. It seems, further, that the partition partly consisted of an opus reticulatum, so that the incense could spread from the holy to the most holy. This we infer from 1Ki 6:21 : “So Solomon overlaid the house within with pure gold; and he made a partition by the chains of gold before the oracle, and he overlaid it with gold.”

The floor of the Temple was throughout of cedar, but boarded over with planks of fir (1Ki 6:15). The doors of the oracle were composed of olive-tree; but the doors of the outer temple had posts of olive-tree arid leaves of fir (1Ki 6:31 sq.). Both doors, as well that which led into the Temple as that which led from the holy to the holy of holies, had folding- leaves, which, however, seem to have been usually kept open, the aperture being closed by a suspended curtain-a contrivance still seen at the church- doors in Italy, where the church doors usually stand open; but the doorways can be passed only by moving aside a heavy curtain. From 2Ch 3:5, it appears that the greater house was also ceiled with fir. It is stated in 2Ch 3:5-9 “that the weight of the nails employed in the Temple was fifty shekels of gold;” and also that Solomon “overlaid the upper chambers with gold.”

The lintel and side posts of the oracle seem to have circumscribed a space which contained one fifth of the whole area of the partition; and the posts  of the door of the Temple one fourth of the area of the wall in which they were placed. Thus we understand the passage 1Ki 6:31-35, which also states that the door was covered with carved work overlaid with gold.

Within the holy of holies stood only the Ark of the Covenant; but within the holy were ten golden candlesticks and the altar of incense. SEE ALTAR; SEE CANDLESTICK.

The Temple was surrounded by an inner court, which in Chronicles is called the court of the priests, and in Jeremiah the higher court. This, again, was surrounded by a wall consisting of cedar beams placed on a stone foundation (1Ki 6:36): “And he built the, inner court with three rows of hewed stone, and a row of cedar beams.” This enclosure, according to Josephus (Ant. 8:3, 9), was three cubits high. Besides this inner court, there is mentioned a great court (2Ch 4:9) “Furthermore, he made the court of the priests, and the great court, and doors for the court, and overlaid the doors of them with brass.” It seems that this was also called the outward court (comp. Eze 40:17). This court was also more especially called the court of the Lord's house (Jer 19:14; Jer 26:2). These courts were surrounded by spacious buildings, which, however, according to Josephus (War, 5, 5, 1), seem to have been partly added at a period later than that of Solomon. For instance (2Ki 15:35), Jotham is said to have built the higher gate of the house of the Lord. In Jer 26:10; Jer 36:10 there is mentioned a new gate (comp. also Eze 40:5-47; Eze 42:1-14). But this prophetic vision is not strictly historical, although it may serve to illustrate history (comp. also Josephus, Ant. 8:3, 9). The third entry into the house of the Lord mentioned in Jer 38:14 does not seem to indicate that there were three courts, but appears to mean that the entry into the outer court was called the first, that into the inner court the second, and the door of the sanctuary the third. It is likely that these courts were quadrilateral. In the visions of Ezekiel they form a square of four hundred cubits. The inner court contained towards the east the altar of burnt-offering, the brazen sea, and ten brazen lavers; and it seems that the sanctuary did not stand in the center of the inner court, but more towards the west. From these descriptions we learn that the Temple of Solomon was not distinguished by magnitude, but by good architectural proportions, beauty of workmanship, and costliness of materials. Many of our churches have an external form not unlike that of the Temple of Solomon. In fact, this Temple seems to have been the pattern of ‘our church buildings, to which the chief addition  has been the Gothic arch. Among others, the Roman Catholic Church at Dresden is supposed to bear much resemblance to the Temple of Solomon.

2. Modern Reconstructions. — It thus appears that as regards the building itself we have little more than a few fragmentary notices, which are quite insufficient to enable us to make out a correct architectural representation of it, or even to arrive at a very definite idea of many things belonging to its complicated structure and arrangements. All attempts that have been made in this direction have utterly failed, and, for the most part, have proceeded on entirely wrong principles. Such, was remarkably the case with the first great work upon the subject by professedly Christian writers namely, the portion of the commentary on Ezekiel by the Spanish Jesuits Pradus and Villapandus (1596-1604) which treats of the Temple. It was accompanied by elaborate calculations and magnificent drawings; but the whole proceeded on a series of mistakes-first, that the Temple of Ezekiel was a delineation of that which had been erected by Solomon; secondly, that this was again exactly reproduced in Herod's; and, thirdly, that the style of architecture from the first was of the Greeco-Roman character-all quite groundless suppositions. Their idea of Solomon's Temple was that both in dimensions and arrangement it was very like the Escurial in Spain. But it is by no means clear whether the Escurial was in process of building while their book was in the press in order to look like the Temple, or whether its authors took their idea of the Temple from the palace. At all events, their design is so much the more beautiful and commodious of the two that we cannot but regret that Herrera was not employed on the book and the Jesuits set to build the palace. Various other writers, chiefly on the Continent, followed in the same line — Haffenreffer, Capellus (Τρισάγιον, printed in the Crit. Sacri), Lightfoot, Sturm (in Ugolino), Lamy, Semmler, Mela notice of whose treatises, some of them large and ponderous, may be seen in Bahr, Salomonische Tempel (§ 3).

They are now of comparatively little use' Lightfoot's, as Bahr admits, is the best of the whole, being more clear, learned, and solidly grounded in its representations But it has chiefly to do, as its title indicates (The Temple, especially as it stood in the Days of Our Savior), with the Temple of Herod, and but very briefly refers to the Temple of Solomon. An essentially different class of writings on the Temple sprang up after the middle of last century, introduced by J. D. Michaelis, which, in the spirit of the times, made little account of anything but the outward material  structure, this being regarded as a sort of copy-though usually in a very inferior style of art of some of the temples of heathen antiquity. It is only during the present century that any serious efforts have been made to construct an idea of Solomon's Temple on right principles; that is, on the ground simply of the representations made concerning it in Scripture, and with a due regard to the purposes for which it was erected, and the differences as well as the resemblances between it and heathen temples of the same Hera. A succession of works or treatises with this view has appeared, almost exclusively in Germany, several of them by architects and antiquarians, with special reference to the history of the building art. They differ very much in merit; and in one of the latest, as perhaps also the ablest, of the whole, the treatise of Bahr already referred to (published in 1848), a review is given of the aim and characteristics of preceding investigations. As a general result, it has been conclusively established on the negative side, and is now generally acquiesced in, that the means entirely fail us for presenting a full and detailed representation, in an architectural respect, of the Temple and its related buildings. Its being cast in the rectilinear and chest form plainly distinguished it from erections in the Greek and Roman style; and, if the employment of Phoenician artists might naturally suggest some approach in certain parts to Phoenician models, it is, on the other hand, admitted by the most careful investigators in this particular department of antiquarian study that little or nothing is known of the Phoenician style of building (Bahr, p. 46). We here present the delineations of several later antiquaries, which show how variously the historical descriptions are interpreted and applied.

Entirely different from the foregoing is Prof., Paine's idea of the Temple, arising from his interpretation of the “enlarging” and winding about still upward” of Eze 41:7 to mean an over jutting of the upper chambers by galleries (Temple of Solomon, p, 38). — A serious objection to such an arrangement is the insecurity of a building thus widening at the top.

VI. Zerubbabel's Temple. — We have very few particulars regarding the Temple which the Jews-erected after their return from the Captivity, and no description that would enable us to realize its appearance. But there are some dimensions given in the Bible and elsewhere which are extremely interesting as affording points of comparison between it and the temples which preceded it or were erected after it.

The first and most authentic are those given in the book of Ezr 6:3 when quoting the decree of Cyrus, wherein it is said, “Let the house be builded, the place where they offered sacrifices, and: let the foundations thereof be strongly laid; the height thereof threescore cubits, and the breadth thereof threescore cubits; with three rows of, great stones, and a row of new timber.” Josephus quotes this passage almost literally (Ant. 11:4, 6), but in doing so enables us to translate “row” (Chald. נַדְבָּךְ, layer) as story (δόμος, so also the Sept.) as, indeed, the sense would lead us to infer-for it could only apply to the three stories of chambers that surrounded Solomon's, and afterwards Herod's, Temple; and with this again we come to the wooden structure which surmounted the Temple and formed a fourth story. It may be remarked, in passing, that this dimension of sixty cubits in height accords perfectly with the words which Josephus puts into the mouth of Herod (ibid. 15:11,1) when he makes him say that the Temple built after the Captivity wanted sixty cubits of the height of that of Solomon. For, as he had adopted, as we have seen above, the height of one hundred and twenty cubits, as written in the Chronicles, for that Temple, this one remained only sixty. The other dimension of sixty cubits in breadth is twenty cubits in excess of that of Solomon's Temple; but there is no reason to doubt its correctness, for we find, both from Josephus and the Talmud, that it was the dimension adopted for the Temple when rebuilt, or rather repaired, by Herod. At the same time, we have no authority for assuming that any increase was made in the dimensions of either the holy place or the holy of holies, since we find that these were retained in Ezekiel's description of an ideal Temple, and were afterwards those of Herod's. As this Temple of Zerubbabel was still standing in Herod's time, and was, more strictly speaking, repaired rather than rebuilt  by him, we cannot conceive that any of its dimensions were then diminished. We are left, therefore, with the alternative of assuming that the porch and the chambers all round were twenty cubits in width, including the thickness of the walls, instead of ten cubits, as in the earlier building. This may, perhaps, to some extent, be accounted for by the introduction of a passage between the Temple and the rooms of the priest's lodgings, instead of each being a thoroughfare, as must certainly have been the case in Solomon's Temple. This alteration in the width of the Pteromata made the Temple one hundred cubits in length by sixty in breadth, with a eight it is said, of sixty cubits, including the upper room, or Talar, though we cannot help suspecting that this last dimension is somewhat in excess of the truth.

The only other description of this Temple is found in Hecataeus the Abderite, who wrote shortly after the death of Alexander the Great. As quoted by Josephus (Cont. Revelation 1, 22), he says that “in Jerusalem, towards the middle of the city, is a stone-walled enclosure about five hundred feet in length (ὡς πεντάπλεθρος) and one hundred cubits in width, with double gates, in which he describes the Temple as being situated. It may be that at this age it was found necessary to add a court for the women or the Gentiles, a sort of Narthex or Galilee for those who could not enter the Temple. If this, or these together, were one hundred cubits square, it would make up the “nearly five plethora” of our author. Hecatseus also mentions that the altar was twenty cubits square and ten high. Although he mentions the Temple itself, he unfortunately does not supply us with any dimensions.

The Temple of Zerubbabel had several courts (αὐλαί) and cloisters or cells (πρόθυρα). Josephus distinguishes an internal and external ἱερόν, and mentions cloisters in the courts. This Temple was connected with the town by means of a bridge (Ant. 14:4).

VII. Ezekiel's Temple. — The vision of a temple which the prophet Ezekiel saw while residing on the banks of the Chebar in Babylonia, in the twenty-fifth year of the Captivity, does not add much to our knowledge of the subject. It is not a description of a temple that ever was built or ever could be erected at Jerusalem, and can consequently only be considered as the beau ideal of what a Shemitic temple ought to be. As such it would certainly be interesting if it could be correctly restored; but, unfortunately, the difficulties of making out a complicated plan from a mere verbal  description are very great indeed, and are enhanced in this instance by our imperfect knowledge of the exact meaning of the Hebrew architectural terms, and it may also be from the prophet describing not what he actually knew, but only what he saw in a vision.

Be this as it may, we find that the Temple itself was of the exact dimensions of that built by Solomon, viz. an adytum (Eze 40:1-4) twenty cubits square, a naos twenty by forty, and surrounded by cells of ten cubits' width, including the thickness of the walls; the whole, with the porch, making up forty cubits by eighty. The height, unfortunately, is not given. Beyond this were various courts and residences for the priests, and places for sacrifice and other ceremonies of the Temple, till he comes to the outer court, which measured five hundred reeds on each of its sides; each reed (Eze 40:5) was six Babylonian cubits long, viz. of cubits each of one ordinary cubit and a handbreadth, or, at the lowest estimate, twenty-one inches. The reed was therefore at least ten feet six inches, and the side consequently five thousand two hundred and fifty Greek feet, or within a few feet of an English mile, considerably more than the whole area of the city of Jerusalem, Temple included.

It has been attempted to get over this difficulty by saying that the prophet meant cubits, not reeds; but this is quite untenable. Nothing can be more clear than the specification of the length of the reed, and nothing more careful than the mode in which reeds are distinguished from cubits throughout; as, for instance, in the next two verses (Eze 40:6-7), where a chamber and a gateway are mentioned each of one reed. If “cubit” were substituted, it would be nonsense. Nevertheless, Prof. Paine has given a reconstruction of this as well as the actual Temple, for the description and dimensions in the vision are consistent with themselves and capable of being plotted down.

Notwithstanding its ideal character, the whole is extremely curious, as showing what were the aspirations of the Jews in this direction, and how different they were from those of other nations; and it is interesting here, inasmuch as there-can be little doubt but that the arrangements of Herod's Temple were in some measure influenced by the description here given. The outer court, for instance, with: its porticos measuring five hundred cubits each way, is an exact counterpart, on a smaller scale, of the outer court of Ezekiel's Temple, and is not found in either Solomon's or  Zerubbabel's; arid so: too, evidently, are several of the internal arrangements. SEE EZEKIEL.

VIII. Herod's Temple. — The most full, explicit, and trustworthy information on this subject is contained ill that tract of the Jewish Talmud entitled Middoth (i.e. “measures”), which is almost as minute in its descriptions and dimensions (no doubt by parties who had seen, and ,as priests been familiar with, the edifice) as a modern architect's specifications. Besides this, the two descriptions of the temple, incidentally given by Josephus (ut sup.) are three consecutive accounts of the ancient structure. Our principal attempt will therefore be to follow these where they agree, and to reconcile their seeming discrepancies going at the same time all important allusions in the Bible and uninspired historians of antiquity, and constantly comparing the whole with the indications on the modern site. Occasional use, for verification, may be made of the measures in the spiritual temple of Ezekiel 40-42, but: with great caution, as but few of' them seem to have been borrowed from the actual type which, moreover, was Solomon's Temple, and not Herod's

(I.) The OUTER CIRCUIT OF THE TEMPLE. We assume that the present enclosure of the Haram corresponds to the areas of the Temple and of the Tower Antonia taken together; and the most convenient mode of considering the general contour of the outer wall will be after presenting the following arrangements:

1. Remains of cyclopean masonry are still found at intervals on all the sides of the present enclosure of the peculiar beveled character which marks their antiquity. The English engineers engaged in the late Ordinance survey traced all these along the southern end, and found them resting on the native rock, some of them still retaining the marks of the original Tyrian workmen (see Recovery of Jerusalem, p. 108). Now Josephus informs us (Ant. 15, 11, 3; War, 5, 5, 1) that the area of Moriah was enlarged by building up enormous walls from the valleys and filling them in with earth. The lower courses of these seem to have been buried under the rubbish that fell upon them from the demolition of the upper part of the walls, and have thus escaped. It is difficult to suppose that such masonry could have been the work of later times, or that the area would have been altered after such  prodigious bounds had been set to it. Particular coincidences of ruins on the eastern, southern, and western sides will be noted in giving the circuit of the wall in detail. The “Jews Wailing-place” along the western wall is agreed upon all hands to be a veritable mark of antiquity, going back at least as far as the time of Herod.

2. The enormous vaulted substructions found under the southern end of the Haram are evidently the same which would be left between these embankments and the native rock; and it was apparently among these that the tyrant Simon subsisted till after the destruction of the city (Josephus, War, 7:2, 4). But especially does Maimonides speak expressly of the arches supporting the ground on-this part in order to prevent graves and other pollution beneath (Lightfoot, Prospects of the Temple, ch. 1).

3. That the platform (not the mere building) of the Tower Antonia occupied the whole northern end of this enclosure we think is nearly certain from the following facts:

a. The scarped rock and wall on this side can be no other than the precipice, rendered more inaccessible by art, above which Josephus states that this tower, as ‘well as those at the other corners of its courts, was reared (War, 5, 5, 8). No such ridge can be found to the north of this.

b. The presence of the fosse (found in the modern “Pool of Bethesda”) on this part seems ‘to limit its site. This ditch is not only referred to in the several notices of Antonia by Josephus above cited, but in Ant. 14:4,1, 2 he speaks of it as being “broad and deep,” “of immense depth;” so that it could hardly, have failed to remain as a landmark in all ages.

c. The projecting bastions at the north-west and northeast angles appear to be the relics of the towers at these corners, and the projection at the Golden Gate may have been connected with the tower at the south-east corner.

d. The present barracks of the Turkish troops are on the traditionary site of the Tower of Antonia at the northwest corner of the Haram.

4. The actual size of the present enclosure agrees remarkably with the dimensions of the Temples and Antonia's areas. According to the Talmud (Middoth, 2, 1), the outer court of the Temple was 500 cubits square, which, taking the most approved estimate of the Jewish or Egyptian cubit at 1.824 feet, SEE CUBIT, would give 912 feet as the length of each side.  Now the total length of the southern wall of the Haram is 922 feet, which will allow 5 feet for the thickness (at the surface) of each wall, a coincidence that cannot be accidental. Again, Josephus gives the distance around the whole enclosure of the Temple and Antonia together as being six stadia (War, 5, 5, 2); and if we subtract from this his estimate of four stadia for the circuit of the Temple (Ant. 15:11, 3), we have one stadium, or about 606 feet, for the additional length of the court of Antonia northward on each side. Now this added to the square whose base has just been found will give about 1521 feet for the sides of the entire enclosure on the east and west; and it is a remarkable fact that the length of the Haram in this direction, according to the Ordnance Survey, averages 1540 feet, leaving again 5 feet for the thickness of each of the three walls. We are not sure, however, but that a somewhat greater thickness should be allowed the outer wall, which (on the west side, at least) Josephus says was “broad” (War, 6:3, 1), and on all sides “very strong” (Ant. 14:4, 1).

On this point, however, there are some considerations that at first seem to be powerful objections:

(a) Josephus, in the passage last referred to, makes the Temple area only a stadium square. But this is evidently nothing more than a round number from mere recollection, measured only by the eye; whereas the Talmud is so minute in its interior specification that there can be little doubt which to follow. The 500 reeds in the measurement of the spiritual temple by Ezekiel (Eze 42:16-20) seem to have been taken from these 500 cubits.

(b) The modern area is not rectangular, nor are its opposite sides parallel or of equal length; the south-west corner is the only one that has been positively settled as being aright angle, and the north side is certainly longer than that on the south. We do not conceive, therefore, that the term “square” in the Mishna and Josephus need be so strictly taken, but only to mean that the area was a quadrilateral, apparently rectangular to the eye, and of equal dimensions on the east, south, and west sides, which are exposed to view. This mode of reconcilement, we think, is better than to suppose the line on either of these sides to have been shifted in the face of every possible evidence of identity. By running the dividing line between the Temple and the court of Antonia immediately south of the Golden Gate (so as to make this latter, which is evidently ancient, the entrance to Antonia, and not to the Temple, which had but one eastern gate), we  obtain another right angle, and make the four sides of the Temple area nearly equal.

Having thus settled the general line of the outer wall of the Temple, it remains to trace the objects of interest lying along it, both on the inner and outer sides, in which endeavor we will begin. On the south-west corner. Here was the famous bridge of which Josephus so often speaks (Ant. 14:4, 2, twice; War, 1, 7, 2; 2, 16, 3; 6:6, 2; 8, 1). Accordingly, in the foundation-stones on the western side of the present wall, 39 feet from the south corner, may still be seen the three lower courses (50 feet long) of the first arch, evidently, of this bridge, which spanned the Tyropoeon. A measurement of the curve indicates that the span of the entire arch was about 45.feet (see these details in the Ordnance Survey, p. 27), so that seven such arches would conveniently extend across the valley (350 feet, the remaining 125 feet. to the wall being embankment) and allow suitable piers between them. This was evidently the “passage over the intermediate valley,” through which

2. The first gate (from the south) on the western side of the Temple “led to the king's palace” on Zion (Josephus, Ant. 15:11, 5). This passage seems to have been originally built by Solomon (1Ki 10:5; 2Ch 9:4). The arches, however, may belong to the time of the reconstruction of the bridge, perhaps by Herod. Here, We think, must be located “the gate Shallecheth (literally, a “casting down,” perhaps with reference to the steepness of the valley), by the causeway of the going up” to Zion (1Ch 26:16; comp. 1Ch 26:18); although Lightfoot places them both at the northern end of the Temple wall, reading Josephus's four gates in a southward order (Works, 9:226). There exists still, in fact, a sort of embankment not far north of this spot, across which the “upper level” aqueduct from Bethlehem is probably carried to Moriah. This is apparently the same with the gate anciently named Sur (2Ki 11:6), otherwise called the Gate of the Foundation (2Ch 23:5)., The reason of the name “Sur” (literally, “removed”) is quite uncertain. The “foundation” may refer to the high base of the wall supporting the- bridge adjoining. It seems to have been this passage between the abode of the usurping Athaliah on Zion and the refuge of the young king in the Temple proper that was specially guarded; the guards were three and the same in each, but differently named: one section was at the Horse Gate (at “the king's  house”), another at the other end of the bridge (at this “gate of Sur,” or “of the foundation”), and the third at the gates of the inner enclosure (“the doors” generally, “the gate behind the [former] guard”); so that if any enemy passed the first two among “the people in the [outer] courts,” he should still be intercepted by the last before reaching the prince. Lightfoot interprets differently (Works, 9:326). In the Talmud it is explicitly said that there was (apparently but) one gate in the western Temple wall, and in the same connection the gates are repeatedly referred to as being five in number, of which four are assigned to the other sides (Middoth, 1, 1, 3). This single western one is there called Kipbnus (ibid. 1, 3). That this was the same with the gate in question, we think to be probable, from the consideration that this being the principal entrance on this side-as is evident not only from its position and the points connected, but also from the slighting manner in which the rest are referred to and their destination mentioned-will account for the silence in the Talmud respecting the others. From the name itself little can be safely argued; see Lightfoot's attempts to define it (Works, 9:226). Each of the gates in the outer wall of the Temple (as well as those in the inner wall) was 20 cubits high and 10 wide (Middoth, 2, 3), which Josephus, apparently including side and cap ornaments, extends (in the case of the inner, and therefore probably also the outer, wall) to 30 cubits high and 15 wide (War, 5, 5, 3).

3. The second gate northward seems to have been that anciently called Parbar, from a comparison of the following facts:

a. In 1Ch 26:18, it is mentioned in connection with “the causeway,” as if next to Shallecheth.

b. In 2Ki 23:11 is made mention of a gate leading from “the suburbs” into the Temple, apparently not far from the palaces and this precisely agrees with the southern one of the two middle gates which Josephus states led to “the suburbs” (Ant. 15:11, 5). The word “Iparbar” (which only occurs in these two Biblical passages, and in Eze 27:28) is used by the rabbins as meaning “suburb,” although its radical sense would appear to be an open building or space (see Gesenius and Buxtorf, Lex. s.v.)

c. At a point 265 feet north of the south-west corner of the Haram there still-exists a gate (Bab el-Mugharibeh, “the gate of the Western Africans”) in the modern wall, leading into the Haram, and in the nature of the case there must always have been a gate near this spot.

d. Beyond this point, as we shall presently see, there is no opportunity for a gate south of the point where the north wall of Zion would have joined the Temple; but that wall must have included one of these “gates to the suburbs,” both for the sale of convenience and to prevent an undue crowding of three gates in the western Temple wall north of its junction with the Zion wall. Here, however, there is just convenient space for a gate, and a suitable locality about half-way between the bridge and the Zion wall.

e. These views are confirmed by the following point:

4. Josephus mentions (War, 6:3, 2) as lying along this wall “John's Tower, which he built in the war he made against Simon, over the gates that led to the Xystus,” by which gate we understand this of Parbar, and that the tower was constructed over an enlargement of its gateway lying opposite Simon's or the Lying-out Tower.

5. The next object of interest is “the Council-house” mentioned by Josephus as the termination of the old wall at the Temple (War, 5, 4, 2), which plainly implies that it lay in the corner where the city and Temple walls met, and immediately joined them both. This building we therefore locate on that part of the Haram which adjoins the termination of the present Street of David, for the reasons following:

a. The courses of old foundation-stones forming “the Jews Wailing-place” show that there was no structure anciently adjoining them, and therefore the Council house must be located north of this spot.

b. The space here unappropriated (about 100 feet, between the Jews Wailing-place and David Street) would be a suitable one for a public building with its interior court and connected offices:

c. The Mukhama, or “town-hall,” of the modern city is exactly on this spot, and “‘some of it has more the appearance of being in situ than many of the other remains in the city” (Ordnance Survey, p. 28).

6. Just north of the Zion wall thus located, we would place one of the gates of Asuppim, referred to in 1Ch 26:17 as lying on the western side of the Temple, identical with Josephus's other gate leading to the suburbs, at a convenient place, and uniformly situated with respect to the gate above and that below, and just at the present Bab es-Silsileh, or “Gate  of the Chain,” at the head of the modern “Street of David,” which is the principal entrance to the Haram.

7. Adjoining this on the inside must have been the House of Asuppim, or “collections” (1Ch 26:15), occupying (part of) the cloister between the two gates of the same name. It probably was the place of deposit for the Temple offerings (see Lightfoot, Works, 9:230). This is apparently “that northern edifice which was between the two gates” mentioned by Josephus (War, 6:2, 7), for that these were the two gates of Asuppim is evident from several considerations:

a. The Romans, although then assaulting the outer Temple wall, evidently attacked its north-west corner, where the Temple proper was nearest to them, and therefore would not have reared their engines south of the junction of the old wall with the Temple, which leaves but these two gates for the sphere of their operations on the west.

b. That this building was on the west side of the Temple is clear from the fact that of the four engines the first was opposite the north-west angle of the inner court [from a northerly point of attack], and the last one farther along the north side; if, then, this second one be opposite the same north- west corner of the inner court from a westerly direction, the third will be farther south on the west side, between the south gate of Asuppim and the old wall — a natural and consistent arrangement. The Tower of Antonia proper prevented any being reared nearer the extreme north-west corner of the outer wall.

8. The other Gate of Asuppim we therefore place at a corresponding distance northward, opposite where a gate enters the Haram from the modern “Cotton Mart,” and hence called Bab el-Kattanin. Lightfoot asserts that this gate (which, however, he calls Shallecheth) was diametrically opposite the eastern gate (Works, 9:226), but apparently without any authority. This is evidently also Josephus's “last [gate on this side that] led to the other city,” i.e. Acra (Ant. 15:11,5).

9. In this last passage, also, Josephus states that on passing out of this gate “the road descended down into the valley [the he Tyropoeon] by a great number of steps, and thence again by the ascent,” which agrees with the fact that the detritus adjoining the wall is here 72 feet' deep (Ordnance Survey, p. 29).

10. We next arrive at the north-west corner of the Temple enclosure, about 1000 feet from the east as well as the south side. Near this corner were private passages for the Roman guard from Antonia to the galleries within the wall (Josephus, War, 5, 5, 8).

11. On the north side there was but one gate (the “two gates” of Josephus [War, 6:2, 7] have been shown above not to belong to the north side), which the Talmud calls Tedi (Middoth, 1, 3), a word of uncertain signification, but apparently indicative of “privacy” from its being less used, and therefore less ornamented, than the other gates (so Lightfoot from the Talmud), which the obstruction of Antonia would naturally occasion. We place it in the middle of the wall, nearly opposite both the Gate of Song and the present “Gate el-Hitta,” on the north side of the Haram.

12. The north-east corner of the square would thus fall just south of the Golden Gate, considered as representing the tower at that angle of the enclosure of Antonia, possibly the old tower of Meah (Neh 3:1; Neh 12:39).

13. On the east side there was but one gate, that of Shushan (Middoth, 1, 3), so called from a representation of that city on the walls of one of its chambers. It was opposite the entrance of the porch of the Temple, in order that the priest, when he burned the red heifer on the Mount of Olives, might exactly face the altar; on which account the tower over the gate was lower than those surmounting the other gates, so as not to intercept his view. So infers Lightfoot from the Talmud and Maimonides (Works, 9:218, 219); which location, however, Mr. Williams finds it necessary to dispute (Holy City, 2, 355, note 5). This position shows that this gate and the altar were in a range with the other gates between them. By an inspection of the sectional view of the Temple on the map, it will appear that at a certain height on the Mount of Olives the fire on the altar might be seen through the inner gates and over this gate. We find no traces of this gate mentioned by travelers.

14. At the south-east corner Josephus says there was a tremendous precipice (Ant. 15:11, 3, 5), apparently “the pinnacle of the Temple” on which the tempter placed Christ (Luk 4:9), still to be recognized in the steep descent at this point, and proved to have been anciently more profound by the vaulted substructions beneath the inside of the Haram, raising this angle of its platform above the old bed of the valley. The wall is here about 60 feet high, and about S0 feet deep from the present surface of  the ground outside. From Josephus's language in War, 6:3, 3, it is evident that the precipice at the northeast angle was also very considerable.

15. On the south side, according, to the Talmud; ‘were two gates, both named Huldah (Middoth, 1, 3), perhaps from the prophetess of that name. These are evidently the “gates in the middle” of this side mentioned by Josephus (Ant. 15:11, 5). We conclude that they lay very near together, and (with Dr. Robinson) identify them with the double gateway still found in the south Haram wall at the point where the modern city wall joins it. Its entire breadth is 42 feet (Robinson, Bibl. Res. 1, 450) and it is reached by a sloping passage from the platform of the Haram, as the embankment here could never have otherwise admitted an exit, nor even then without exterior steps. Lightfoot, however, makes these gates divide the wall into three equal parts (Works, 9:224), apparently merely arguing from the statement of Josephus. It is worthy of note that in 1Ch 26:14-18 but one set of guards is constantly assigned to the south side, in like terms as to the single gates on the north and east, whereas four sets are, in both enumerations, assigned to the west side. The other modern vestiges of portals on this side are of inferior size and antiquity.

16. On the several sides of the Court of the Gentiles that lay within the outer wall (called also the Outer Court, Lower Court, and by the rabbins usually “Mountain of the Lord's House”) there were several objects worthy of special note:

(1.) On the north and west sides were double interior porticos or cloisters, each 15 cubits wide, supported by columns and sustaining a roof on cedar beams (Josephus, War, 5, 5, 2).

(2.) On the east side was Solomon's Porch (Joh 10:23; Act 3:11), of the same size and style with those on the north and west (Josephus, Ant. 15:11, 3; 20:9, 7).

(3.) On the south side was the Royal Portico (apparently so called after Herod, who rebuilt it; Josephus, War, 1, 21, 1), which differed- from the rest in being triple, the two side aisles being 30 feet broad, and the middle one once and a half as broad (Ant. 15:11, 5). Lightfoot has strangely set these down as being respectively 15 and 42J cubits broad (Pitman's edition of his Works, 9:239, with which his own map agrees; the English folio edition, 1, 1061, has the same numbers; but the Latin edition in Ugolino, Thesaurus, 9:596, has for the middle aisle forty-one cubits), in which we  suspect some oversight (perhaps from thinking of the dimensions of the other cloisters), as all editions of Josephus here read alike, and the Middoth does not particularize on this point. The hypothesis of Williams (Holy City, 2, 401) that would throw the Royal Portico outside the Temple area is opposed to all ancient authority; so much so that even his coadjutor Prof. Willis is constrained to dissent from him (ibid. 1, 103).

(4.) These cloisters were adorned with Corinthian columns of solid marble, 162 in number (of such size that three men could just span them with their outstretched arms, making about a diameter of six feet), which separated the aisles, besides another row half imbedded in the outer wall (Josephus, Ant. 15:11, 5). We understand this to be the number of all the columns that stood alone in all the circuit of this court, and not those of the Royal Portico merely; for they would then be unduly crowded, and the average space between them which we have made (about 45 feet) is no greater span for the roof timbers than across the middle aisle of the south cloister. The harmony with which the several gates fall in between them when thus distributed is no little corroboration of the entire scheme. In the substructed vaults the rows of piers are 15 feet apart, and thus certain rows of them would fall exactly under these pillars, these piers also averaging about half the distance apart of the columns above. (See Prof. Willis's remarks in Williams's Holy City, appendix, 1, 125-128:; although we cannot see why he should think that a column stood over-each pier one way when they could have been only over every other, or every third one, the other way.) These columns were 25 cubits high on three sides, which determines the height of the roof on those sides (Josephus, War, 5, 5, 2); but on the south side the (shafts of the) two exterior rows were 27 feet high, the capitals and double-bases raising the roof to'50 feet, and the middle aisle was twice as high, probably by another series of columns of the same size surmounting the first (Ant. 15:11, 5). Balustrades doubtless guarded the edges of the flat roofs, and the gates were probably capped with turrets, for ornament as well as defense.

(5.) There were porters' lodges adjoining at least five of the gates (Middoth, 1, 1), and probably similar structures for the accommodation of the Levites guarding each of the gates (1Ch 26:12-13).

(6.) The Talmud also speaks of shops in this court, where articles used in sacrifice were kept for sale, as well as of a room in which the Jewish “Council of Twenty-three,” and afterwards the Sanhedrim, sat; these  Lightfoot locates near the Shushan Gate, the former on the ground floor and the latter overhead (Works, 9:241-244). It was probably an abuse of this privilege of sale that led to the introduction of cattle, sheep, and pigeons by the traders whom Christ expelled.

(II.) THE SACRED ENCLOSURE. Brevity will require that in the consideration of the details of the interior portions of the Temple the simple dimensions and statements should be exhibited, together with their authority, with as little discussion as possible.

1. A lattice-wall all around, 1 cubit broad, 3 cubits high, with equidistant pillars containing notices of non-admission (Josephus, Ant. 15:11, 5; War, 5, 5, 2); called chil (Lam 2:8).

2. This stood 12 steps, each one half cubit high and broad, above the Gentiles' Court [on the north and south sides] (Middoth, 2, 3), but 14 [on the east side] (War, 5, 5, 2).

3. Adjoining was a platform, 10 cubits wide (War, 5, 5, 2).

(III.) THE COURT OF THE WOMEN.

1. This court (called also New Court, 2Ch 20:5; Outer Court, Eze 46:21 : Treasury, Joh 8:20) was 135 cubits square [internally] (Middoth, 2, 5); “foursquare” (War, 5, 5, 2).

2. A gate on each side (War, 5, 5, 2). These were 30 cubits wide [including ornaments], supported by pillars at the side, and having rooms above (War, 5, 5, 3).

3. The east gate (called “Beautiful,” Act 3:2) was 40 cubits wide [including side ornaments of 5 cubits] (War, V, 5,). 3

4. There were 5 steps from the platform [i.e. the difference between the floors of this court and that of the Israelites] (War, 5, 5, 2, 3).

5. There were 15 steps to: the Court of the Israelites (War, 5, 5, 3); circular for the “Psalms of degrees” (Middoth, 2).

6. Corner courts of the Women's Court, each 40 cubits from east to west [and 30 broad], with interior open spaces, 20 cubits by 14, for boiling sacrifices; the covered rooms around that in the north-east corner for performing the ceremony of release from a Nazarite's vow, in the southeast for a wood repository, in the south-west for cleansing lepers, in the north-  west chambers for wine and oil for offerings (Middoth, 2, 5; Eze 46:21-24). Lightfoot, however, makes the Nazarites' room in the south- east, the wood-room in the north-east, the lepers' room in the north-west, and the wine and oil rooms in the south-west (Works, 9:307), correcting Surenhusius's mistranslation.

7. Single galleries of two stories [men below, women above] between the corner courts [on the north, east, and west sides] (Middoth, 2, 5); supported by columns similar to those of the Gen tiles' Court (War, 5, 5, 2).

8. There were eleven treasure-chests distributed in front of the columns in this court, besides- the two at the gate Shushan for the half-shekel tax (Lightfoot, from the rabbins, Works, 9:315).

9. Underground rooms for musical instruments on each side of the gate between this and the Israelites' Court (Middoth, 2, 6).

10. There was a tower over the east [Beautiful] gate with an occult [subterranean] passage from the Tower Antonia for the Roman guard (Ant. 15:11, 7)

(IV.) THE COURT OF THE ISRAELITES.

1. This was 187 cubits from east to west, 135 from north to south, 8 cubits wide on the north and south, and 11 on the east and west (Middoth, 2-6).

2. Surrounded by a portico similar to those of the Gentiles' Court, but single (War, 5, 5. 2).

3. Had three gates on the north and south, none on the west (Middoth, 1, 4; War, 5, 5, 2). Those on the north and south equidistant (Ant. 16:11, 5; Middoth, 5, 3).

4. East gate called Higher Gate (2Ki 15:35; 2Ch 27:3), New Gate (Jer 26:10; Jer 36:10), Gate of Entrance (Eze 40:15), Gate of Nicanor (Middoth, 1, 4).

5. Gates and rooms in the will adjoining as follows, beginning at the south- west corner (for the authority of most of these points it is sufficient to refer to Lightfoot's citations [Works, 9:333-380], as there can be no dispute respecting them. We have not in all cases arranged the rooms precisely like  Lightfoot, but have made a few slight changes where they seemed requisite):

(1) Sentinel's Hall, west of the first gate.

(2.) Gate of Kindling.

(3.) Guard-room, adjoining east.

(4.) Gate of Firstlings, in the middle.

(5.) Guard-room adjoining it.

(6.) Wood-room for the use of the altar, adjoining the

(7.) Water-gate, the last on this side.

(8.) Well-room, with its draw-well connected with a reservoir [the aqueduct from Bethlehem?] deriving its waters from a westerly direction, and-an engine for forcing it into the priests' laver.

(9.) House Gazith, at the south-east corner, consisting of two parts:

[1.] The Session-room of the Sanhedrim, with its triple semicircles for seating the members, and its desks. From a comparison of the number of members with the size of the room, we find that the space in the wall could by no means contain them, and have therefore enlarged it outwardly.

[2.] A room for the priests to pray and cast their lots in.

(10.) On the south side of the Gate of Nicanor, the Pastry-mail's Chamber, for baking the salt cakes burned with the daily sacrifice.

(11.) On the north side of the same gate, the Priests' Wardrobe, for the pontifical dresses.

(12.) In the north-east corner, the Earthenware-room, for the sacred pottery.

(13.) Al Guard-room, adjoining on the east.

(14.) The Gate of Song.

(15.) Adjoining this, a Wash-room for cleansing the entrails, etc., of sacrifices.

(16.) A Room for Hides of victims, and

(17.) The Salt-rooeri, for the salt used in preserving them, both in order, adjoining

(18.) The Gate of Women. Adjoining this,

(19.) A Treasure-room, for the more permanent deposit of the money from the House of Asuppim.

(20.) A Guard-room, and next,

(21.) The other Treasure-room, for the same purpose as the former. These adjoined

(22.) The Gate of Burning, the last of the six.

(23.) The interval between this gate and the western wall was called the House of Burning, and was divided into three equal parts. This building projected inwardly into the Court of the Israelites, like one portion of the House Gazith. These two buildings alone had entrances from the sacred enclosure, all the other rooms being entered only from the court within:

[1.] Adjoining the gate, the House of the Consecrated Stones of the former altar (removed after the rededication under the Maccabees, as having been desecrated by Antiochus Epiphanes), in the northern subdivision; and on the south the Shew-bread Bakery.

[2.] In the middle the Priests' Hall, where was a fire for the use of the guards at night.

[3.] The western portion is occupied, on the north for a Priests' Bathing-room, and on the south for keeping the Lambs selected for the daily sacrifice.

6. The principal difficulty connected with this court is the number of steps, and their height, leading into it on the north and south, and arises from a confusion in the terms by which Josephus mentions them. He says (War, 5, 5, 2) that between the sacred platform and the interior court “were other steps, each of 5 cubits apiece,” which we understand to mean that the Court of the Israelites was entered by [two flights of] steps, each [flight] rising 5 cubits, thus making 20 steps, in two sets of half-cubit steps. Again he says (ibid. § 4) that “there were 15 steps [those of the “degrees”] which led away [i.e. eastward] from the [west] wall of the Court of the Women to [i.e. towards] this greater gate [the Beautiful Gate], whereas those that led thither [i.e. to the platform down to which the Beautiful Gate led] from the other gates [opening towards this platform] were five steps shorter,” by  which we can only understand (according to the above interpolations) that the number of the steps leading out of the Court of the Israelites on the east exceeded by 5 the number [in each flight] of those on the north and south; for if these latter were but 10 in all, each must have been one cubit in the rise (7 cubits at the Nicanor Gate 2 at the Beautiful Gate = 10), an impracticable ascent. Finally, he says (ibid. § 2) that “the height of its buildings [those of the Women's Court], although it were on the outside 40 cubits, was hidden by the steps, and on the inside that height was but 25 cubits,” which we take to denote that the top of the wall enclosing the Court of the Israelites (which was continuous with that of the Court of the Women) was 40 cubits from the level of the floor of the Court of the Gentiles, the intervening steps making the difference (15 cubits) of its internal altitude-as would be true within a single cubit (121 10 . The gate- turrets were still higher than this. The steps mentioned by Josephus (War, 5, 1, 5) as preventing the erection of John's engines on any other spot than “behind the inner court over against the west end of the cloister” seem to be those that ran around the three sides of the Priests' Court, at the railing separating it from the cloistered Court of the Israelites.

7. The thickness of this wall is nowhere stated in the Mishna, but is given by Josephus as being 8 cubits (War, 6:5, 1, at the close); and the numerous rooms contained within it would seem to justify a greater thickness than in any of the other walls.

(V.) THE COURT OF THE PRIESTS, THE GREAT ALTAR, AND THE TEMPLE PROPER.

These are treated of in the Mishna in the fullest detail, and the minutest points to the thickness of the walls and partitions, the number, size, and position of the doors, the dimensions, order, and situation of the rooms and passages, with all their peculiarities and contents — are given with the precise explicitness of specifications for a builder's contract; so that as to everything, great or small, contained within these bounds there is such full and trustworthy authority that all one has to do is to collect and plot them down on the plan. This the reader will find so carefully and completely done to his hand by Lightfoot, in his Prospects of the Temple, so often referred to, that to detail it here would be but to repeat his statements: we have examined his authorities and conclusions in detail, and believe that no accurate description can do much more than follow his digest on this subject. We have embodied the results in our accompanying this volume.  The points in which we have varied from his plan are too few and unimportant to be worth enumerating. One particular, however, requires special consideration, because its settlement involves the discussion of the few points that have not been determined above; and to this we add such other remarks as will convey a sufficiently definite idea of the main edifice.

1. The Position of the Great Altar. — Its distance from the northern boundary of the Court of the Israelites is given in the Mishna in the following words: “From north to south [the Israelites' Court was] 135 cubits [wide], as follows: from the ascent to the extremity of the altar [i.e the whole length of the altar including its inclined ascent] were 62 cubits [i.e. horizontal measure, for the altar is elsewhere given as 32 cubits square, and the slope of the ascent as another 32 cubits, which would give 64 instead of 62 cubits, measured superficially (see Lightfoot, Works, 9:413)], from the altar to the rings 8 cubits; the place of the rings was 24 cubits, thence from the rings to the tables were 4 cubits, from the tables to the columns 4, from the columns to the wall of the court 8 cubits [making thus 110 cubits] ; the rest [25 cubits] were as well the space between the ascent and wall as a place of columns” (Middoth, 5, 1). This last clause is somewhat ambiguous, but is generally understood as meaning that there was a space of 25 cubits between the south wall and the foot of the “ascent,” which contained some extra posts (like those on the north side) for sacrificing on crowded occasions an interpretation from which we do not see any good reason for dissenting. So L'Empereur (in his separate commentary on the Middoth, p. 173) explains, “Partly for an [open] space and partly for the place of [extra] columns,” assigning 12N cubits to each portion, which amounts to the same thing as to the point in question. So also Lightfoot (Works, 9:413). The position of the altar from east to west is fixed with regard to the court in which it lay in terms which are free from any ambiguity.

In common with most antiquarians, awe are disposed to find the native rock, on which the altar is assumed to have been reared, in the remarkable Sacred Rock under the dome of the central mosque of the Haram. This is 50 or 60 feet broad, occupying nearly the whole space immediately under the dome, and rising about 5 feet above the floor of the building, which is 12 feet higher than the rest of the enclosure. The center of the rock is about 785 feet from the southern and 610 from the eastern wall of the Haram. The frequent supposition that it stood within the most holy place, or at least within the Temple proper, is negative by the relative distances  presently to be noticed from the Talmud. The positive reasons for making the altar coincide with the Sacred Rock may be stated as follows:

(a.) Tradition, Jewish, Christian, and Moslem favors it (see Williams, Holy City, 2, 340-343).

(b.) This rock is prominent above all other spots, and we know that the great altar was higher than even the floor of the Temple itself.

(c.) The upper platform of the Haram thus most nearly coincides with that of the sacred enclosure of the Temple.

(d.) The cave and sewer at the south-east corner of the present rock would thus be identical with the ancient cesspool and drain for the blood sprinkled around the altar.

This site of the great altar fixes the general position of the Temple and sacred enclosure generally within the great area, and agrees with the only definite statement in the Mishna on the subject, namely, that “the greatest space between the Temple and the wall of the outer court was on the south side, the next greatest on the east, the next on the north, and the least on the west” (Middoth, 2, 1). According to our arrangement, the spaces (at the nearest point) between the chêl, or sacred fence, and the inner surface of the outmost wall are respectively on the west about 78 feet, on the north about 80 feet, on the east about 239 feet, on the south about 643 feet. Lightfoot's plan has nearly the same. Dr. Wm. Brown (of Scotland), in his work on the Antiquities of the Jews (1, 70), lays them down in cubits, as follows: south, 259; east, 90; north,.72; west, 49. Fergusson arbitrarily refers these measurements to the inner court of the Temple (Temples of the Jetos, p. 118), on the ground that the Talmud states that “in the place largest in measurement was held most service” (Middoth, 2, 1); but the text obviously means the space in the outer court, as that-alone is the subject there treated of.

The position of the altar also fixes the line of the boundary between the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, which at this date cut off one cubit from the south-east corner of the altar a circumstance of which the rabbins take frequent notice (see Lightfoot, Works, 9:395). This boundary originally ran entirely south of the holy city (Jos 15:7-9; Jos 18:15-17), but the conquest of Jebus by David appears to have annexed Mount Zion permanently to Judah (2Sa 4:1). The subsequent purchase of the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite by David (2Sa 24:24; 2 Samuel 1  Chronicles 21:25) as the; site of his altar, and eventually of the Temple (2Ch 3:1), does not seem to have removed it entirely out of the tribe of Benjamin.

General Description of the Temple Proper. — This we find well summarized in Winer (Realwörterb. 2, 583 sq.), from the combined statements of the Talmud and Josephus (the latter, however, although a priest by birth, and therefore entitled to admission to the building, so constantly mixes the description of Herod's with that of Solomon's Temple that we must often distrust his details).

This edifice was constructed upon new foundations (Josephus, Ant. 15:11, 3), and of white marble, the blocks being in some instances 45 cubits long, 6 broadband 5 high (War, 5, 5, 6; comp. Ant. 15:11,3). The entire width (from north to south) of the porch was (exteriorly) 100 cubits; but the remainder (rear part) of the building was only 60 cubits (according to the Talmudists TO, including the side chamber of 5 cubits, the wall of 6 cubits, etc.), so that the porch projected 20 (or 15) cubits on each side beyond the rest of the structure. Its length was also 100 cubits, and its height the same; but Josephus says (Anc. 15:11, 3) that eventually it sank 20:cubits (the original height being 120), a statement which Hirt (p. 10) regards (probably with justice) as a mere legend. The interior space was, according to Josephus, so divided that the porch had a length (from north to south) of 50 cubits, a breadth of 20, and a height of 90 (comp. War, 5, 5, 5); the holy place a length of 40 cubits, a breadth of 20, and a height of 60; and the most holy place a length and breadth of 20 cubits, and a height of 60; but the Talmud (Middoth, 4:6) makes the height of both the latter rooms to have been only 40 cubits, by which we suspect it means the extra height above the ceiling of the most holy place, since this last was a perfect cube. The entire building also seems to have been 100 cubits in each dimension, as Josephus in the main indicates, although his numbers in several passages appear to be confused or corrupt. This: likewise is the statement of the Talmud (ibid. 4:7), according to which the length (from east to west) of the porch was on y 11 cubits, that of the sanctuary 40 cubits, and that of the shrine 20 cubits; while on the west, below the holy of holies, was a space (for a chamber) of 6 cubits (comp. also ibid. 4:3), besides 23 cubits: for the thickness of the walls and partitions. If, as Josephus and the Talmud both state, the porch was 100 cubits high, but (as the latter states) only-90 high on the inside, the difference. of 10 cubits may have been that of the peaked roof, if a gable; but the difference in their numbers as to the height  of the rear portion of the building gives probability to the statement of the Talmud (ibid. 4:6) that there was an upper room (עֲלַיָּה) over the holy and most holy places, containing trap-doors in the floor, through which workmen were let down into the most holy place to make repairs'(ibid. 4:5), Josephus calls this part of the building τὸ ὑπερῷον μερος, and the Talmud gives it a height of 40 cubits, which apparently refers only to the intermediate space left by the difference between the holy and the most holy place. As to the style of the roof (whether flat or peaked) Josephus says nothing; he only remarks (War, 5, 5, 6) that it was surmounted (κατὰ κορυφήν) by golden spikes (ὄβελοι), probably of gilded iron, fastened with lead, for. scaring away the birds; the same are mentioned in the Talmud (כולה עורב, Middoth, 4:6), where they are said to have been one cubit in height. The roof itself appears, according to the Mishna, to have been a low gable (see L'Empereur, ad Middoth, 4:6), with a balustrade (מעפה) three cubits high. The space above the עֲלַיָּה. is thus divided (Middoth, 4:6): 1 cubit כיור (? ceiling); 2 cubits בית דלפה (place of rain-water); 1 cubit מקרה (timber); 1 cubit מע זיבה (flooring); 3 cubits railing; 1 cubit scarecrows. On both sides of the interior apartments was a space of 20 cubits devoted to a suite of rooms (ο0λΚοΛ ῍ρπιΧ-ρεψο), which, however, extended only 60 cubits high (Josephus, Ant. 15:11, 3; War, 5, 5,5). According to the Talmud (Middoth, 4:3), these (תָּאַים) were in all 38; namely, 15 on the north and south side each, and 8 on the west or rear (comp the “many mansions,” μοναὶ πολλαί, of Joh 14:2). The shoulder or projecting space (north and south) on each side of the porch (40 cubits in Josephus, 30 in the Talmud) was used as a depository of the sacrificial implements (בית החילפות, locus secespitarumi, Middoth, 4, 7).

The most holy place, which was entirely empty (ἔκειτο οὐδὲν ὅλ·ως ἐν αὐτῷ, Josephus, War, 5, 5,5), except the stone (אבן שׁתהי) which occupied the place of the ark (Mishn a, Yoa, 5, 2), and on which the high- priest set the censer (the rabbins relate many marvels concerning it), was separated at the doorway from the holy place (Josephus, War, 5, 5, 5) by a vail καταπέτασμα), which was torn by the earthquake at Jesus' death (Mat 27:51). The rabbins speak of a double vail: according to the Talmud these occupied a space of 1 cubit between the apartments  (טרקסין, Middoth, 4:7). The holy place had an entrance with two gold- plated door-leaves, which, according to Josephus (War, 5, 5, 4), were 55 cubits high and 16 broad; but, according to the Mishlia (Middoth, 4:1), 20 cubits high and 10 broad — a difference which Lightfoot reconciles by supposing that Josephus includes the decorations (cornice, entablature, etc.). The Talmudists also speak of a double door at this passage, which the thickness of the walls renders probable. The sanctuary stood open, or was closed only by a screen of embroidered Babylonian tapestry of byssus. See VAIL. As furniture of the holy place Josephus mentions only the seven-armed candelabrum, the table of shew-bread, and the altar of incense. The porch had a doorway 70 cubits high and 25 broad (Mishna, 40 high and 20 broad, Middoth, 3, 7: probably to be reconciled as above). The porch contained two tables, one of marble, the other of gold, on which the priests daily set respectively the old and the fresh shew-bread taken from and carried into the Temple (Mishna, Shekel. 6:4).

In front of the porch, within the priests' court, stood in close proximity (but somewhat to the south, Middoth, 3, 6) the laver (כַּיּוֹר); and there (22 cubits from the porch) stood the great altar, SEE BURNT-OFFERING, the intervening space being regarded as especially holy (Mishna, Cluelim, 1, 9). North of this were 6 rows of rings (in the pavement.), to which the animals to be slaughtered were fastened; a little beyond were low pillars with cedar beams across them, from which the sacrifices were suspended: and between these pillars stood marble tables (של שיש שלחנות), on which their flesh and entrails were laid (Middoth, 3, 5; 5, 2; Tamid, 3, 5; Shekalim, 6:4). West of the altar stood two tables; one of marble, on which the fat of the victims was deposited; the other of silver (?), upon which were kept the implements for this service. SEE SACRIFICIAL OFFERING.

3. Magnificence of the Central Building. — The vast sums which Herod laid out in adorning this structure gave it the most magnificent and imposing appearance. “Its appearance,” says Josephus “had everything that could strike the mind and astonish the sight. For it was on every side covered with solid plates of gold so that when the sun rose upon it, it reflected such a strong and dazzling effulgence that the eye of the beholder was obliged to turn away from it, being no more able to sustain its radiance than the splendor of the sun” (War, 5, 5, 4). To strangers who approached the capital, it appeared, at a distance, like a huge mountain covered with  snow. For where ft was not decorated with plates of gold, it was extremely white and glistening. The historian, indeed, says that the Temple of Herod was the most astonishing structure he had ever seen or heard of, as well on account of its architecture as its magnitude, and likewise the richness and magnificence of its various parts, and the fame and reputation of its sacred appurtenances. Tacitus calls it imensce opulentice templum (Hist. 5, 12).. Its external glory, indeed, consisted not only in the opulence and magnificence of the building, but also in the rich gifts with which it was adorned, and which excited the admiration of those who beheld them (Luk 21:5). In the portico the various votive offerings made both by Jews and foreigners were deposited (see Richter, Α᾿νθήματα Templi Hierosol. [Lips. 1764]). Among these treasures (2 Maccabees 3, 2; 2Ma 9:16; Josephus, Ant. 14:16, 4: 18:3' 5; 19:6,1 1; War, 2, 17, 3; 5, 13, 6; Apion. 2, 2: Philo, Opp. 2, 569, 591) we find specially mentioned a large golden table, presented by Pompey the Great, and several golden vines of exquisite workmanship and immense size; for Josephus assures us that some of the clusters of golden grapes were as tall as a man (War, 5, 5, 4). One such golden vine (גפן של זהב, Middoth, 3,:8) especially seems to have been trained up over the entire front of the building (Josephus, Ant. 15:11, 3; comp. Tacit. Hist. 5, 5). See the monographs De Vite Aurea in Temiplo bvy J;inus [Lips. 1706], Green [ibid. 1737], and Huldrich [Zür. 1782]j). Herod, in imitation of the Greeks and Romans, suspended in the porch several. of the rich spoils and trophies which he had taken from the Arabs and other barbarous tribes of the East. This was a common custom among the heathen nations; Virgil introduces Eneas boasting of having suspended the spoils which he took from the Greeks, oil the portals of a Grecian temple- (En. 3). SEE GAMMADIM.

IX. The Apocalyptic Temple. — In the vision of Johnon Patmos he expressly- tells us respecting the New Jerusalem, “I saw no temple therein, for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple thereof” (Rev 21:22). The celestial city itself, in other words, is to be one vast temple filled with the perpetual Shechinah. We here give Paine's. sketch of the ideal city on the mountain, the length of which was equal to its breadth, and this again was equal to the height of the city above the plain (Rev 21:16).

X. Sacred Observances Connected with the Temple.

1. The Daily Service. — The following is an outline of the regular duties of the priesthood:

(1.) The morning service. After having enjoyed their repose, the priests bathed themselves in the rooms provided for that purpose and waited the arrival of the president of the lots. This officer having arrived, they divided themselves into two companies, each of which was provided with lamps or torches, and made a circuit of the Temple, going in different directions, and meeting at, the pastryman's chamber on the south-side of the gate Nicanor. Having summoned him to prepare the cakes for the high-priest's meat offering, they retired with the president to the south-east corner of the court and cast lots for the duties connected with the altar. The priest being chosen to remove the ashes from the altar, he again wash-ed his feet at the laver, and then with the silver shovel proceeded to his work. As soon as he had removed one shovel full of the ashes, the other priests retired to wash their hands and feet, and then joined him in cleansing the altar and renewing the fires. The next act was to cast lots for the thirteen particular duties connected with offering the sacrifice; which being settled, the president ordered one of them to fetch the lamb for the morning sacrifice.

While the priests on this duty were engaged in fetching and examining the victim, those who carried the keys were opening the seven gates of the Court of Israel and the two doors that separated between the porch and the holy place; When the last of the seven gates was opened, the silver trumpets gave a flourish to call the Lesites to their deks for the music, and the stationary men to their places as the representatives of the people. The opening of the folding-doors of the Temple was the established signal for killing the sacrifice, which was cut in pieces and carried to the top of the altar, where it was salted and left while the priests once more retired to the room Gazithi to join in prayer. While the sacrifice was lain in the court of the priests, the two priests appointed to trim the lamps and cleanse the altar of incense were attending to their duties in the holy place. After the conclusion of their prayer and a rehearsal of the ten commandments and their phylacteries, the priests again cast lots to choose two to offer incense on the golden altar, and another to lay the pieces of the sacrifice on the fire of the brazen altar.

The lot being determined, the two who were to offer the incense proceeded to discharge their duty, the time for which was between the sprinkling of the blood and the laying the pieces upon the altar, in the morning, and in the evening, between the laying the pieces upon the altar and the drink offering. As they proceeded to the Temple  they rang the megemphita, or great bell, to warn the absent priests to come to worship, the absent Levites to come to sing, and the stationary men to bring to the gate Nicanor those whose purification was not perfected. The priest who carried the censer of coals which had been taken from one of the three fires on the great altar, after kindling the fire on the incense altar, worshipped and came out into the porch, heaving the priest who had the incense alone in the holy place. As soon as the signal was given by the president, the incense was kindled, the holy place was filled with perfume, and the congregation without joined in the prayers (Luk 1:9). These being ended, the priest whose lot it was to lay the pieces of the sacrifice upon the altar threw them into the fire, and then, taking the tongs, disposed them in somewhat of their natural order. The four priests who had been in the holy place now appeared upon the steps that led to the porch, and, extending their arms so as to raise their hands higher than their heads, one of them pronounced the solemn blessing (Num 6:24-26). After this benediction, the daily meat offering was offered; then the meat-offering of the high priest; and last of all the drink-offering; at the conclusion of which the Levites began the song of praise, and at every pause in the music the trumpets sounded and the people worshipped. This was the termination of the morning service. It should be stated that the morning service of the priests began with the dawn of day, except in the great festivals, when it began much earlier; the sacrifice was offered immediately after sunrise.

(2.) During the middle of the day, the priests held themselves in readiness to offer the sacrifices which might be presented by any of the Israelites either of a voluntary or an expiatory nature. Their duties would therefore vary according to the number and nature of the offerings they might have to present.

(3.) The evening service varied in a very: trifling measure from that of the morning; and the same priests ministered, except when there was one in the house of their Father who had never burned incense, in which case that office was assigned to him, or, if there were more than one, they cast lots who should be employed. SEE DAILY OFFERING.

2. Holiness of the Place. — The injunction of Lev 19:3, “Ye shall reverence my sanctuary,” laid the people under an obligation to maintain a solemn and holy behavior when they came to worship in the Temple. We have already seen that such as were ceremonially unclean were forbidden to enter the sacred court on pain of death; but in the course of time there  were several prohibitions enforced by the Sanhedrim which the law had not named. The following have been collected by Lightfoot out of the Rabbinical writings (Temple Service, ch.10) 10.

(1.) “No man might enter the mountain of the house with his staff.”

(2.) “None might enter in thither with his shoes on his feet? though he might with his sandals.

(3.) “Nor might any man enter the mountain of the house with his scrip on.”

(4.) “Nor might he come in with the dust on his feet,” but he must wash or wipe them, “and look to his feet when he entered into the house of God,” to remind him, perhaps, that he should than shake off all worldly thoughts and affections.

(5.) “Nor with money in his purse.” He, might bring it in his hand, however; and in this way it was brought in for various purposes. If this had not been the case, it would seem strange that the cripple should have been placed at the gate of the Temple to ask alms of those who ῥentered therein (see Act 3:2).

(6.) None might spit in the Temple; if he were necessitated to spit, it must- be done in some corner of his garment.”

(7.) “He might not use any irreverent gesture, especially before the gate of Nicanor,” that being exactly in front of the Temple.

(8.) “He might not make the mountain of the house a thoroughfare,” for the purpose of reaching the place by a nearer way; for it was devoted to the purposes of religion.

(9.) “He that went into the court must go leisurely and “gravely into his place; and there he must demean himself, as in the presence of the Lord God, in all reverence and fear.”

(10.) “He must worship standing, with his feet close to each other, his eyes directed to the ground, his hands upon his breast, with the right one above the left” (see Luk 18:13).

(11.) “No one, however weary, might sit down in the court.” The only exception was in favor of the kings of the house of David.

(12.) “None might pray with his head uncovered. And the wise men and their scholars never prayed without a veil.” This custom is alluded to in 1Co 11:4, where the apostle directs the men .to reverse the practice adopted in the Jewish Temple.

(13.) Their bodily gesture in bowing before the Lord was either “bending of the knees,” “bowing the head,” or “falling prostrate on the ground.”

(14.) Having performed the service, and being about to retire, “they might not ‘turn their backs upon the altar.” They therefore went backwards till they were out of the court.

Concerning the high veneration which the Jews cherished for their Temple, Dr. Harwood has collected some interesting particulars from Philo, Josephus, and the writings of Luke. Their reverence for the sacred edifice was such that rather than witness its defilement they would cheerfully submit to death. They could not bear the least disrespectful or dishonorable thing to be said of it. The least injurious slight of it, real or apprehended, instantly awakened all the choler of a Jew, and was an affront never to be forgiven. Our Savior, in the course of his public instructions, happening to say, “Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up again” (Joh 2:19) it was construed into a contemptuous disrespect, designedly thrown out against the Temple-his words instantly descended into the heart of a Jew and kept rankling there for several years; for, upon his trial, this declaration, which it was impossible for a Jew ever to forget or to forgive, was alleged against him as big with the most atrocious guilt and impiety (Mat 26:61). Nor was the rancor and virulence which this expression had occasioned at all softened—by all the affecting circumstances of that excruciating and' wretched death they saw him die; even as he hung upon the cross, with infinite triumph, scorn, and exultation, they upbraided him with it, contemptuously shaking their heads and saying, “O thou who couldst demolish our Temple and rear it up again in all its splendor in the space of three days, now save thyself, and descend from the cross” (Mat 27:40). Their superstitious veneration for the Temple further appears from the account of Stephen. When his adversaries were baffled and confounded by that superior wisdom and those distinguished gifts he possessed, they were so exasperated at the victory he had gained over them that they went aid suborned persons to swear that they had-heard him speak blasphemy against Moses and against God. These inflaming the populace, the magistrates, and the Jewish clergy, he  was seized, dragged away, and brought before the Sanhedrim. Here the false witnesses whom they had procured stood up and said, “This person before you is continually uttering the most reproachful expressions against this sacred place” (Act 6:13), meaning the Temple. This was blasphemy not to-be pardoned. A judicature composed of high-priests and scribes would never forgive such impiety. We witness the same thing in the case of Paul when they imagined that he had taken Trophimus, an Ephesian, with him into the Temple; for which insult they had determined to imbrue their hands' in his blood (21, 28, etc.).

XI. Literature. — As we have said above, the two classical authorities on the Temple are the general description of Josephus (Ant. 15:11, and War, 5, 5) and the minute account of the Herodian building in the Talmudic tract Middoth (Mishna, 5, 10), which has been edited and commented upon by. L'Empereur of Oppyck (Lugd. Bat. 1630, 4to). Among the older works on the ‘subject we especially name vols. 8 and 9 of Antiquitates Hebraicae, by Ugolino, which contain, in addition to other dissertations, Moses Maimonides, Constitutiones de Domo Electa; Abraham ben- David, De Templo; see also Schulze, De Variis Judceorum Erroribus in Descriptione Templi Secundi (F. ad M. 1756; also prefixed to his edition of Reland, De Spoliis Templi Hierosolymitani [Ultraj. 1775]) , Hafenrefer, Templum Ezech. (Tubing. 1613); Villalpando and Prado, In Ezechiel; Jud. Leo, Libri Quatuor de Templo Hieros. tam Priori quam Poster. ex Hebr. Lat. Vers. a J. Sanbert (Helmst. 1665, 4to); Cappellus, Τρισάγιον, sive Triplex Templi Delineatio (Amst. 1643, 4to; also inserted in the Critici Anglicani, vol. 8:and in vol. 1 of Walton's Polyglot).; Harenberg, In d. Brem. u. Verdisch. Biblioth. 4:1 sq., 573 sq., 879 sq.; Lamy, De Tabern. Faed., Urbe Hieros. et de Templo (Par. 1720 sq.); Cremer, De Salom. Templo (Harderov. 1748) Ernesti, De Templo Herod. (Lips. 1752); Grulick, De Divino in Templo Ezech. Consilio (Vitemb. 1775). Monographs on the Temple in Hebrew have been written by C. Altschul (Amst. 1724), J. M. Altschul (ibid. 1782), W. Altschul (Sklov, 1794; Warsaw, 1814), Leone (Amst. 1660; Middelb. 1642; in Latin by Saubert [Helmst. 1665]), Heller (Prague, 1602; F. ad M. 1714), Chefez (Ven. 1696), Wilna (Sklov, 1802), Snizler (Lond. 1825). The principal later works on the subject are those of Lightfoot, Descriptio Templi Hierosolymitani, in Opp. 1, 533 sq.; Hirt, Der Tempel Salomons (Berlin, 1809, 4to); Stieglitz, Gesch. der Baukunst (Nuremb. 1827), p. 125 sq.; Less, Beitrdge zur Geschich. d. ausbild. Baukunst (Leips. 1834), i, 63 sq.; Meyer, Der Tempel Salom. (Berlin,  1830; inserted also in Blatterf. hohere Wahrheit, 1); Grilneisen, in the Kunstblatt z. Morgenbl. 1831, No. 73-75, 77-80. Other works are mentioned by Meusel, Biblioth. Histor. 1; 2, 113 sq.; and Winer, Realwörterb. s.v. Tempel.” See also Bennett, The Temple of Ezekiel (Lond. 1824); Isreels, Ezekiel's Temple (ibid. 1827); Kirchner, Der Tempel zu Jerus. (Neu-Ebers. 1834); El-Sinti, Hist. of the Temple (from the Arabic by Reynolds, Lond. 1837); Keil, Der Tempel Salomo's (Dorp. 1839); Kopp, id. (Stuttgart, 1839); the Stud. u. Krit. 1844, 2, 320, 361; Thenius, Erklar. d. Konige, in the Kurzgef. exeq. Handb. 9. Anhang, p. 25 sq.; Bahr, Der Salom. Tenpel (Carlsr. 1848); Balmer-Rinck, Gesch. d. Tempel- Architectur (Ludwigsb. 1858). The latest works are those of Bannister, The Temples of the Hebrews (Lond. 1861); Paine, Solomon's Temple, etc. (Bost. 1861); Unruh, D. alte Jerus. u. s. Bauwerke (Lagensatz, 1861); Rosen, Der Tempel-Platz des Moria (Gotha, 1866 ); Fergusson, The Temples of the Jews (Lond. 1878). This last and most pretentious effort at reconstructing the Jewish Temple is thoroughly vitiated by two favorite preconceptions of the author-namely, a false location of the structure at the south-west angle of the Haram, and an overweening estimate of modern architectural taste as a guide on so ancient a subject. Thus he flippantly dismisses the explicit-and repeated Rabbinical statement of the dimensions of the Court of the Women as “absurd” (p. 98) and “impossible” (p. 117), because it cannot be got within his imaginary “rectangle 600 feet square” (Josephus's round number for the entire Temple area). He falsely asserts that this Rabbinical account “is borrowed avowedly; but unintelligently, from Ezekiel” (p. 117), ignoring the fact that the Mishna, which contains these measurements, has come down, traditionally if not in writing, from contemporaries of Herod's Temple itself. What a pity that these authorities, or even Herod himself, did not have the benefit of such learned criticism on their work!

## Temple (2)[[@Headword:Temple (2)]]

             This name was scarcely ever used in the first three ages by any Christian writer for a church, but only for the heathen temples; but when idolatry was destroyed, and temples were purged and consecrated as Christian churches, then the writers of the following ages freely gave them the name of temples. At first no idol temples were made use of as churches, but were generally tolerated until the twenty-fifth year of Constantine. A.D. 333. In that year he published' his laws commanding the destruction of temples, altars, and images. This policy was continued until the reign of Theodosius,  when another method was adopted, and we find the emperor turning the famous temple of Heliopolis, called Balanium, into a Christian church. Honorius (A.D. 408) published two laws forbidding the destruction of temples in the cities, because, being purged, they might serve for ornament or public use. Bede (lib. i. c. 30) tells us “that Gregory the Great gave Austin the monk instructions about the temples among the Saxons in Britain, that if they were well built they should not be destroyed, but only converted to the service of the true God.” Sometimes the temples were pulled down, and the materials were given to the Church, out of which new edifices were erected for the service of religion.' Sometimes additions were made to the emoluments of the clergy by the donation of heathen temples and the revenues that were settled upon them, although the latter were usually appropriated by the emperors themselves. See Bingham, Christ. Antiq. bk. 5, ch. 4:§ 10; bk. 8:ch. 1, § 6; ch. 2, § 4.

## Temple, Daniel[[@Headword:Temple, Daniel]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Reading, Mass., Dec. 23, 1789. He was employed in mechanical labors until he was twenty-one years old. In 1810 he was converted, and joined the Church. His attention was called to the missionary field by reading Buchanan's Researches, and he commenced the work of preparation by entering Phillips Academy at Andover. He subsequently entered Dart-mouth College, from which he graduated in 181,7. His influence for good in college was great. He spent three years at the Andover Theological Seminary, and was licensed to preach at Billerica by the Andover association in August, 1820. After being employed one year in Massachusetts by the American board, he was ordained at the same time with the Rev. Isaac Bird at North Bridgewater, Oct. 3, 1821. After his marriage with Miss Rachel B. Dix, he ‘sailed from Boston for Malta, Jan. 2, 1822 carrying with him the first printing-press, which has since proved such a blessing to the people of the Orient. His wife died in Malta in 1827. Two of his four children survive, and are now preaching the Gospel. He returned to America in 1830, and after remaining a short time, during which he married again, he went back to Malta, where he remained until 1833 when he left for Smyrna, taking with him the whole printing establishment. Though he first set up the press in Malta, its productions were for regions beyond. The authorities ordered the press away from Smyrna, yet he retained it until he left the coast. He established schools there among the Greeks, but whoever would see what he accomplished must go to Constantinople, Aintab, and elsewhere in that land. He  continued his connection with the press until he left the mission, in 1844, and returned to America. After his return, he commenced preaching at Phelps. Ontario Co., N. Y., where: his labors were greatly blessed. His acquaintance with the Scriptures was wonderful, being familiar with every part of them. For some time before his end he was not able to preach; but in sickness and in health, in suffering as in labors, he glorified his Master until his death, which took place at Reading, Mass., Aug. 11,1851. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 2, 677 sq. (W.V.S.) Temporal, a term often used for secular, in a distinction from spiritual or ecclesiastical; likewise for anything belonging to time in contrast with eternity.

## Temporal Power of the Pope[[@Headword:Temporal Power of the Pope]]

             is a phrase susceptible of two meanings which are very distinct from each other, and the confusion of which has led to frequent and serious misunderstanding.

I. In one of these senses it means the sovereign power possessed by the pope as ruler of the Papal States, or STATES OF THE CHURCH SEE STATES OF THE CHURCH (q.v.), where the history of its origin, progress, and downfall is briefly detailed. The question as to the necessity or utility of such power vested in the hands of a spiritual ruler, and even its lawfulness and its compatibility with his spiritual duties, has been warmly debated. This controversy is not of entirely recent origin, for many of the medieval sectaries urged the incompatibility of the spiritual with the temporal power in the same person, not only in relation to the pope, but also to the baron-bishops. Such were the doctrines of the Vaudois, of Pierre de Bruis, and especially of Arnold of Brescia. In the centuries following, the antipapal controversies turned so entirely upon doctrine that there was little attention paid to this question. It did not enter in any way into the conflict of Gallican and Ultramontane principles. Even Bossuet not only admitted the lawfulness of the pope's temporal sovereignty, but contended that it was in some sense necessary to the free exercise of his spiritual power. The controversy only assumed any practical interest during the conflict between Pius VII and Napoleon I, the design of the latter of annexing papal territory to France being one of the main causes of dispute. No formal and authoritative judgment of the Roman Church has been pronounced regarding the question of temporal power, but a strong and almost unanimous expression of opinion was tendered to the late pope, Pius IX, in the form of letters and addresses from bishops and others in  every part of Catholic Christendom. They profess that the possession of temporal power is no essential part of the privileges of the successor of Peter, but they regard it as the means providentially established for the protection of the spiritual independence of the pope and the free exercise of his functions as spiritual ruler of the Church.

II. By the second signification of the phrase “temporal power of the pope” is understood what would more properly be called the claim of the pope, in virtue of his office, to a power over the temporalities of other kings and states. This power may be of two kinds:

1. Directive, or the power, as supreme moral teacher, to instruct all members of his Church, whether subjects or sovereigns, in the moral duties of their several states.

2. Coercive. If the power be regarded as coercive, it is necessary to distinguish the nature of the coercion which may be employed. Coercion may either consist in the threat or infliction of purely spiritual censures, or it may involve temporal consequences, such as suspension or deprivation from office, forfeiture of the allegiance of subjects, and even liability to the punishment of death. In the former sense it may be regarded as the natural consequence of the spiritual headship of the Church, which is acknowledged by all Catholics. But the claim to authority over the temporalities of kings has gone far beyond these limits. From the 10th century popes have claimed and repeatedly exercised a power of coercing kings, and have punished them when refractory by suspension, by deprivation, and by the transfer of the allegiance of their subjects. This claim has been a subject of controversy between the Gallican and Ultramontane schools, and in the latter two theories have been devised for its explanation. The first and most extreme supposes that this power was given directly by God to Peter and his successors; that the two powers are foreshown by the “two swords” (Luk 22:38); and that the temporal power is a privilege of-the primacy by divine law equally with the spiritual sovereignty itself. The second, or indirect, theory holds that the temporal power is not directly of divine institution, but is an indirect though necessary consequence of the spiritual supremacy, and is only given as' a means of completing and, in a corrupt and disorganized state, rendering more efficacious the work which the spiritual supremacy is directly instituted to accomplish. In this latter form the theory of the temporal  power was defended by cardinal Bellarmine, and the celebrated declaration of the Gallican clergy in 1862 was directed against it.

A third view of the temporal power was propounded by Fenelon, and is generally described as the “historical theory of the temporal power.” According to this, the pope does not possess, whether by direct divine appointment or in virtue of the necessities of his spiritual office, any temporal power whatsoever; but he possesses the plenitude of spiritual power which is required for the government of the Church, and is empowered to enforce it by spiritual penalties, and especially by excommunication. Although these penalties are purely spiritual, yet the religious sentiment and awe with which the Church is regarded by many invest them with certain temporal effects. In several countries, as England (A.D. 859), France, Spain (A.D. 638), and Germany, the forfeiture of certain civil rights was attached, in the case of private persons, to the spiritual censure of excommunication. The same spirit of the age is seen in the form of the oath taken at the coronation of the sovereign in many countries, by which the monarch swore to be the protector and defender of the sovereign pontiff and the holy Catholic Church thus making their kingdoms feudatory to the see of Rome. From these and similar indications of the public feeling of the medieval time, the advocates of this theory of the temporal power infer that orthodoxy and obedience to the pope were accepted as a condition of the tenure of supreme civil authority. On the other hand, it is difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile this theory with the language used by the popes in enforcing their claims to temporal authority, and with the fact that such power continued to be claimed and exercised until very recent times. See Barnum, Romanism As It Is; Elliott, Delineation of Romanism; and the articles PAPACY SEE PAPACY and SEE STATES OF THE CHURCH.

## Temporalities of Bishops[[@Headword:Temporalities of Bishops]]

             as, in law, are the lay revenues, lands, tenements, and fees belonging to the sees of bishops or archbishops, as they are barons and lords of Parliament, including their baronies. They are defined as all things which a bishop hath by livery from the king, as manors, lands, tithes. From the time of Edward I to the Reformation, it was customary, when bishops received their temporalities from the king, to renounce in writing all right to the same by virtue of any provision from the pope, and to admit that they received them from the king alone. The custody of these temporalities is said by  Blackstone to form part of the king's ordinary revenue, and thus, a vacancy in the bishopric occurring, is a right of the crown, originating in its prerogative in Church matters, the king being, in intendment of law, preserver of all episcopal sees. For the same reason, before the dissolution of religious houses, the sovereign had the custody of the temporalities of all such abbeys and priories as were of royal foundation. There is another reason in virtue of which the king possesses this right, which is, that as the successor is not known, the property of the see would be liable to spoil and devastation. The law, therefore, has wisely given to the king the custody of these temporalities until a new election, with power to take to himself all intermediate profits, and to present to all preferments falling vacant during the vacancy of the see. This revenue cannot be granted to a subject; but the 14 Edward III, stat. 4 ch. 4:5, empowers the king, on a vacancy occurring, to lease the temporalities to the deal and chapter, with a reservation of all advowsons, escheats, and the like. To remedy the wrongs to the Church perpetrated by former sovereigns, who sometimes kept bishoprics vacant in order to enjoy the possession of their temporalities, and when they did supply the vacancy compelled the new bishop to purchase back his temporalities at an exorbitant price, Henry I, by charter, agreed neither to sell, let to farm, nor take anything from the domains of the Church until the successor was installed. By Magna Charta provision was made that no waste should be committed in the temporalities of the bishoprics, and that neither should the custody of them be sold. At present this revenue of the crown is of very small account; for as soon as the new bishop is consecrated and confirmed, he usually receives, restitution of his temporalities entire and untouched from his sovereign, to whom he at the same time does homage, and then possesses, which he did not before, a fee simple in his bishopric, and may maintain an action for the profits.

## Tempt[[@Headword:Tempt]]

             is used in the Bible in the Latin sense of prove, as a rendering especially of

בָּחִן, bachdn, and πειράζω, which both signify to test or try. It is applied to various beings in different senses, not always involving an evil purpose wherein the temptation is presented to the mind as an inducement to sin. SEE TEMPTATION.

1. God is said to have tempted Abraham by commanding him to offer up his son Isaac (Gen 22:1), intending to prove his obedience and faith, to confirm and strengthen him by this trial, and to furnish in his person an  example and pattern of perfect obedience for all succeeding ages. God does not tempt or try men in order to ascertain their tempers and dispositions, as if he were ignorant of them, but to exercise their virtue, to purify it, to render it conspicuous to others, to give them an opportunity of receiving favors from his hands. When we read in Scripture that God proved his people, whether they would walk in his law or not (Exo 16:4), and that he permitted false prophets to arise among them, who prophesied vain things to try them whether they would seek the Lord with their whole hearts, we should interpret these expressions by that of James (Jam 1:13-14), “Let no man say when he is tempted, ‘I am tempted of God,' for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man. But every man is tempted when he is drawn away by his own lust and enticed.”

2. The devil tempts us to evil of every kind, and lays snares for us, even in our best actions. Satan, having access to the sensorium, lays inducements before the minds of men to solicit them to sin (1Co 7:5; 1Th 3:5; Jam 1:13-14). Hence Satan is called that old serpent, the devil, and “the tempter” (Rev 12:9; Mat 4:3), and the temptation of our first parents to sin is expressly recognized as the work of the devil (Gen 3:1-15; Joh 8:44; 2Co 11:3; 1Jn 3:8). He tempted our Savior in the wilderness, and endeavored to infuse into him sentiments of pride, ambition, and distrust (Mat 4:1; Mar 1:13; Luk 4:2). He tempted Ananias and Sapphira to lie to the Holy Ghost (Act 5:3). In the prayer that Christ himself has taught us, we pray God “to lead us not into temptation” (Mat 6:13); and a little before his death, our Savior exhorted his disciples to “watch and pray, that they might not enter into temptation” (26:41). Paul says,” God will not suffer us to be tempted above what we are able to bear” (1Co 10:13).

3. Men are said to tempt the Lord when they unseasonably require proofs of the divine presence, power, or goodness. Without doubt, we are allowed to seek the Lord for his assistance, and to pray him to give us what we need; but it is not allowed us to tempi him, nor to expose ourselves to dangers from which we cannot escape unless by miraculous interposition of his omnipotence.. God is not obliged to work miracles in our favor; he requires of us only the performance of such actions as are within the ordinary measures of our strength. The Israelites in the desert repeatedly tempted the Lord, as if they had reason to doubt his presence among them,  or his goodness, or his power, after all his appearances in their favor (Exo 16:2; Exo 16:7; Exo 16:17; Num 20:12; Psa 78:18; Psa 78:41, etc.).

4. Men tempt or try one another when they would know whether things are really what they seem to be, whether men are such as they are thought or desired to be. The queen of Sheba came to prove the wisdom of Solomon by proposing riddles for him to explain (1Ki 11:1; 2Ch 9:1). Daniel desired of him who had the care of feeding him and his companions to prove them for some days whether abstinence from food of certain kinds would make them leaner (Dan 1:12; Dan 1:14). The scribes and Pharisees often tempted our Savior, and endeavored to decoy him into their snares (Mat 16:1; Mat 19:3; Mat 22:18).

## Temptation[[@Headword:Temptation]]

             (מִסָּה, πειρασμός, both meaning trial) in the modern usage of the term, is the enticement of a person to commit sin by offering some seeming advantage. There are four things, says one, in temptation (1) deception, (2) infection, (3) seduction, (4) perdition. The sources of temptation are Satan, the world, and the flesh. We are exposed to them in every state, in every place, and in every time of life. They may be wisely permitted to show us our weakness, to try our faith, to promote our humility, and to teach us to place our dependence on a superior Power; yet we must not run into them, but watch and pray; avoid sinful company; consider the love, sufferings, and constancy of Christ, and the awful consequences of falling a victim to temptation. The following rules have been laid down, by which we may in some measure know when a temptation comes from Satan:

1. When the temptation is unnatural, or contrary to the general bias or temper of our minds;

2. When it is opposite to the present frame of the mind;

3. When the temptation itself is irrational, being contrary to whatever we could imagine our own minds would suggest to us;

4. When a temptation is detested in its first rising and appearance;

5. Lastly, when it is violent. See Brooks, Owen, Gilpin, Capel, and Gillespie on Temptation; South, Seven Sermons on Temptation, in vol. 6 of his Sermons; Pike and Hayward, Cases of Conscience; and Bishop Porteus, Sermons, vol. 1, ser. 3 and 4.

## Temptation Of Christ[[@Headword:Temptation Of Christ]]

             Immediately after the inauguration of his ministry, Jesus was led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil; and after enduring for forty days the general assault of Satan, he suffered three' special solicitations, which are recited in detail (Mat 4:1-11; Mar 1:12-13; Luk 4:1-13). SEE JESUS CHRIST.

I. Particulars and Drift of the Trial. — In the first temptation the Redeemer is hungered, and when the devil bids him, if he be the Son of God, command that the stones may be made bread, there would seem to be no great sin in this use of divine power to overcome the pressing human want. Our Lord's answer is required to show us where the essence of the temptation lay. He takes the words of Moses to the children of Israel (Deu 8:3), which mean, not that men must dispense with bread and feed only on the study of the Divine Word, but that our meat and drink, our food and raiment, are all the work of the creating hand of God, and that a sense of dependence on God is the duty of man. He tells the tempter that as the sons of Israel standing in the wilderness were forced to humble themselves and to wait upon the hand of God for the bread from heaven which he gave them, so the Son of man, fainting in the wilderness from hunger, will be humble and will wait upon his Father in heaven for the Word that shall bring him food, and will not be hasty to deliver himself from that dependent state, but will wait patiently for the gifts of his goodness.

In the second temptation, it is not probable that they left the wilderness, but that Satan was allowed to suggest to our Lord's mind the place and the marvel that could be wrought there. They stood, it has been suggested, on the lofty porch that overhung the valley of Kedron, where the steep side of the valley was added to the height of the Temple (Josephus, Ant. 15:11, 5), and made a depth that the eye could scarcely have borne to look down upon. “Cast thyself down” perform in the holy city, in a public place, a wonder that will at once make all men confess that none but the Son of God could perform it. A passage from Psalms 91 is quoted to give a color to the argument. Our Lord replies by an allusion to another text that carries us back again to the Israelites wandering in the wilderness: “Ye shall not tempt the Lord your God, as ye tempted him in Massah” (Deu 6:16). Their conduct is more fully described by the psalmist as a tempting of God: They tempted God in their heart by asking meat for their lust; yea,  they spake against God: they said, Can God furnish a table in the wilderness? Behold he smote the rock that the waters gushed out and the streams overflowed. Can he give bread also? Can he provide flesh for his people?” (Psalms 78). Just parallel was the temptation here. God has protected thee so far, brought thee up, put his seal upon thee by manifest proofs of his favor. Can he do this also? Can he send the angels to buoy thee up in thy descent? Can he make the air thick to sustain and the earth soft to receive thee? The appropriate answer is, “Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.”

In the third temptation it is not asserted that there is any mountain from which the eyes of common men can see the world and its kingdoms at once displayed; it was with the mental vision of One who knew all things that these kingdoms and their glory were seen. Satan has now begun to discover, if he knew not from the beginning, that One is here who can become the King over them all. He says, “All these things will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me.” In Luke the words are fuller: “All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them, for that is delivered unto me, and to whomsoever I will, I give it;” but these words are the lie of the tempter, which he uses to mislead. “Thou art come to be great to be a King on the earth; but I am strong, and will resist thee. Thy followers shall be imprisoned and slain; some of them shall fall away through fear; others. shall forsake thy cause, loving this present world. Cast in thy lot with me; let thy kingdom be an earthly kingdom, only the greatest of all a kingdom such as the Jews seek to see established on the throne of David. Worship me by living as the children of this world live, and so honoring me in thy life then all shall be thine.” The Lord knows that the tempter is right in foretelling such trials to him; but though clouds and darkness hang over the path of his ministry he must work the work of him that sent him, and not another work: he must worship God, and none other. “Get thee hence, Satan; for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.” As regards the order of the temptations, there are internal marks that the account of Matthew assigns them their historical order. Luke transposes the last two, for which various reasons are suggested by commentators (Mat 4:1-11; Mar 1:12-13; Luk 4:1-13).

The three temptations are addressed to the three forms in Which the disease of sin makes its appearance on the soul-to the solace of sense, and the love of praise, and the desire of gain (1Jn 2:16); But there is one  element common to them all-they are attempts to call up a willful and wayward spirit, in contrast to a patient self-denying one. SEE TEMPT. The author of Ecce Homo, although he takes too subjective a view of the last temptation scene, has admirably developed the thought, as lying at the foundation of Christ's whole public demeanor, that he was constantly on his guard against the prevailing notion of an establishment of the Messiah's kingdom by force instead of the influence of love; and he well observes that the temptation to this course was one that must have presented itself at some time to the Redeemer's mind.

II. Credibility and Design of the Narrative. — That when our Lord retired to the interior part of the wilderness the enemy of mankind should present the most plausible temptation to our Redeemer, under these trying circumstances, is perfectly consistent with the malevolence of his character. The grand question is, Why was Satan suffered thus to insult the Son of God? Wherefore did the Redeemer suffer his state of retirement to be thus disturbed with the malicious suggestions of the fiend? It may be answered that herein (1) he gave an instance of his own condescension and humiliation, (2) he hereby proved his power over the tempter, (3) he set an example of firmness and virtue to his followers, and (4) he here affords consolation to his suffering people by showing not only that he himself was tempted, but is able to succor those who are tempted (Heb 2:13; Heb 4:15).

III. Historical Character of the Scene. — As the baptism of our Lord. cannot have been for him the token of repentance and intended reformation which it was for sinful men, so does our Lord's sinlessness affect the nature of his temptation, for it was the trial of one who could not possibly have fallen. This makes a complete conception of the temptation impossible for minds wherein temptation is always associated with the possibility of sin. But while we must be content with an incomplete conception, we must avoid the wrong conceptions that are often substituted for it. The popular view of this undoubted portion of our Savior's history is that it is a narrative of outward transactions; that our Savior, immediately after his baptism, was conducted by the Spirit into the wilderness-either the desolate and mountainous region now called Quarantania by the people of Palestine (Kitto, Phys. Hist. p. 39, 40), or the great desert of Arabia, mentioned in Deu 8:15; Deu 32:10; Hos 13:5; Jer 2:6, etc. — where the devil tempted him in person, appeared to him in a visible form, spoke to  him in an audible voice, removed him to the summit “of an exceeding high mountain,” and to the top of “a pinnacle of the Temple at Jerusalem;” whereas the view taken by many learned commentators, ancient and modern, is that it is the narrative of a vision, which was designed to “supply that ideal experience of temptation, or trial, which it was provided in the divine counsels for our Lord to receive previously to entering upon the actual trials and difficulties of his ministry” (Bishop Maltby, Sermons [Lond. 1822 ], 2, 276). Farmer also considers it a “divine vision,” and endeavors with much learning and ingenuity to “illustrate the wise and benevolent intention of its various scenes as symbolical predictions and representations of the principal trials attending Christ's public ministry” (Inquiry into the Nature and Design of Christ's Temptation [Lond. 1776, 8vo], preface).

On behalf of the popular interpretation, it is urged that the accounts given by the evangelists convey no intimation that they refer to a vision; that the feeling of hunger could not have been merely ideal; that a vision of forty days' continuance is incredible; that Moses, who was a type of, Christ, saw no “visions,” and that hence it may be concluded Christ did not; that it is highly probable there would be a personal conflict between Christ and Satan when the former entered on his ministry. Satan had ruined the first Adam, and might hope to prevail with the second (Trollope, Analecta [Lond. 1830], 1, 46). Why, too, say others, was our Lord taken up into a mountain to see a vision? As reasonably might Paul have taken the Corinthians into a mountain to “show them the more excellent way of charity” (1Co 12:31).

On the contrary side, it is rejoined that the evangelists do really describe the temptation as a vision. Matthew says, ἀνήχθη εἰς τὴν ἔρημον ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος; Mark, τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτὸν ἐκβάλλει; and Luke, ἤγετο ἐν τñ πνεύματι. Do these phrases mean no more than that Jesus went by the guidance or impulse of the Spirit to a particular locality.? Do they not rather import that Christ was brought into the wilderness under the full influence of the prophetic spirit making suitable revelations to his mind? With regard to the hunger, the prophets are represented as experiencing bodily sensations in their visions (Eze 3:3; Rev 10:10). Further arguments, derived from an unauthorized application of types, are precarious that the first Adam really had no personal encounter with Satan; that all the purposes of our Lord's temptation might be answered by a vision, for, whatever might be the mode, the effect was intended to be  produced upon his mind and moral feelings, like Peter's vision concerning Cornelius, etc. (Act 10:11-17); that commentators least given to speculate allow that the temptation during the first forty days was carried on by mental suggestion only, and that the visible part of the temptation began “when the tempter came to him” (Mat 4:3; Luk 4:3; Scott, ad loc.); that with regard to Christ's being “taken up into an exceeding high mountain,” Ezekiel says (Eze 40:2), “in the visions of God brought he me into the land of Israel, and set me upon a very high mountain,” etc.; and that John says,” he carried me away in the spirit to a great and high mountain, and showed me that great city, the holy Jerusalem” (Rev 21:10). But certain direct arguments are also urged on the same side. Thus,' is it consistent with the sagacity and policy of the evil spirit to suppose that he appeared in his own proper person to our Lord uttering solicitations to evil? Was not this the readiest mode to frustrate his own intentions? Archbishop Seeker says, “certainly he did not appear what he was, for that would have entirely frustrated his intent” (Sermons, 2, 114).

Chandler says,. The devil appeared not as himself, for that would have frustrated the effect of his temptation” (Serm. 3,178). Seeker supposes that “Satan transformed himself into an angel of light;” but was it likely that he would put on this form in order to tempt our Lord to idolatry? (Mat 4:9). Chandler thinks he appeared as “a good man;” but would it have served his purpose to appear as a good man promising universal dominion? The supposition that the devil disguised himself in any form might indeed constitute the temptation a trial of our Lord's understanding, but not of his heart. Besides, Christ is represented as addressing him as “Satan” (Mat 4:10). It is further urged that the literal interpretation does but little honor to the Savior, whom it represents as carried or conducted “by the devil at his will,” and therefore as accessory to his own temptation and danger; nor does it promote the consolation of his followers, none of whom could ever be similarly tempted. Our Lord indeed submitted to all the liabilities of the human condition; but do these involve the dominion of Satan over the body to the extent thus represented? The literal interpretation also attributes miraculous powers to the devil, who, though a spiritual being, is represented as becoming visible at pleasure, speaking in an audible voice, and conveying mankind where he pleases-miracles not inferior to what our Lord's preservation would have been had he cast himself headlong from the Temple. Suppose we even give up the old notion that “the devil hurried Christ through the air, and carried him from the wildernesss to the Temple” (Benson, Life of Christ, p. 35),  and say, with-Doddridge and others, that “the devil took our Lord about with him as one person takes another to different places,” yet how without a miracle shall we account for our Savior's admission to the exterior of the Temple, unless he first, indeed, obtained permission of the authorities, which is not recorded (comp. Josephus, Ant. 15:11; 3, 5; War, 5, 5).

The difficulty is solved by the supposition simply of a change in our Lord's perceptions. How can we further understand, except by the aid of a vision or a miracle, that the devil “showed our Lord all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them in a moment of time” (ἐν στίγμῇ χρόνου), a phrase referring to the mathematical point, and meaning the most minute and indivisible portion of duration, that is, instantaneously; yet in this space of time, according to the literal interpretation, “the devil showed our Lord all the kingdoms of the world and all the glory of them,” i.e. whatever relates to their magnificence, as imperial robes, crowns, thrones, palaces, courts, guards, armies, etc. Scott and Poddridge resort to the supposition of an “illusory show;” but it may be asked, if one of the temptations was conducted by such means, why not the other two? Macknight endeavors to explain “all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them” as relating only to the land of promise (Harmony of the Gospels [Lond. 1822], p. 350, note).

Farmer conceives that no mountain in Palestine commands so extensive a prospect. It is a further difficulty attending the literal interpretation that Satan represents all the kingdoms of the world and their glory to be at his disposal; an assertion denied by our Lord, who simply rejects the offer. It may readily be conceived that it would answer all purposes that Jesus should seem to have the proposal in question made to him. It is next observed that many things are spoken of in Scripture as being done which were only done in vision. See the numerous instances collected by bishop Law (Considerations of the Theory of Religion [Lond. 1820], p. 85,86). The reader may refer to Gen 32:30; Hos 1:3; Jer 13:25; Jer 13:27; Ezekiel 3; Eze 4:5. Paul calls his being “caught up into the third heaven and into Paradise” a vision and revelation of the Lord (2Co 12:1-4). It is plain from this instance in the case of Paul, and from that of Peter (Act 12:7-9), who had already experienced visions (Act 10:10, etc.), that neither of the apostles could at first distinguish visions-from impressions made on the senses. In further illustration it is urged that the prophets are often said to be carried about in visions (Eze 8:1-10; Eze 11:24-25; Eze 37:1; Eze 40:1-2). The phrase “by the spirit,” etc., is said to be equivalent to “the hand of God,” etc., among the prophets (1Ki 18:46; 2Ki 3:15; Eze 1:3). A  comparison of the parallel phrases in the Sept. of Ezekiel and in the evangelists, in regard to Christ's temptation, is thought to cast much light upon the subject; the phrase “the devil leaveth him” being equivalent to the phrase “the vision I had seen went up from me” (Eze 11:24).

Another form of the above theory is that the presence of the tempter, the words spoken, etc., were merely conceptual, i.e. mental phenomena or impressions upon the Savior, similar to the suggestions ordinarily experienced by saints in temptations of peculiar vividness or pungency. This view is confuted by the following considerations:

1. The language (“came,” “said,” “taketh him,” etc.) implies, if not a physical, certainly at least a visional presentation as distinct as if actual. Such expressions as “The word of the Lord came,” urged as parallel, are not in point; for in these the subject presented being necessarily immaterial of itself, defines the presentation as being merely mental.

2. The comparison of our Savior's psychology in this case with that of common mortals is inapposite, since they, being fallen, are always, in some sense at least, tempted ab intra (Jam 1:14), whereas Jesus, being immaculate, could have no evil thoughts of his own surmising; nor could they arise in his mind except as directly suggested from some absolutely external source. And even supposing they could have occurred as an intellectual proposition to his mental perception, they must have instantly passed away without any of that vividness and pertinacity which the whole narration implies, unless they had been enforced and sustained by the personal solicitation of a palpable being and a formal conversation.

3. The parallel with the temptation of Adam in Paradise requires more than an imaginary scene. Some, indeed, have by a like process of interpretation taken the record of the Fall in Eden likewise out of the province of actual history; and it is difficult to see why one event is not as fit a subject for this eviscerating rationalism in hermeneutics as the other (see Townsend, Chronological Arrangement [Lond. 1828], 1, 92). In short, there must have been a substantial basis of fact in the case of our Savior to justify the marked character of the transaction as recorded by the evangelists.

We conclude, therefore, that all these suppositions set aside the historical testimony of the gospels; the temptation as there described arose not from the sinless mind of the Son of God, where, indeed, thoughts of evil could not have harbored, but from Satan, the enemy of the human race. Nor can  it be supposed that this account is a mere parable, unless we assume that Matthew and Luke have wholly misunderstood their Master's meaning. The story is that of a fact, hard indeed to be understood, but not to be made easier by explanations such as would invalidate the only testimony on which it rests (Heubner, Practical Commentary on Matthew).

IV. Literature. — See, besides the works cited above, Bagot,-Temptation in the Wilderness (Lond. 1840); Hall, Sermons on Our Lord's Temptation (ibid. 1845); Dallas, Christ's Temptation (ibid. 1848); Krummacher, Christ in the Wilderness (from the Germr., 3d ed. ibid. 1852); Smith [T. T.], Temptation of Our Saviour (ibid. 1852); Monod,: Temptation of Christ (from the French, ibid. 1854); Macleod, Temptation of Our Lord (ibid. 1872); and the Am. Theol. Rev. July, 1861; Bost. Rev. March, 1863; also the monographs cited by Wolf, Curce in N.T. 1, 66; by Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 23; by Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 89; and by Mever, Commentary on Matthew 4 (Edinb. ed.), 1, 129.

## Tempus Clausum[[@Headword:Tempus Clausum]]

             (FERIATUM, SACRATUM), a closed time, is the period during which noisy festivities are prohibited in the Church of Rome, particularly such as are common in connection with the celebration of a marriage. The origin of such prohibitions is to be found in the ideas which exercised, in some degree at least, a determining influence over the regulation of fasts. SEE FASTING. Prayer and continence were employed as a preparation for the worthy observance of feasts among the Israelites (Exo 19:14 sq.; 1Sa 21:4), and the custom is endorsed by Paul in 1Co 7:5. The most ancient ecclesiastical regulations upon this subject date back to the middle of the 4th century (e.g. Conic. Laodicen. c. 51, 52). The civil authorities confirmed the prohibitions imposed by the Church (e.g. Cod. De Feriis, c. 11, 3, 12 of Leo, and Anthemius 469), and thereupon the Tempus Clausunm was generally made to apply to the Lenten period, and its extension over the Advent and other festal periods recommended. No general and inflexible rule for the dies' observabiles existed during the Middle Ages, and none has since been established. The usual time is contained between the first Sunday in Advent aid the octave of Epiphany, Septuagesima and Easter, Rogation and Trinity Sundays. Quiet weddings, as they are termed, are permitted to be celebrated during those periods, but never without a dispensation from the local bishop.  The tempus clausum was adopted by the Protestant churches of Germany (see Goschen, Doctr. de Matrimon. ex Ordinat. Eccl. Evang. etc. [Halis, 1848, 4to], p. 38, 39; art. 133-140), and the subject received careful consideration so late as 1857 in the conference of Eiseaiach (see Moser, Allgem. Kirchenbl. f. d. evangel. Deutschl. 1857, p. 325 sq., 343; 1858, p. — 197 sq.). The Tempus Clausum Quadragesimae in such churches commonly extends over the period between Ash-Wednesday and Easter- Sunday, though it includes only the Passion week in some regions, and in others is not recognized at all. Its observance also varies greatly. Public amusements are prohibited, and marriages are sometimes wholly forbidden or are compelled to be quietly celebrated. Where such legal prohibitions are in force, dispensations from their operation may usually be obtained, except in Altenburg and the principality of Lubeck and Reuss. On the subject, see Hartzheim, Concilia Gernmanie, 3, 56; Conc. Trident. sess. 24:10, De Reform. Matrimon.; Bihmnir, Jus Eccles. Prot. lib. 3, tit. 46, § 45; lib. 4 tit. 16:§ 2 sq.; Kliefoth, Liturgische Abhandlungen, i, 55 sq. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s. SEE LENT.

## Temurah[[@Headword:Temurah]]

             SEE CABALA; SEE TALMUD.

## Ten[[@Headword:Ten]]

             (עֶשֶׂר, ser, or some modification of it; δέκα; the Heb. plur. עַשְׂרַים, esrim, means “twenty;” the root עָשִׂר, asár, is thought by Fürst and Mihlau to signify heaping, but Gesenius regards it as primitive), the number which lies at the basis of modern numeration, having its natural origin in the twice five fingers used for counting, and largely employed as such even by the Hebrews, notwithstanding their peculiar regard for seven as containing the notion of completeness. SEE NUMBER.

In the civil and ecclesiastical usages of the Israelites this numerical idea especially appears in their word for “tithe” (מִעֲשֵׁר, Lev 27:30-32, etc.; Sept. δεκάτη, scil. μοῖρα, “a part;” Vulg. decimal), plainly derived from עשר, “ten,” which also (in the form עשר) means “to be rich;” hence ten is the rich number, perhaps because including all the units under it. The same idea has been rather hastily conceived as being retained in the Greek; thus, δέκω, δέχομαι, “to receive,” “hold,” etc., δέκα, “ten,” because the ten fingers hold everything; and in the Latin, teneo;  French, contenir; English, contain, ten. Pythagoras speaks of the Decade, which is the sum of all the preceding numbers 1+2+3+4, as comprehending all musical and arithmetical proportions. For a view of his doctrine of numbers and the probability of its Egyptian origin, see Wilkinson, Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians, 4:193-200. For Aristotle's similar ideas of the number ten, see Probl. 3, 15. This number seems significant of completeness or abundance in many passages of Scripture. Jacob said unto Laban, “Thou hast changed my wages these ten times” (Gen 31:41); “Am not I better to thee than ten sons?” (1Sa 1:8); “These ten times have ye reproached me” (Job 19:3); “Thy pound hath gained ten pounds” (Luk 19:16), etc. This number, as the end of less numbers and beginning of greater, and as thus signifying perfection, sufficiency, etc., may have been selected for its suitableness to those eucharistic donations to religion, etc., which mankind were required to make, probably, in primeval times. Abraham gave to Melchisedek, “priest of the Most High God,” a tenth of all the spoils he had taken from Chedorlaomer (Gen 14:20; Heb 7:4). The incidental way in which this fact is stated seems to indicate an established custom. Why should Abraham give tithes of the spoils of war and not of other things? For instances of the heathen dedicating to their gods the tenth of warlike spoils, see Wettstein, On Heb 7:4. Jacob's vow (Gen 28:22) seems simply to relate to compliance with an established custom; his words are, literally, “And all that thou shalt give me I will assuredly tithe it unto thee,” אעשרנו ל ִעשר. On the practice of the heathen, in various and distant countries, to dedicate tithes to their gods, see Spelman, On Tithes, ch. 26; Selden, ch. 3; Lesley, Divine Right of Tithes, § 7; Wettstein, On Heb 7:2. The Mosaic Law, therefore, in this respect, as well as in others, was simply a reconstitution of the patriarchal religion. Thus the tenth of military spoils is commanded (Num 31:31). For the law concerning tithes generally, see Lev 27:30, etc., where they are first spoken of as things already known. These tithes consisted of a tenth of all that remained after payment of the first-fruits of seeds and fruits, and of calves, lambs, and kids. This was called the first tithe, and belonged to God as the sovereign. SEE TITHE.

## Ten Articles[[@Headword:Ten Articles]]

             In the year 1536 convocation under Henry VIII gave sanction to the “Ten Articles,” entitled “Articles devised by the king's highness majesty to  establish Christian quietness and unity among us.” These were probably compiled by Cranmer, though ostensibly emanating from the crown. Five of the articles related to doctrines and five to ceremonies. The former were:

1. That Holy Scriptures and the three Creeds are the basis and summary of a true Christian faith.

2. That baptism conveys remission of sins and the regenerating grace of the Holy Spirit, and is absolutely necessary as well for children as adults.

3. That penance consists of contrition, confession, and reformation, and is necessary to salvation.

4. That the body and blood of Christ are really present in the elements of the Eucharist.

5. That justification is remission of sin and reconciliation to God by the merits of Christ; but good works are necessary.

The latter were:

1. That images are useful as remembrancers, but are not objects of worship.

2. That saints are to-be honored as examples of life, and as furthering our prayers.

3. That saints may be invoked as intercessors, and their holydays observed.

4. That ceremonies are to be observed for the sake of their mystical signification, and as conducive to devotion.

5. That prayers for the dead are good and useful, but the efficacy of papal pardon, and of soul-masses offered at certain localities, is negatived. Upon these articles was founded the work entitled Institution of a Christian Man (q.v.), commonly known as “The Bishop's Book” (q.v.). SEE ARTICLES.

## Ten Broeck, Anthony, D.D[[@Headword:Ten Broeck, Anthony, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born in New York city in 1815. He graduated from Columbia College, and from the General Theological Seminary in 1837; for many years was engaged in teaching; was connected with a school in Orange N.J., under the supervision of bishop Doane; taught in the Mt. Auburn Institute in Washington; founded the bishop Bowman Institute at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; and became rector of Burlington College. He was rector of St. James's Church; Eatontown, N.J., at the time of his death, September 22, 1880. See Whittaker, Almanac and Directory, 1881, page 175.

## Ten Commandments, the[[@Headword:Ten Commandments, the]]

             the common designation of the Decalogue, or that portion of the law of Moses which contains the moral law. See LAW OF MOSES.

I. Title. — The popular name in this, as in so many instances, is not that of Scripture. There we have the “ten words” (עֲשֶׂרֶת הִדְּבָרַים, asereth haddebarim, the decade of the words; Sept. τὰ δέκα ῥήματα; Vulg. verba decean), not the ten commandments (Exo 34:28; Deu 4:13; Deu 10:4, Hebrews). The difference is not altogether an unmeaning one. The word of God, the “word of the Lord,” tie constantly recurring term for the fullest revelation, was higher than any phrase expressing merely a command, and carried with it more the idea of a self- fulfilling power. If, on the one side, there was the special contrast to which our Lord refers between the commandments of God and the traditions of men (Mat 15:3), the arrogance of the rabbins showed itself, on the other, in placing the words of the scribes on the same level as the words of God. SEE SCRIBE.

Nowhere in the later books of the Old Test. is any direct reference made to their number. The treatise of Philo, however, περὶ τῶν δέκα λογίων, shows that it had fixed itself on the Jewish mind, and, later still, it gave occasion to the formation of a new word (the “Decalogue,” ἡ δεκάλογος, first in Clem. Al., Paed. 3, 12), which has perpetuated itself in modern languages. Other names are even more significant. These, and these alone, are “the words of the covenant,” the unchanging ground of the ‘union between Jehovah and his people, all else' being as a superstructure, accessory and subordinate (Exo 34:28). They are also the tables of testimony, sometimes simply “The testimony,” the witness to men of the divine will, righteous itself, demanding righteousness, in man- (Exo 25:16; Exo 31:18, etc.). It is by virtue of their presence in it that the ark becomes, in its turn, the ark of the covenant (Num 10:33, etc.), that the sacred tent became the tabernacle of witness, of testimony (Exo 38:21, etc.). SEE TABERNACLE.

They remain there, throughout the glory of the kingdom, the primeval relics of a hoar antiquity (1Ki 8:9), their material, the writing on them, the sharp incisive character of the laws themselves, presenting a striking contrast to the more expanded teaching of a later time. Not less did the commandments themselves speak of the earlier age when not the silver and the gold, but the ox and the ass, were the great representatives of wealth (comp. 1Sa 12:3).

Ewald is disposed to think that even in the form in which we have the commandments there are some additions made at a later period, and that the second and the fourth commandment were originally as briefly imperative as the sixth or seventh (Gesch. Isr. 2, 206). The, difference  between the reason given in Exo 20:11 for the fourth commandment and that stated to have been given in Deu 5:15 makes, perhaps, such a conjecture possible. Scholia, which modern annotators put into the margin, are, in the existing state of the Old Test., incorporated into the text. Obviously both forms could not have appeared written on the two tables of stone, yet Deu 5:15; Deu 5:22 not only states a different reason, but affirms that “all these words” were thus written. Keil (Comment. on Exodus , 20) seems on this point disposed to agree with Ewald.

II. Double Record. — The Decalogue is found in two passages, first in Exo 20:2-17, again in Deuteronomy 5:621 and there are certain differences between the two forms, which have been taken advantage of by rationalistic interpreters, sometimes for the purpose of disparaging the historical correctness of either form, and sometimes as a conclusive argument against the doctrine of inspiration. The differences are of three kinds:

(1.) Simply verbal, consisting in the insertion or omission of the Hebrew letter וַ, which signifies and; in Exodus it is only omitted once where it is found in Deuteronomy, namely, between graven image and any likeness, in the second commandment; but in Deuteronomy it occurs altogether six times where it is wanting in Exodus; and of these four are at the commencement of the last four commandments, which are severally introduced with an and, joining them to what precedes.

(2.) Differences in form, where still the sense remains essentially the same: under the fourth commandment, it is in Exodus “nor thy cattle,” while in Deuteronomy it is “nor thine ox, nor thine ass, nor any of thy cattle” a mere amplification of the former by one or two leading particulars; and in the tenth commandment, as given in Exodus, “thy neighbor's house” comes first, while in Deuteronomy it is “thy neighbor's wife;” and here also after “thy neighbor's house,” is added “his field” another slight amplification.

(3.) Differences in respect to matter these are altogether four. The fourth commandment is introduced in Exodus with remember, in Deuteronomy with kelp; the reason also assigned for its observance in Exodus is derived from God's original act and procedure at creation, while in Deuteronomy this is omitted, and the deliverance of Israel from the land of Egypt is put  in its stead; in Deuteronomy the fifth commandment runs, “Honor thy father and thy mother, as the Lord thy God commanded thee,” the latter words having no place in Exodus; and in the tenth commandment, instead of “Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife,” it stands in Deuteronomy “Thou shalt not desire thy neighbor's wife” differing only, however, in this, that the one (covet) fixes attention more upon the improper desire to possess, and the other upon the improper desire itself.

It is obvious that these differences leave the main body or substance of the Decalogue, as a revelation of' law, entirely untouched; not one of them affects the import and bearing of a single precept; nor, if viewed in their historical relation, can they be regarded as involving in any doubt or uncertainty the verbal accuracy of the form presented in Exodus We have no reason to doubt that the words there recorded are precisely those which were uttered from Sinai, and written upon the tables of stone.' In Deuteronomy Moses gives a revised account of the transactions, using throughout certain freedoms, as speaking in a hortative manner, and from a more: distant point of view; and, while he repeats the commandments as those which the Lord had spoken from the midst of the fire and written on tables of stone (Deu 5:22), he yet shows in his very mode of doing it that he did not aim at an exact reproduction of the past, but wished to preserve to some extent the form of a free rehearsal. This especially appears in the addition to the fifth commandment, “as the Lord thy, God commanded thee,” which distinctly pointed back to a prior original, and even recognized that as the permanently existing form. The introducing also of so many of the later commands with the copulative and tends to the same result; as it is precisely what would be natural in a rehearsal, though not in the original announcements, and came from combining with the legislative something of the narrative style.

Such being plainly the character of this later edition, its other and: more noticeable deviations the occasional amplifications admitted to it, the substitution of desire for covet, with respect to a neighbor's wife, in the tenth command; and of the deliverance of Israel from Egypt, for the divine order of procedure at the creation, in the fourth must be regarded as slightly varied and explanatory statements, which it was perfectly competent for the authorized mediator of the covenant to introduce, and which, in nature and design, do not materially differ from the alterations sometimes made by inspired writers of the New Test. on the passages they quote from the Old (see Fairbairn, Hermen. Manual, p. 354 sq.). They are not without use in an exegetical  respect; and in the present case have also a distinct historical value, from the important evidence they yield in favor of the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy; since it is inconceivable that any later author, fictitiously personating Moses, would have ventured on making such alterations on what had been so expressly ascribed by Moses to God himself, and which seemed to bear on it such peculiar marks of sacredness and inviolability (Havernick, Introduction to the Pentateuch, § 25).

III. Source. —The circumstances in which the ten great words were first given to the people surrounded them with an awe which attached to no other precept. In the midst of the cloud, and the darkness, and the flashing lightning, and the fiery smoke, and the thunder, like the voice of a trumpet, Moses was called to receive the law without which the people would cease to be a holy nation. Here, as elsewhere, Scripture unites two facts which men separate. God, and not man, was speaking to the Israelites in those terrors, and yet in the language of later inspired teachers, other instrumentality was not excluded. Buxtorf, it is true, asserts that Jewish interpreters, with hardly an exception, maintain that “Deus verba Decalogiper se immediate locutus est” (Diss. de Decal.). The language of Josephus, however (Ant. 15:5, 3), not less than that of the New Test., shows that at one time the traditions of the Jewish schools pointed to the opposite conclusion. The law was “ordained by angels” (Gal 3:9) “spoken by angels” (Heb 2:2), received as the ordinance of angels (Act 7:53). ‘The agency of those whom the thoughts of the Psalmist connected with the winds and the flaming fire (Psa 104:4; Heb 1:7) was present also on Sinai. The part of Moses himself was, as the language of Paul (Gal 3:19) affirms, that of “a mediator.” He stood “between” the people and the Lord “to show them the word of the Lord? (Deuteronomy 5), while they stood afar off to give form and distinctness to what would else have been terrible and overwhelming. — The voice of the Lord” which they heard in the thunderings and the sound of the trumpet, “full of majesty,” “dividing the flames of fire” (Psa 29:3-9), was for him a divine word, the testimony of an eternal will, just as in the parallel instance of Joh 12:29, a like testimony led some to say “it thundered,” while others received the witness. No other words were proclaimed in like manner. The people shrank even from this nearness to the awful presence, even from the very echoes of the divine voice. The record was as exceptional as the original revelation. Of no other words could it be said that they were written as these were written,  engraved on the tables of stone, not as originating in man's contrivance or sagacity, but by the power of the Eternal Spirit, by the finger of God (Exo 31:18; Exo 32:16). SEE BATH-KOL.

IV. The number ten was, we can hardly doubt, itself significant to Moses and the Israelites. The received symbol, then and at all times, of completeness (Bahr, Symbolik, 1,175-183), it taught the people that the law, of Jehovah was perfect (Psa 19:7) , The fact that they were written, not on one, but on two tables, probably in two groups of five each (infra), taught men (though with some variations from the classification of later ethics) the great division of duties towards God and duties towards our neighbor, which we recognize as the groundwork of every true moral system. It taught them also, five being the symbol of imperfection (Bath, 1, 183-187), how incomplete each set of duties would be when divorced from its companion. The recurrence of these numbers in the Pentateuch is at once frequent and striking. Ewald (Gesch. Isr. 2, 212-217) has shown by a large induction how continually laws and precepts meet us in groups of five or ten. The numbers, it, will be remembered, meet us again as the basis of all the proportions of the tabernacle (q.v.) and temple. It would show an ignorance of all modes of Hebrew thought to exclude this symbolic aspect. We need not, however, shut out altogether that which some writers (e.g. Grotius, De Decal. p. 36) have substituted for it, the connection of the ten words with a decimal system of numeration through the ten fingers on which a man counts. Words which were to be the rule of life for the poor as well as the learned, the groundwork of education for all children, might well be connected with the simplest facts and processes in man's mental growth, and thus stamped more indelibly on the memory. Bahr, absorbed in symbolism, has nothing for this natural suggestion but two notes of admiration (!!). The analogy of ten great commandments in the moral law of Buddhism might have shown him how naturally men crave a number that thus helps them. A true system was as little likely to ignore the natural craving as a false. (see note in Ewald, Gesch. Isr. 2, 207). SEE TEN.

V. Tables. — In what way the Ten Commandments were to be divided has, however, been a matter of much controversy. At least four distinct arrangements present themselves.

1. In the received teaching of the Latin Church resting on that of Augustine (Qu. in Ex. 71; Ep. ad January c. 11; De Decal. etc.), the first table contained three commandments, the second the other seven. Partly on  mystical grounds, because the tables thus symbolized the trinity of divine persons and the eternal Sabbath, partly as seeing in it a true ethical division, he adopted this classification. It involved, however, and in part proceeded from, an alteration in the received arrangement. What we know as the first and second were united; and consequently the Sabbath law appeared at the close of the first table as the third, not as the fourth, commandment. The completeness of the number was restored in the second table by making a separate (the ninth) command of the precept, “Thou shalt not covet; thy neighbor's wife,” which with us forms part of the tenth; It is an almost fatal objection to this order that in the first table it confounds, where it ought to distinguish, the two sins of polytheism and idolatry; and that in the second it introduces ant arbitrary and meaningless distinction. The later theology of the Church of Rome apparently adopted it as seeming to prohibit image-worship only so far as it accompanied the acknowledgment of another God (Catech. Trident. 3, 2,20).

2. The familiar division-referring the first four to our duty towards God, and the six remaining to our duty towards man-is, on ethical grounds, simple and natural enough. If it is not altogether satisfying, it is because it fails to recognize the symmetry which gives to the number five so great a prominence; and perhaps, also, because it looks on the duty of the fifth commandment from the point of view of modern ethics rather than from that of the ancient Israelites and the first disciples of Christ (infra).

3. A modification of 1 has been adopted by later Jewish writers (Jonathan ben-Uzziel, Abed-Ezra, Moses ben Nachman, in Suicer, Thesaur. s.v. Δεκάλογος). Retaining the combination of the first and second commandments of the common order, they have made a new “word” of the opening declaration, “I am the Lord thy God which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage,” and so have avoided the necessity of the subdivision of the tenth. The objection to this division is (1), that it rests on no adequate authority, and (2) that it turns into a single precept what is evidently given as the groundwork of the whole body of laws.

4. Rejecting these three, there remains that recognized by the older Jewish writers-Josephus (Ant. 3,. 6, 6) and Philo. (De Decal. 1), and supported ably and thoughtfully by Ewald (Gesch. Isr. 2, 208), which places, five commandments in each table, and thus preserves the pentad and decad grouping which pervades the whole code. A modern jurist would perhaps.  object that this places the fifth commandment in a wrong position; that a duty to parents is a duty towards our neighbor. From the Jewish point of view, it is believed, the place thus given to that commandment was essentially the right one. Instead of duties towards God, and duties towards our neighbors, we must think of the first table as containing all that belonged to the Εὐσέβεια of the Greeks, to the Pietas of the Romans- duties, i.e., with no corresponding rights; while the second deals with duties which involve rights, and come, therefore, under the head of Justitia. The duty of honoring, i.e. supporting, parents came under the former head. As soon as the son was capable of it, and the parents required it, it was an absolute, unconditional duty. His right to any maintenance from them had ceased. He owed them reverence as he owed it to his Father in heaven (Heb 12:9). He was to show piety (εὐσεβεῖν) to them (1 Timothy 5, 4). What made the “Corban” casuistry of the Scribes so specially evil was that it was, in this way, a sin against the piety of the first table, not merely against the lower obligations of the second (Mar 7:11). It at least harmonizes with this division that the second, third, fourth, and fifth commandments all stand on the same footing as having special sanctions attaching to them, while the others that follow are left in their simplicity by themselves, as if the parity of rights were in itself a sufficient ground for obedience. A further confirmation of the truth of this division is found in Rom 13:9. Paul, summing up the duties “briefly comprehended” in the one great law, “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,” enumerates the last five commandments, but makes no mention of the fifth.

VI. Addition. — To these Ten Commandments we find in the Samaritan Pentateuch an eleventh added:

“But when the Lord thy God shall have brought thee into the land of Canaan, whither thou goest to possess it, thou shalt set thee up two great stones, and shalt plaster them with plaster, and shalt write upon these stones all the words of this law. Moreover, after thou shalt have passed over Jordan thou shalt set up those stones, which I command thee this day, on Mount Gerizim, and thou shalt build there an altar to the Lord thy God, an altar of stones; thou shalt not lift up any iron thereon. Of unhewn stones shalt thou build that altar to the Lord thy God, and thou shalt offer on it burnt-offerings to the Lord thy God, and thou shalt sacrifice peace- offerings, and shalt eat them there; and thou shalt rejoice, before the Lord thy God in that mountain beyond Jordan, by the way where the sun goeth  down, the laud of the Canaanite that dwelleth in the plain country over against Gilgal, by the oak of Moreh, towards Sichem (Walton, Bibl. Polyglot.). In the absence of any direct evidence, we can only guess as to the history of this remarkable addition.

(1.) It will be seen that the whole passage is made up of two which are found in the Hebrew text of Deu 27:2-7; Deu 11:30, with the substitution, in the former, of Gerizim for Ebal.

(2.) In the absence of confirmation from any other version, Ebal must, so far as textual criticism is concerned, be looked upon as the true reading; Gerizim as a falsification, casual or deliberate, of the text.

(3.) Probably the choice of Gerizim as the site of the Samaritan temple was determined by the fact that it had been- the Mount of Blessings, Ebal that of Curses. Possibly, as Walton suggests (Proleg. c. 11), the difficulty of understanding how the latter should have been chosen instead of the former as a place for sacrifice and offering may have led them to look on the reading Ebal as erroneous. They were unwilling to expose themselves to the taunts of their Judean enemies by building a temple on the Hill of Curses. They would claim the inheritance of the blessings; they would set the authority of their text against that of the scribes of the Great Synagogue. One was as likely to be accepted as the other. The “Hebrew verity” was not then acknowledged as it has been since.

(4.) In other repetitions or transfers in the Samaritan Pentateuch we may perhaps admit the plea which Walton makes in its behalf (loc. cit.) that, in the first formation of the Pentateuch as a Codex, the transcribers had a large number of separate documents to copy, and that consequently much was left to the discretion of the individual scribe. Here, however, that excuse is hardly admissible. The interpolation has every mark of being a bold attempt to claim for the schismatic worship on Gerizim the solemn sanction of the voice on Sinai, to place it on the same footing as the ten great words of God. The guilt of the interpolation belonged, of course, only to the first contrivers of it. The later Samaritans might easily come to look on their text as the true one; on that of the Jews as corrupted by a fraudulent omission. It is to the credit of the Jewish scribes that they were not tempted to retaliate, and that their reverence for the sacred. records prevented them from suppressing the history which connected the rival sanctuary with the blessings of Gerizim. SEE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH.

VII. Taryum. — The treatment of the Ten Commandments in the Targum of Jonathan ben-Uzziel is not without interest. There, as noticed above, the first and second commandments are united to make up the second, and the words “I am the Lord thy God,” etc., are given as the first. More remarkable is the addition of a distinct reason for the last five commandments no less than for the first five. “Thou shalt commit no murder, for because of the sins of murderers the sword goeth forth upon the world.” So, in like manner and with the same formula, “death goeth forth upon the world” as the punishment of adultery; famine as that of theft; drought as that of false witness; invasion, plunder, captivity, as those of covetousness (Walton, Bib. Polyglott.). SEE TARGUM.

VIII. Talmud. — The absence of any distinct reference to the ten commandments as such in the Pirke Aboth (=Maxims of the Fathers)'is both strange and significant. One chapter (ch. v) is expressly given to an enumeration of all the scriptural facts which may be grouped in decades the ten words of Creation, the ten generations from Adam to Noah and from Noah to Abraham, the ten trials of Abraham, the ten plagues of Egypt, and the like; but the ten divine words find no place in the list. With all their ostentation of profound reverence for the law, the teaching of the rabbins turned on other points than the great laws of duty. In this way, as in others, they made void the commandments of God that they might keep their own traditions. Comp. Stanley, Jewish Church, lect. 7 in illustration of many of the points here noticed. SEE TALMUD.

IX. Economical Importance. — The giving of the Ten Commandments marks an era in the history of God's dispensations. Of the whole law this was both the first portion to be communicated, and the basis of all that followed. Various things attested this superiority. It was spoken directly by the Lord himself not communicated, like other parts of the old economy, through the ministration of Moses and spoken amid the most impressive signs of his glorious presence and majesty. Not only were the Ten Commandments thus spoken by God, but the further mark of relative importance was put upon them of being written on tables of stone-written by the very finger of God. They were thus elevated to a place above all the statutes and ordinances that were made known through the mediator of the old covenant; and the place then given them they were also destined to hold in the future; for the rocky tablets on which they were engraved  undoubtedly imaged an abiding validity and importance. It was an emblem of relative perpetuity. The very number of words, or utterances; in which they were comprised, ten, bespoke the same thing; for in the significancy that in ancient times was ascribed to certain numbers, ten was universally regarded as the symbol of completeness (Spencer, De Leg. Hebrews 1, 3; Bahr, Symbolik, 1, 175). SEE DECALOGUE.

## Tenebree[[@Headword:Tenebree]]

             (darkness), an office for the Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of Holy Week, commemorating the sufferings and death of our Blessed Savior. The name of the office has been traced to the fact that it was formerly celebrated at midnight, as an allusion to Christ walking no more openly with the Jews, as Cranmer says. Others suggest that it is derived from the gradual extinction of lights, which originally were put out one by one as the morning began to grow clear; or in symbol of grief and mourning; or, as Beleth suggests, of the eclipse of three hours at the Passion. The number of lights varied. In some churches there was a candle corresponding to each psalm and lesson of the office. Thus we find seven, nine, twelve, fifteen, twenty-four, twenty-five at York, thirty, seventy-two, or even as many as each person thought fit to bring. These were extinguished sometimes at once, or at two or three intervals. In some places they were quenched with a moist sponge, and in others with a hand of wax to represent Judas. St. Gregory of Tours says that on the night of Good- Friday the watchings were kept in darkness until the third hour, when a small light appeared above the altar. Cranmer explains that the Lamentations of Jeremiah were read in memory of the Jews seeking our Lord's life at this time. The Reproaches and Trisagion were not sung until the 14th century on Good-Friday.

## Tenison, Thomas[[@Headword:Tenison, Thomas]]

             a learned English prelate, was born at Cottenham, Cambridgeshire, Sept. 29, 1636; and receiving his primary education at the free school at Norwich, entered Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, where he graduated in Lent term, 1656-7. He began to study medicine, but on the eve of the Restoration decided upon the theological profession, and was ordained privately at Richmond in Surrey by the bishop of Salisbury. Being admitted fellow of his college March 24, 1662, he became tutor, and in 1665 was chosen one of the university preachers, and about the same time was  presented to the cure of St. Andrew the Great in Cambridge. In 1667 he received the rectory of Holywell and Nedingworth, Huntingdonshire, from the earl of Manchester, and in 1674 was chosen principal minister to the Church of St. Pete's Mancroft, Norwich. In 1680 he took the degree of D.D., and in October of the same year was presented by Charles II, being then a royal chaplain, to the vicarage of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, London. Immediately after the Revolution he was promoted to be archdeacon of London; was consecrated bishop of Lincoln, Jan. 10, 1692; and was raised to the archbishopric of Canterbury in 1694. In 1700 he was appointed one of a committee to recommend to the king proper persons for all ecclesiastical preferments in his gift above the value of £20 per annum. He attended his majesty during his last illness, and crowned queen Anne. He was, in April, 1706, made first commissioner in the treaty of union between England and Scotland; and afterwards crowned George I. His death occurred at Lambeth Palace Dec. 14, 1715. By his will he bequeathed large sums to charitable purposes, and proved a liberal benefactor to Benedict College, Cambridge, the library of St. Paul's Cathedral, the Society for the Promotion of the Gospel, Bromley College, etc. He published, The Creed of Mr. (Thomas) Hobbes Examined (Lond. 1670,18mo): — Idolatry: a Discourse (1678, 4to): — Baconiana; or Certain Genuine Remains of Lord Bacon (1679, 8vo; 1674, 4to). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Tennent, Gilbert[[@Headword:Tennent, Gilbert]]

             an eloquent Presbyterian divine, and .eldest son of the Rev. William Tennent, Sen., was born in the County of Armagh, Ireland, Feb. 5,1703; emigrated with his father to America in 1718; received his education under the paternal roof; had the honorary degree of master of arts conferred upon him by Yale College in 1725; studied theology privately; was licensed to preach in May, 1725; and was ordained and installed minister of a Presbyterian congregation at New Brunswick, N. J., in 1726. In 1740 he was prevailed on by Whitefield to accompany him on a preaching tour to Boston; and this tour constituted one of the great events of his life. The effect of his-preaching in Boston is thus described by the Rev. Mr. Prince, minister of the Old South Church: “It was both terrible and searching… By his arousing and spiritual preaching, deep and pungent convictions were wrought in the minds of many-hundreds of persons in that town; and the same effect was produced on several scores in the neighboring congregations. And now was such a time as we never knew. The Rev. Mr.  Cooper was wont to say that more came to him in one week in deep concern than in the whole twenty-four years of his preceding ministry. I can say also the same as to the numbers who repaired to me.” He had much to do in bringing about the division of the Presbyterian Church in 1741; indeed, it was owing, in a great measure, to one sermon called the “Nottingham Sermon,” which Dr. Alexander declares to be “one of the most severely abusive sermons that were ever penned,” that that schism occurred. It is to his honor, however, that, seventeen years after, he was a principal instrument in a reunion of the two parties. In 1743 he became pastor of a Presbyterian congregation (disciples of Whitefield) in Philadelphia, where he continued the residue of his ministry and life, which was about twenty years. He died July 23,1764. Mr. Tennent, as a preacher, had few equals in his vigorous days. “His reasoning powers were strong; his thoughts nervous and often sublime; his style flowery and diffusive; his manner of address warm and pathetic — such as must convince his audience that he was in earnest.” Henry B. Smith, D.D., says of him, “Gilbert Tennent, that soul of fire.” He was of a truly public spirit, needing no other motive to exert himself than only to be persuaded that the matter in question was an important public good. He published Sermons (Phila. 1744, 8vo): — Discourses (1745, 12mo): — Sermons (1758,12mo). He also published many occasional sermons, some pamphlets, etc. See Sprague, Annals ‘of the Amer. Pulpit, 3, 35-41; Serm. on his Death, by S. Finley, D.D. (1764, 8vo); Alexander, Hist. of the Log College, p. 91-94'; Sermons and Essays by the Tennents and their Contemporaries (1855, 12mo); Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Gillies, Hist. Coll. (J. L.S.).

## Tennent, John[[@Headword:Tennent, John]]

             a Presbyterian minister, and third son of the Rev. William Tennent, Sen., was born in the County of Antrim, Ireland, Nov. 12, 1706. His parents emigrated to America when he was twelve years old. He was educated at the Log College, and licensed to preach Sept. 18, 1729. On Nov. 19, 1730, he was installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Freehold, Monmouth Co., N.J. He had but a brief ministry, his death occurring April 23,1732. He was distinguished for a clear, discriminating mind and earnest manner. One of his sermons, on regeneration, was published, with a short memoir of his life, by his brother Gilbert Tennent. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3, 41.

## Tennent, William (1)[[@Headword:Tennent, William (1)]]

             a Presbyterian minister and educator, and the father of Gilbert, John, and William Tennent, was born in Ireland in 1673. He received a liberal education in his native country, and was probably a graduate of Trinity College, Dublin. He entered the ministry originally in the Episcopal Church, and was ordained deacon by the bishop of Down, July 1, 1704; and priest, Sept. 22,1706. He emigrated to America in 1718, and immediately changed his ecclesiastical relations, being received into the Presbyterian Church September 17 of the same year. He supplied East Chester and Bedford, N.Y.; Bensalem and Smithfield, Bucks Co., Pa.; and in 1726 accepted a call from the Church at Neshaminy, in the same county, where he spent the remainder of his life. He was but fully settled when he was impressed with the conviction that there were other duties than those of a pastor demanding his attention. The country was in a forming state, and he felt that it was all-important that it should have a right direction. His four sons followed in the footsteps of their godly father, and were consistent Christians. His attention was early directed to the young men who were growing up around him, and who he saw must be educated to become useful members of society. As there were no schools or colleges in that region, he determined to erect a building for educational purposes. His means were limited, and consequently the building must correspond with them. In process of time a log house was erected of humble proportions about a mile from Neshaminy Creek, near to the church. This building was afterwards designated the “Log College,” and was the first literary and theological institution of the Presbyterian Church in this country. It was the immediate parent of Princeton College and Theological Seminary, and of all other institutions of a similar character in the Church. The site of the Log College was in every way desirable, commanding as it did an extensive prospect of level, fertile country, bounded by distant hills. The distinguished Whitefield, who visited it in 1739, says of it:

“The place wherein the young men study is a log house about twenty feet long aid nearly as many broad, and to me it seemed to resemble the school of the old prophets, for their habitations were mean; and that they sought not great things for themselves is plain from those passages of Scripture wherein we are told that ‘each of them took a beam to build them a house; and that at a feast of the sons of the prophets one of them put on the pot, while the others went to fetch some herbs out of the field, “All we can say of most of our universities is, that they are glorious without. From this  despised place seven or eight worthy ministers of Jesus have lately been sent forth; more are almost ready to be sent, and the foundation is now laying for the instruction of many others.” Of Mr. Tennent, the founder of this college, but little is known outside of his connection with the institution. Whitefield's journal refers to him thus: “At my return home was much comforted by the coming of one Mr. Tennent, an old gray-headed disciple and soldier of Jesus Christ. He keeps an academy about twenty miles from Philadelphia; and has been blessed with four gracious sons, three of which have been, and still continue to be useful in the Church of Christ. He is a great friend of Mr. Erskine of Scotland, and he and his sons are secretly despised by the synod generally, as Mr. Erskine and his friends are hated by the judicatories of Scotland, and as the Methodist preachers are by the brethren in England.” Whitefield further says:

“Set out for Neshaminy, where old Mr. Tennent lives, and where I was to preach to-day according to appointment. About twelve o'clock we came together and found 3000 people assembled in the meeting house yard. Mr. Wm. Tennent, Jr., as we stayed beyond the time, was preaching to them. When I came up he soon stopped, gave out a psalm, which was sung, and then I began to speak as the Lord gave me utterance. At first the people seemed unaffected, but in the midst of my discourse the power of the Lord Jesus came upon me, and I felt such a struggling within myself for the people as I scarce ever felt before; the hearers began to be melted down immediately and to cry much, and we had good reason to hope the Lord intended good for many. After I had finished, Mr. Gilbert Tennent gave a word of exhortation to confirm what had been delivered. After our exercises were over, we went to old Mr. Tennent's, who entertained us like one of the ancient patriarchs. His wife to me seemed like Elizabeth, and he like Zachary. Both, as far as I can learn, walk in the command of the Lord blameless. Though God was pleased to humble my soul so that I was obliged to retire for a while, yet we had sweet communion with each other, and spent the evening in concerting what measures had best be taken for promoting our dear Lord's kingdom. It happened very providentially that Mr. Tennent and his brethren are appointed to be a presbytery by the synod, so that they intend bringing up gracious youths and sending them out from time to time into the Lord's vineyard.” Among the ministers sent out from Log College to preach the Gospel were his four sons, Gilbert, William, John, and Charles; Rev. Messrs. Samuel Blair, Samuel J. Finley (afterwards D.D. and president of Princeton College), W. Robinson, John  Rowland, and Charles Beatty. In 1742 this venerable man became unable to perform his duties as pastor, and his pulpit was supplied by the presbytery. In 1743 Mr. Beatty was ordained as his successor. His work was nearly done, and of him it may be said, in the language of Dr. Alexander, “The Presbyterian Church is probably not more in debted for her prosperity, and for the evangelical spirit which has generally pervaded her body, to any individual than to the elder Tennent.” He died at his loved home in Neshaminy, May 6,1746. His published works consist mostly of sermons, twenty-three of which appear in one volume, 8vo. Two other discourses were also published. Many occasional sermons and pamphlets were published in Philadelphia in 1758. Rev. Samuel Finley, D.D., his former pupil, preached his funeral discourse, which was also published. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3, 23; Genesis Assemb. Miss. Mag. or Evangel. Intell. 2; Alexander, Hist. of Log College; Tennent's Family Record. (W.P.S.)

## Tennent, William (2)[[@Headword:Tennent, William (2)]]

             a Presbyterian minister, and brother of Gilbert Tennent, was born in the County of Antrim, Ireland, Jan. 3, 1705. He emigrated with his father, the Rev. William Tennent, Sen., to America in 1718, where he received his education under the instruction of his father, and studied theology by the aid of his brother. He was licensed by the Philadelphia Presbytery, and ordained pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Freehold, N.J., Oct. 25, 1733, where he remained until his death, March 8, 1777. About the time that Mr. Tennent completed his theological course, he was the subject of a remarkable trance, which has perhaps given him his greatest celebrity. A full account of this extraordinary incident was published by Elias Boudinot. Mr. Tennent contributed sermons to Sermons on Sacramental Occasions (1739), and a Sermon upon Mat 5:23-24 (1769). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3, 52; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Steel, Burning and Shining Lights (1864); Genesis Assemb. Miss. Mag. vol. 2; Alexander, Hist. Log College; Prince, Christ. Hist.; Life of William Tennent, with an Account of his being Three Days in a Trance (N. Y. 1847, 18mo); Sermons and Essays by the Tennents and their Contemporaries (1855; 12mo); Blackwood's Mag. 4:693; Storr, Constitution of the Human Soul (1857), p. 317. (J.L.S.)

## Tennent, William (3)[[@Headword:Tennent, William (3)]]

             a Presbyterian minister, and son of the Rev. William Tennent (2), was born in Freehold, N.J., in 1740. He graduated at the College of New Jersey in 1758, was licensed to preach by the presbytery of New Brunswick in 1762, ordained by the same presbytery in 1763, and installed as junior pastor of the Church in Norwalk, Conn., in 1765. — In 1772 he became pastor of an Independent Church in Charleston, S. C. He died Aug. 11,1777. Mr. Tennent was an eloquent preacher. Elegance of style, majesty of thought, and clearness of judgment characterized all his discourses. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3, 242; Hall, Hist. of Norwalk; Ramsey, Hist. of South Carolina, vol. 2; Hist. of the Church of Charleston; Alison, Funeral Sermon. (J.L.S.)

## Tennent, William Mackay, D.D[[@Headword:Tennent, William Mackay, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, graduated from the College of New Jersey in 1763, and in 1772 was ordained pastor at Greentield, Conn. In 1781 he accepted a call to the Presbyterian Church at Abingdon, near Philadelphia, where he  continued until his death, in December 1810. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3:26.

## Tenney, Asa Peaslee[[@Headword:Tenney, Asa Peaslee]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Corinth, Vt., Feb. 14,1801. He worked at an anvil in Haverhill, N.H.; studied theology with Rev. Grant Powers and President Tyler of Dartmouth College; preached his first sermon in father Goddard's meeting-house in Norwich, Vt.; and when twenty-seven years old took a five years commission under the New Hampshire Missionary Society, laboring in Hebron and Groton. In March, 1833, he became first pastor of the Congregational Church in Concord (West), N. H., where he died, March 1, 1867. Mr. Tenney was original, eloquent, and a mighty revivalist. He bad wonderful knowledge of the Bible and human, nature, and was a prodigious worker, his sermons for over thirty-four years averaging more than four a week. See A Blacksmith in the Pulpit and in the Parish, in the Congregational Quarterly, 1867, p. 359 sq., 380.

## Tenney, Caleb Jewett, D.D[[@Headword:Tenney, Caleb Jewett, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Hollis, N. H., May 3, 1780. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1801, entered the ministry Aug. 20, 1802, and was ordained Sept. 12, 1804, pastor at Newport, R. I., where. he remained until May, 1814, when he resigned and became co-pastor in Wethersfield, March 27, 1816, but, on account of his voice failing, was dismissed in 1840, and removed to Northampton, Mass., where he died, Sept. 28,1847. He acted as agelit for both the American and the Massachusetts Colonization Society. His publications were Two  Discourses on Baptism (1816) and a few Occasional Sermons. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 2, 472.

## Tenney, Ephraim[[@Headword:Tenney, Ephraim]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Dummerston, Vt., Nov. 12, 1813. He graduated at Wheaton College, Ill., in 1841, and entered the Union Theological Seminary the same year, and in the year following he died in Brooklyn, N. Y., March 8. (W.P.S.)

## Tenney, Erdix, D.D[[@Headword:Tenney, Erdix, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, son of Dr. Joshua Tenney, was born at Corinth, Vermont, June 11, 1801. He studied at Bradford Academy; in 1826 graduated from Middlebury College; in 1829 from the Andover Theological Seminary; was ordained pastor, January 5, 1831, at Lyme, N.H., and was dismissed August 12, 1867. From 1867 to 1880 he resided at Westborough, Massachusetts, without charge; and from 1880 until death, November 13, 1882, at Norwich, Connecticut. See Cong. Year- book, 1883, page 33.

## Tenney, Roswell[[@Headword:Tenney, Roswell]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Hanover, N. H., in 1796. He was educated at Dartmouth College, studied theology in the Union Theological Seminary, Prince Edward Co., Va., was licensed by the Hanover Presbytery April 26, 1828, and ordained by the same Nov. 28, 1829. His first preaching was as a home missionary; after that he preached successively at Salem, Unity, Somerset, and New Lexington, Va.; three points in Perry County, O. Logan, Belpre, and Warren; two points in Washington County, O.; Dover, Mass.; Hanover Center, N. H.; again in Salem and Fearing, O.; and finally at Amesville, in Athens County. He died Aug. 6, 1866. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 321.

## Tenney, Samuel Gilman[[@Headword:Tenney, Samuel Gilman]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Rowley, Mass., April 12, 1793. He sought an education with a view of entering the ministry, being impressed that it was his duty to preach. He was fitted for college at Meriden, N. H., after which he entered Dartmouth College, from which he graduated in 1823. He studied theology under the Rev. Dr. Chapin at Woodstock, Vt. He was ordained June 29, 1825, and installed pastor of the London Church, Vt. Here he labored for six years with success. He was subsequently pastor in the following places Bakersville, Vt., four years; Waitsfield, Vt., two years; Hillsborough, N.H., five years; Wordsborough, Vt., seven years; and Alstead, N.H., seven years, when be retired, after an unbroken ministry of forty-nine years, in the sixty-fourth year of his age. His labors were blessed in many places by special and powerful revivals. He died in Springfield, Vt., Dec. 5, 1874. (W. P. S.)

## Tent[[@Headword:Tent]]

             (usually and properly אֹהֶל, 6hel, so called from glittering [Gesenius] or being round [Fürst], σκηνή; both occasionally “tabernacle;” elsewhere

מַשְׁכָּן, mishkcn, a. dwelling [Son 1:8], the regular term for “tabernacle;” סֻכָּה, sukkah [2Sa 11:11], a “booth;” or קֻבָּה, kubbdh', a dome like pavilion, only in Num 2:8), a movable habitation, made of curtains extended upon poles. SEE TABERNACLE.

Among the leading characteristics of the nomad races, those two have always been numbered whose origin has been ascribed to Jabal the son of Lamech (Gen 4:20), viz. to be tent-dwellers (ישֵׁב אֹהֶל, comp. Gen 25:27; σκηνίτης, Pliny, 6:32, 35) and keepers of cattle. Accordingly the patriarchal fathers of the Israelites were dwellers in tents, and their descendants proceeded at once from tents to houses. We therefore read but little of huts, among them, and never as the fixed habitations of any people with whom they were conversant. By huts we understand small dwellings, made of the green or dry branches of trees intertwined, and sometimes plastered with mud. In Scripture they are called booths. Such were made by Jacob to shelter his cattle during the first winter of his return from Mesopotamia (Gen 33:17). In after-times we more frequently read of them as being erected in vine-yards and orchards to shelter the man who guarded the ripened produce (Job 27:18; Isaiah 1, 8; Isa 24:20). It was one of the Mosaical institutions that during the Feast of Tabernacles the people should live for a week in huts made of green boughs (Lev 23:42). In observing the directions of the law respecting the Feast of Tabernacles, the Rabbinical writers laid down as a distinction between the ordinary tent and the booth, sukkah, that the latter must in no case be covered by a cloth, but be restricted to boughs of trees as its shelter (Sukkah, 1, 3). In hot weather the Arabs of Mesopotamia often strike their tents and betake themselves to sheds of reeds and grass on the bank of the river (Layard, Nineveh, 2, 215; Burckhardt, Notes on Bed. 1, 37, 46; Volney, Travels, 1, 398).

In Egypt the Hebrews, for the most part, left off tent life, and lived in houses during their bondage; but on their deliverance, and during their protracted sojourn in the wilderness, tent life was again resumed by the nation (Exo 16:16; Jos 7:24), and continued for some time even after their settlement in the Holy Land (22, 8). Hence the phraseology  of tent life remained among the people long after it had ceased to be their normal condition (1Ki 12:16). Here we may observe that tent life is not peculiar to nomads only, for we find settled clans, occupied in agricultural pursuits, still dwell in tents, and such, probably, was the case in Palestine in all ages. The family of Heber the Kenite was apparently of this class (Jdg 4:11-22), and even the patriarchs seem partly to have adopted that mode of life. Isaac not only “had possession of flocks ‘and possession of herds,” but also he “sowed in the land, and received in the same year a hundredfold” (Gen 26:12). It was not until the return into. Canaan from Egypt that the Hebrews became inhabitants of cities, and it may be remarked that the tradition of tent-usage survived for many years later in the tabernacle of Shiloh, which consisted, as many Arab tents still consist, of a walled enclosure covered with curtains (Mishna, Zebachim, 14:6; Stanley, Sinai and Palest. p. 233).

The Midianites, the Philistines, the Syrians, the descendants of Ham, the Hagarites, and Cushanites are mentioned in Scripture as living in tents. But the people most remarkable for this unsettled and wandering mode of life are the Arabs, who, from the time of Ishmael to the present day, have continued the custom of dwelling in tents. Amid the revolutions which have transferred kingdoms from one possessor to another, these wandering tribes still dwell, unsubdued and wild as was their progenitor. This kind of dwelling is not, however, confined to the Arabs, but is used throughout the continent of Asia. In one of the tents shown in Assyrian sculptures a man is represented arranging a couch for sleeping on, in another persons are sitting conversing, and in others cooking utensils and the process of cooking are shown. In the smaller one (on next page), a man is watching a caldron on what appears to be a fire between some stones. Among tent- dwellers of the present day must be reckoned

(1) the great Mongol and Tartar hordes of Central Asia, whose tent- dwellings are sometimes of gigantic dimensions, and who exhibit more contrivance both in the dwellings themselves and in their method of transporting them from place to place than is the case with the Arab races (Horace, Carm. 3, 24, 10; Marco Polo, Trav. [ed. Bohn], p. 128,135, 211; Gibbon, ch. 26 [vol. 3, p. 298, ed. Smith]);

(2) as above observed, the Bedawin Arab tribes, who inhabit tents which are probably constructed on the same plan as those which were the dwelling-places of Abraham and of Jacob (Heb 11:9).

The first tents were undoubtedly covered with skins, of which there are traces in the Pentateuch (Exo 26:14); but nearly all the tents mentioned in Scripture were doubtless of goats'-hair, spun and woven by the women (Exo 35:26; Exo 36:14), such as are now, in Western Asia, used by all who dwell in tents. Tents of linen were, and still are, only used occasionally for holiday or traveling purposes by those who do not habitually live in them. Some modern tents are constructed, of most costly materials, and are very beautiful. Chardin mentions that a late king of Persia had one made which cost upwards of two millions sterling. It was called the “golden house,” because gold glittered everywhere about it (see Pict. Bible, note on Son 5:1). A tent or pavilion on a magnificent scale, constructed for Ptolemy Philadelphus at Alexandria, is described by Athenaeus (Exodus 5, 196 sq.). This class of tents is furnished with Turkey carpets for the floor and cushions to recline upon, according to the wealth of the owner, though the inside arrangements vary among different clans and tribes. Those who are too poor to afford themselves a proper tent merely hang a piece of cloth from a tree to give them shelter.

An Arab tent is called beit, “house;” its covering Consists of stuff, about three quarters of a yard broad, made of black goats'-hair (Song of Solomon i, 5; Shaw, Travels, p. 220), laid parallel with the tent's length. This. is sufficient to resist the heaviest rain. The tent-poles, called amud, or columns, are usually nine in number placed in three groups, but many tents have only one pole, others two or three. The ropes which hold the tent in its place are fastened, not to the tent-cover itself, but to loops consisting of a leathern thong tied to the ends of a stick, round which is twisted a piece- of old cloth, which is itself sewed to the tent-cover. The ends of the tent- ropes are fastened to short sticks or pins, called wed or watedy which are driven into the ground with a chakij, or mallet. Of the same kind was the יָתֵד, nail (q.v.), and the מִקֶּבֶת, hammer (q.v.), which Jael used (Jdg 4:21). Round the back and sides of the tents runs a piece of stuff removable at pleasure to admit air. The tent is divided into two apartments, separated by. a carpet partition drawn across the middle of the tent and fastened to the three middle posts. The men's apartment is usually on the right side on entering, and the women's on the left; but this usage varies in different tribes, and in the Mesopotamian tribes the contrary is the  rule. Of the three side posts on the men's side, the first and third are called yed (hand), and the one in the middle is rather higher than the other two. Hooks are attached to these posts for hanging various articles (Gen 18:10; Jdg 13:6; Niebuhr, Voyage, 1, 187; Layard, Nin. and Bab. p. 261). SEE PILLAR.

In the men's apartment the ground is usually covered with carpets or mats, and the wheat sacks and camel bags are heaped up in it around the middle post like a pyramid, at the base of which, or towards the back of the tent, are arranged the camel pack-saddles, against which the men recline as they sit on the ground. The women's apartment is less neat, being encumbered with all the lumber of the tent, the water and butter skins, and the culinary utensils. The part of the tent appropriated to the women is called harem; and no stranger is permitted to enter it, unless introduced. Hence, perhaps, Sisera's hope of greater security in the harem of Jael, SEE HOSPITALITY.

“The tents are arranged in a sort of square; they are made of black hair-cloth, not large; and are mostly open at one end' and on the sides, the latter: being turned-up. The tents form the common rendezvous of men, women, children, calves, lambs, and kids” (Robinson, Researches, 1, 485). Few Arabs have more than one tent, unless the family be augmented by the families of a son or a deceased brother, or in case the wives disagree, when the master pitches a tent for one of them adjoining his own. An encampment is generally arranged in the form of an enclosure, within which the cattle are driven at night, and the center of which is occupied by the tent or tents of the emir or sheik. If he is a person of much consequence, he may have three or four tents, for himself, his wives, his servants, and strangers, respectively. The first two are of the most importance, and we know that Abraham's wife had a separate tent (Gen 24:67). It is more usual, however, for one very large tent to be divided into two or more apartments by curtains. The holy tabernacle was on this model (Exo 26:31-37). The individual tents of Leah, Rachel, Zilpah, and Bilhah may thus have been either separate tents or apartments in the principal tent in each case (Gen 31:33). When the pasture near an encampment is exhausted, the tents are taken down, packed on camels, and removed (Isa 38:12; Gen 26:17; Gen 26:22; Gen 26:25). The beauty of an Arab encampment is noticed by Shaw (Travels, p. 221; see Num 24:5). In choosing places for encampment, Arabs prefer the neighborhood of trees, for the sake of the shade and coolness which they afford (Gen 18:4; Gen 18:8; Niebuhr, loc. cit.). Some tribes have their tents constructed so as to house their flocks at night. Grant describes such a one among the Hertush Kurds: “Our tent was about forty feet long  and eighteen or twenty wide, one side left quite open, while a wall of reeds formed the other sides… The ample roof of black hair-cloth was supported by a number of; small poles, and secured with cords and wooden pins driven into the earth. About, one fourth of the tent was fenced off with a wicker trellis for the lambs of the flock, which are kept there during the night” (Nestoians, p. 93). The manufacture of tents formed a regular and lucrative trade (σκηνοποιός), at which Paul occasionally labored, especially in connection with Aquila, at Corinth (Act 18:3. SEE PAUL.

A feature of Oriental life so characteristic as the tent could not fail to suggest many striking metaphors to the Biblical writers, and accordingly the Hebrew has special terms for pitching ( נָטָהor חָנָה) and striking (הֶעַתַּיק) a tent. The tent erected and its cords stretched out' are often figuratively alluded to in the Scriptures. Thus Isaiah represents God as the one “that stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a teint to dwell in” (Isa 40:22). He also says, in speaking of the glorious prosperity of the Church and the need of enlargement, “Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch forth the curtains of thine habitations;” spare not, lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes” (Isa 54:2; see also Isa 33:20). It is a work of some effort to pitch a tent properly, especially a large one, requiring the united efforts of willing hands. Hence the pathetic language of Jeremiah in mourning over the desolations of God's people: “My tabernacle is spoiled, and all my cords are broken; my children are gone forth of me, and they are not; there is none to stretch forth my tent any more and to set up my curtains” (Jer 10:20). “These tents are rapidly struck and removed from place to place, so that the eye which to-day rests on a large encampment active with life may to-morrow behold nothing but a wilderness. Thus Isaiah says, “Mine age is departed, and is removed from me as a shepherd's tent” (Isa 38:12). The facility with which tents are taken- down and the frailty of their material are beautifully alluded to by Paul in 2Co 5:1 (see also 2Pe 1:13-14). — See Hackett, Illustr. of Script. p. 33-40; Van Lennep, Bible Lands, ch. 3; Rhodes, Tent-life from the Earliest Times (Lond. 1858); Conder, Tent-work in Palest. 2, 275 sq.

## Tent (2)[[@Headword:Tent (2)]]

             The following description of this Arab domicile, from Conder's Tent Work, 2:275, contains some additional information:

"The tents are arranged in different ways. Among the Sugr a large encampment was set out in parallel lines some fifty yards apart, the tents in each row being close together, end to end. Among the Ta'amireh and Jahalin the usual form is a rectangle. The average length of tile tent is from twenty to twenty-five feet, but the small ones will sometimes be only ten feet long, and the larger forty feet. The distance between two tents in a lile is about four feet. Thus a camp of twenty tents occupied a space of two hundred feet by seventy feet. In another case the form was a triangle, the reason of this arrangement being that the flocks are driven into the enclosure at night, and thus protected from the attacks of robbers or prevented from straying by themselves.

"The Arab tent is extremely unlike the usual representations, in which it is shown either as a sort of hut, as among the Turkomans, or as a bell-tent, instead of a long black 'house of hair,' with a low, slouping roof and open front. It has, however, been carefully described by Burckhardt, and there is little to add to his account. The canvas of the roof and side walls is of goat's hair, black, with occasionally stripes of white running horizontally (Son 1:5). The pieces of stuff are about two feet wide, and thirty to fifty feet long. The tent has generally nine poles ('Awamnid), arranged three and  three, those in the centre being the longest; thus the tent has a low ridge both ways in order to run the rain off. The cloths at the side can be easily removed as the sun and wind requires, one side being always left open. The tents are supported by cords and by pegs (Antad), which are driven with a mallet (Jdg 4:21). The average height of a tent is about seven feet.

"Frail and cold as these habitations might be thought to prove ,in 'winter, they are really far more comfortable than would be expected. Being so low, the wind does not blow them over, and they are, moreover, most skilfully pitched, generally below a steep bank or low swell. Even in heavy storms I have found the interiors dry, and the heavy canvas does not let the rain -through. The Arabs, however, suffer very much from rheumatism in winter. In summer they occasionally inhabit reed huts ('Arish), which are cooler than the tents."

## Tenth Deal[[@Headword:Tenth Deal]]

             (עשָּׂרוֹן, ‘issaron, a tenth; Sept. δεκατόν), the tenth part, a measure of things dr, specially for grain and meal (Exo 29:40; Leviticus 14; Numbers 15, 28, 29); more fully the tenth of an ephah (as the Sept. and Vulg. explain at 15:4), i.e. an omer, or about three and a half quarts (comp. Lev 5:15; Lev 6:13; Num 5:15). SEE METROLOGY.

## Tenths[[@Headword:Tenths]]

             in English law, are the tenth part of the yearly value of every spiritual benefice as it is valued in the Liber Regis. This was an impost formerly paid to the pope, and was annexed to the crown by the 26 Henry VIII, c. 3, and the 1 Elizabeth, c. 4; but by the 2 Anne, c. 11, was granted, together with the first-fruits, to-wards the augmentation of poor clergymen. A, tax on the temporality, and also certain rents reserved by the king .out of the monastic possessions he granted to his subjects, were also. called tenths. Tenths of ecclesiastical benefices and lands were first paid in 1188 towards Henry II's crusade. SEE TAXATIO ECCLESIASTICA; SEE TEMPORALITIES OF BISHOPS; SEE TITHES.

## Tentzel, Wilhelm Ernst[[@Headword:Tentzel, Wilhelm Ernst]]

             a German theologian, was born July 11,1659, at Greussen, in Thuringia. He became lecturer at the gymnasium at Gotha in 1685, and was appointed in 1696 historiographer there, and died at Dresden, Nov. 24, 1707. In the theological department he is especially known by his controversy with the Jesuit Schelstrate on the arcani disciplina (q.v.): Dissertatio de Disciplina Arcani (Wittenb. 1683; also in his Exercitationes Selectae (Leips. and Frankft. 1692), written against the Antiquitas Illustrata. Tentzel also published Exercitationes X de Hymno Te Deum Laudamus (ibid. 1692). Of great interest is also his historical narrative of the beginning and first progress of Luther's Reformation, thus explaining Seckendorf's history of Lutheranism, edited by Cyprian (ibid. 1718, 3 vols.): — De Proseuchis Samaritarum (Wittenb. 1682): Dissertatio de Ritu Lectionum Sacrarum (ibid. 1685). See Theol. Universal-Lexikon, s.v.; Winer, handbuch der theol. Literdtur, 1, 609, 628, 738, 849, 854; 2, 799; Fabricius, Biblioth. Ecclesiast. (Hamburg, 1718), vol. 1; Regensburger Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B,P.)

## Teo[[@Headword:Teo]]

             SEE ANTELOPE.

## Teocalli[[@Headword:Teocalli]]

             (Aztec, teotl, “god,” and calli, “house”); a name given to the aboriginal temples, many remains of which are still in existence. Recent investigations have rendered it probable that many structures which, on Spanish authority, have been received as temples and palaces were in reality multiple houses.

## Teotl[[@Headword:Teotl]]

             the name for God among the ancient Mexicans. He is called “the Cause of causes” and “‘the Father of all things.” He was identified with the sun-god, which, on this account, was designated the Teotl.

## Tephillin[[@Headword:Tephillin]]

             SEE PHYLACTERY.

## Ter Haar, Bernard[[@Headword:Ter Haar, Bernard]]

             a Dutch theologian, was born at Amsterdam, June 13, 1806. He studied at Leyden, and was in 1839 doctor of theology. After having served several congregations with great success, he was in 1843 called to Amsterdam, and was made professor of theology in 1854 at Utrecht. In 1874 he retired to Velp, near Arnheim, and died November 19,1880. He published, Jean et Theogene (Arnheim, 1838): — Histoire de la Reformation (1845; 5th ed. 1854): — De Historiae Ecclesiasticae et Theologia Moralis Studio (Utrecht, 1854): — De Historicae Religionis Christianae Indole (1860): — L'Historiographie de l'Histoire Ecclesiastique (1870-71, 2 volumes). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Ter Sanctus[[@Headword:Ter Sanctus]]

             is the triumphal hymn of the ancient liturgies, “Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts, heaven and earth are full of thy glory,” etc., and is based on the three holies (Isa 6:3; Revelation 4, 8). In all ancient liturgies the Ter Sanctus comes near, but before, the prayer of consecration, and is sung by the choir and the people. “The pontiff who is to celebrate approaches the altar and praises the works of God, and, giving thanks for all, associates himself with the angels, and vociferates with them the triumphal hymn Holy, holy, holy; and the people also recite it, typifying the equality of peace which we shall hereafter enjoy with the angels, and our union with them” (Simeon of Thessalonica, Comm. on Lit. of St. Chrysos.). This hymn formerly concluded with the words “Hosanna in the highest, blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord, Hosanna in the highest.” This is the  case in the liturgies of St. James, St. Chrysostom, St. Basil, the Malabar, Mozarabic, and Sarum. In that of St. Clement the Sanctus and Hosanna are separate, and the Mozarabic has the further addition “Hagios, hagios, hagios, Kyrie ho Theos.” The prefaces of Ter Sanctus are very various, being adapted to different festivals and seasons. But they invariably end with the doxological form represented by the “Therefore with. angels and archangels,” etc., of the Prayer-book. In all liturgies the preface is sung or said by the celebrant alone, the choir and people joining in at the hymn itself. Hence in the Sarum Missal, followed by the Prayer-books of 1549 and 1552, the Sanctus is printed as a separate paragraph. The hymn is also called Trisagion (q.v.).

## Terah[[@Headword:Terah]]

             (Heb. Te'rach, תֶּרִח, station, SEE TARAH; Sept. Θάῤῥα, Θάρα; Josephus, Θάῤῥος, Ant. 1, 6, 5; Vulg. Thare), the father of Abram, Nahor, and Haran, and through them the ancestor of the great families of the Israelites, Ishmaelites, Midianites, Moabites, and Ammonites (Gen 11:24-32). B.C. 2293-2088. The account, given of him in the Old Test. narrative is very brief. We learn from it simply that he was an idolater (Jos 24:2); that he dwelt beyond the Euphrates in Ur of the Chaldees (Gen 11:28); that in the westerly migration which he undertook in his old age he went with his son Abram, his daughter-in-law Sarai, and his grandson Lot, “to go into the land of Canaan, and they came unto Haran and dwelt there” (Gen 11:31); and, finally, that “the days of Terah were two hundred and five years; and Terah died in Haran”‘(Gen 11:32). Taking the language of Abraham about Sarah being the daughter, of his father but not of his mother (Gen 20:1-2) in its natural sense, Terah must have had children by more wives than one; but we have no particular account of his domestic relations in this respect.  In connection with this migration a chronological difficulty has arisen which may be noticed here. In the speech of Stephen (Act 7:4) it is said that the further journey of Abraham from Haran to the land of Canaan did not take place till after his father's death. Now as Terah was two hundred and five years old (the Samar text and version make him one hundred and forty-five, and- so avoid this difficulty) when he died, and Abram was seventy-five when he left Harali (enl. 12:4) it follows that, if the speech of Stephen be correct, at Abram's birth Terah must have been one hundred, and thirty years old; and therefore that the order of anis sons- Abram, Nahor, Haran given in Gen 11:26-27 is not their order in point of age. Lord Arthur Herve says (Geneai. p. 82, 83), “The difficulty is easily got over by supposing that Abram, though named first on account of his dignity, was not the eldest son, but probably the youngest of the three, born when his father was one hundred and thirty years old a supposition with which the marriage of Nahor with his elder brother Haran's daughter, Milcah, and the apparent nearness of age between Abram and Lot, and the three generations from Nahor to Rebekah corresponding to only two, from Abraham to Isaac, are in perfect harmony.” SEE ABRAHAM.

From Act 7:2-4 it appears that the first call which prompted the family to leave Ur was addressed to Abraham, not to Terah, as well as the second, which, after the death of his father, induced him to proceed from Haran to Canaan. The order to Abraham to proceed to Canaan immediately after Terah's death seems to indicate that the pause at Haran was on his account. Whether he declined to proceed any farther, or his advanced age rendered him unequal to the fatigues of the journey, can only be conjectured. It appears, however, from Jos 24:2; Jos 24:14 that Terah was given to idolatry, or rather, perhaps, to certain idolatrous superstitions, retained together with the acknowledgment and worship of Jehovah, such as existed in the family in the time of his great-grandson Laban (Gen 31:30). This may suggest that it was not in the divine wisdom deemed proper that one who had grown old in such practices should enter the land in which his descendants were destined to exemplify a pure faith.

From the simple facts of Terah's life recorded in the Old Test. has been constructed the entire legend of Abram which is current in Jewish and Arabian traditions. Terah the idolater is turned into a maker of images, and “Ur of the Chaldees” is the original of the furnace” into which Abram was cast (comp. Ezekiel 5, 2). Rashi's note on Gen 11:28 is as follows: “In the presence of Terah his father in the lifetime of his father. And the  Midrash Haggadah says that he died beside his father, for Terah had complained of Abram his son before Nimrod that he had broken his images, and he cast him into a furnace of fire. And Haran was sitting and saying in his heart, ‘If Abram overcome, I am on his side; and if Nimrod overcome, I am on his side. And when Abram was saved, they said to Haran, On whose side art thou? He said to them, I am on Abram's side. So they cast him into the furnace of fire and he was burned; and this is [what is meant by] Ur Casdim (Ur of the Chaldees).” In Bereshith Rabba (par. 17) the story is told of Abraham being left to sell idols in his father's stead, which is repeated in Weil, Biblical Legends, p. 49. The whole legend depends upon the ambiguity of the word עבר, which signifies “to make” and “to serve or worship” so that Terah, who in the Biblical narrative is only a worshipper of idols, is in the Jewish tradition an image-maker; and about this single point the whole story has grown. It certainly was unknown to Josephus, who tells nothing of Terah except that it was grief for the death of this son Haran that induced him to quit Ur of the Chaldlees (Ant. 1, 6, 6).

In the Jewish traditions Terah is a prince and a great man in the palace of Nimrod (Jellinek, Bet hamiidrash, p. 27), the captain of his army (Sepher Hayyashar), his son in-law according to the Arabs (Beer, Leben A brahams, p. 97). His wife is called in the Talmud (Baba Bathra, fol. 91 a) Amtelai; or Emtelai, the daughter of Carnebo. In the book of the Jubilees she is called Edna, the daughter of Arem, or Aram; and by; the Arabs Adna (D'Herbelot, Bibliotheque Orientale, s.v. “Abraham;” Beer, p. 97). According to D'Herbelot, the name of Abraham's father was Azar in the Arabic traditions, and: Terah was his grandfather. Elmakin, quoted by Hottinger (Smegma Orientale, p. 281), says that, after the death of Yuna, Abraham's mother, Terah took another wife, who bare him Sarah. ‘He adds that in tie days of Terah the king of Babylon made war upon the country in which he dwelt, and that Hazrun, the brother of Terah, went out against him and slew him; and the kingdom of Babylon was transferred to Nineveh and Mosul. For all these traditions, see the book of Jasher and the works of Hottinger, D'Herbelot, Weil, and Beer above quoted. Philo (De Somniis) indulges in some strange speculations with regard to Terah's name and his migration.

## Teraphim[[@Headword:Teraphim]]

             (Heb. teraphim, תְּרָפַים; only thus in the masc. plur. in the Bible, but in the fem. plur. תְּרָפוֹת, teraphoth, in Rabbinical writers) seems to denote tutelar household images, by whom families expected, for reverence bestowed, to be rewarded with domestic prosperity, such as plenty of food, health, and various necessaries of domestic life. This word is in the A. V. always rendered either by “teraphim,” or by “images” with “teraphim” in the margin, except in 1Sa 15:23; Zec 10:2, where it is represented by “idolatry,” “idols.” The singular of the word does not occur, though in 1Sa 19:13; 1Sa 19:16 it appears that only one image is referred to. Possibly; as in the case of the Roman Penates (which word, also, has no singular), these representative images were always two or three in number. Strange to say, in the Sept. they are represented by a different rendering in nearly every book where the word occurs: in Genesis 31 by εἴδωλα; in Jdg 17:13 by θεραφίν or τὸ θεραφείν; in 1 Samuel 19 by κενοτάφια; in Eze 21:21 by γλυπτά; in Hos 3:4 by δῆλοι; and in Zec 10:2 by ἀποφθεγγόμενοι. In the Vulg. we find nearly the same variations between theraphim, statua, idola, simulacra, figurae idolorum, idololatria. For other translations, which we find to be equally ‘vague aid various, see below.

I. Derivation of the Term. — The etymology and meaning of this word may be inferred from the various modes in which it is represented by the Greek translators, such as θεραφείν, τὸ θεραφεῖν, or τὰ θεραφίν, reminding us of the etymological connection of תר טר, to nourish, with τρέφ-ειν. Its remote derivatives in modern languages, viz. the Italian tarifa, French tarif, and even the English tripe, throw a little light upon our subject. According to its etymology, the word teraphim has been literally translated nutritores, nourishers. It seems that the plural form was used as a collective singular for the personified combination of all nourishing powers, as the plural teraphim signifies God, in whom all superior powers to be revered with reverential awe are combined (comp. the classical epithets of gods-Sol, Phoebus, Ceres, Venus, Cybele, Pales, Trivia, Fides, Sibylla, etc., almus, ὄμπνιος, τρόφιμος). The word teraphim signified an object or objects of idolatry, as we .may learn from some of the above renderings of the Sept., εἴδωλον, γλυπτόν; and that it was in meaning similar to the Penates is indicated by κενοτάφιον. Aquila renders it  μορφώματα, προτομαί, ἀνθυφαίρεσις, ἐπίλυσις, εἴδωλα; Symmachus also translates it εἴδωλα.

The book Zohar derives the name teraphim from תור, turpitude, but mentions also that rabbi Jehuda derives it from רפה, to slacken, because they slackened the hands of men in well-doing. The rabbi adds that they uttered a נבוּאה רַפה, prophetia laxa, inanis, vana, a loose sort of prediction. Hence rabbi Bechai says that תרפיםare the same as רפים, feeble, objects not to be depended upon. But in Tanchuma the former etymology is produced, since the teraphim were טור מעשה, opus turpitudinis seufeditatis (see Buxtorfii Lex. Talmud. et Rabb. s.v. תר, which root occurs in the Lat. turpis). Onkelos renders teraphim in Genesis 31 by צלמניא, and Jonathan in Judges 17, 18 by רמאין, images. The Targum on Hos 3:4 has מחוי, indicans, expounder of oracles, where the Greek has δήλων; and the Targum on 1Sa 15:23 טעותא, idols. Goussetius, under תר, goes so far as to assert that the word ἄνθρωπος is formed from התרפים. Lud. de Dieu, and after him Spencer, in Leg. Rit. Hebr. Dissert. (7, 1. 3, c. 3, § 7), urges the frequent interchange of the sounds t and s and sh, in order to show that teraphim and seraphim are etymologically connected. Hottinger, in his Smegma, and Kircher, in the first volume of his (Edipus Egyptiacus, exhibit the etymological progression thus: Sor Apis (σὼρ ἀπ, ark of the ox), Sarapis, Serapis, Terapis, Teraphivm. The Arabic author Aben Neph also asserts the identity of Teraphim and Serapides. Others appeal to רפא, θεραπεύειν, to heal (comp. Wichmannshausen, Dissertatio de Teraphim; Witsius, zEgyptiaca, 1, 8; Ugolino, Thes. 12:786). Coln, in his Biblische Theologie, derives teraphim from the Syriac araph, percontari. Gesenius':( Thesaur. p. 1519) refers it to the Arabic root taraph, “to live in comfort;” and compares it with the Sanscrit trip, “to delight,” and the Greek τέρπομαι. Fürst (Heb. Lex.) returns to the root תר, in the sense of nourishing.

II. Biblical References. —

1. Teraphim are first mentioned in Gen 31:19, where we are told that Rachel stole the teraphim of her father Laban, and successfully concealed them from his search under the hiran, or coarse carpet which is used to cover the wicker-work pack-saddle of the camel. Aben-Ezra says  that she stole them in order that her father might not, by means of their oracles, discover the direction of Jacob's flight (and we note that Laban adopted this or some other mode of augury from' his use of the word nichdshthi, “I have augured” [30, 27]); but Josephus says that she carried off these τύπους τῶν θεῶν that they might serve as a material protection to her if overtaken, although she herself disbelieved in them (καταφρονεῖν μὲν τῆς τοιαύτης τιμῆς τῶν θεῶν διδάξαντος αὐτήντοῦ Ι᾿ακώβου [Ant.;i,19, 8]); and, lastly, some suppose that she was tempted by the precious metals of which they were made. It is far, more probable: that, like her father, Rachel, whose mind was evidently tainted with superstition (Gen 30:14), regarded the teraphim as tutelary “gods” (Gen 31:30). Laban's eagerness to recover them shows the importance in which they were held; and it is important to observe that, although a believer in Elohim (Gen 31:53), he openly paid to these teraphim, which were probably ancestral divinities of his family (ibid.), an idolatrous worship. Jurieu (Hist. des Dogmes et des Cultes, 2, 3, 456), after elaborately entering into the question, thinks that they may have been images of Shem and Noah. From this Biblical notice it would seem that they were usually somewhat large figures, which could not very easily be secreted.

2. It is extremely probable that these household deities were among the “strange gods” and talismanic earrings which Jacob required his .family to' give up, and which were buried by him under the boughs of Allon- Meonenim, “the sorcerers oak” (Jdg 9:37). But an isolated act would naturally be ineffectual to abolish a cult which had probably existed for centuries in the Aramaean ‘home of the Shemites; and, consequently, in the time of the Judges we find the worship of teraphim existing in full vigor. The 17th and 18th chapters of Judges are entirely occupied with the story of Micah, an Ephraimite, who in those wild and ignorant times had fancied that' he could honor Jehovah (Jdg 17:13) by establishing a worship in his own house. To the ephod and teraphim which he already possessed (Jdg 17:5) his mother added a Pesel and Massekach (possibly “a graven and a molten image”) made out of the gold which she had consecrated to Jehovah and which he had stolen. When Jonathan, the grandson of Moses, arrived at the house in his accidental wanderings, Micah engaged him as a regular priest, and anticipated, in consequence the special blessing of Jehovah. The five Danite spies consulted these oracular Penates of Micah through the intervention of Jonathan (18:5), and  informed the Danites on their way to Laish of the images which the house contained. The Danite warriors, with the most unscrupulous indifference, violently carried off the whole apparatus of this private cult, including the priest himself, to their new city and we are informed that it continued to be celebrated till the day of the captivity of the land,” which, as we see from the next verse, may perhaps mean till the capture of Shiloh by the Philistines. What is most remarkable in this narrative is the fact that both Micah, who was a worshipper [of Jehovah, and the Danites, who acknowledged Elohim. (Jdg 17:5; Jdg 17:10), and Jonathan, the grandson of Moses himself, should, in spite of the distinctest prohibitions of the law, have regarded the adoration of teraphim and other images as harmless, if not as laudable and that this form of idolatry, without any political motive to palliate it as in the case of Jeroboam, should have been adopted and maintained without surprise or hesitation, nay, even with eager enthusiasm, by an entire tribe of Israel. This is very much as at present some forms of image-adoration are blended with the service of God. That such will- worship, however, was only comparatively innocent, and originated in an obstinate pruritus of improving rather than obeying God's revelation, Samuel clearly expressed tin reproving Saul (1Sa 15:23), “Stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry” (literally teraphim). We do not read that the stubbornness of Saul led him actually to worship teraphim. However, his daughter possessed teraphim, as; we shall see presently.

3. The next notice of teraphim which we find is in 1Sa 19:13-16, where Michal, to give David more time to escape, deceives ‘the messengers of Saul by putting the teraphim” in his bed,” with a pillow of goats'-hair for his bolster.” The use of the article shows that “the teraphim” was something perfectly well known (Thenius, ad loc.); and the fact that we thus find it (or them.) in the house of a man so pious as David entirely confirms our inference as to the prevalence of these images. The suggestions of Michaelis that Michal may have worshipped them unknown to David, and that barren women were especially devoted to them, are wholly without foundation. The article (הִתְּרָפַים) explodes; the arguments of Michaelis (De Theraphis, Comment Soc. Gött. 1763), Bochart (Hieroz. i, 623), etc., that the teraphim in this instance was a mere hastily made doll of rags; in fact, a sort of malkin. We may legitimately infer from the passage that they had some rude resemblance to the human shape, being, perhaps, something like the Hermae; hence Aquila in this place renders the word by προτομαί. The Sept. rendering κενοτάφια very probably points  to the belief that the teraphim were images of deceased ancestors (κενοτάφιά τινα ησαν ἑλισσόμενα ὡς τύπος νεκροῦ. Suid. vid. Bo- chart, Hieroz. I; 2, 51); and the rendering' of put a pillow of goats'-hair for his bolster” by καὶ ηπαρ τῶν αἰγῶν ἔθετο πρὸς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ, “she placed the goats' liver at his head,” shows that they read כְּבִר. “liver,” for כְּבַיר, “mattress.” Now if this ancient reading were correct, it brings the passage into remarkable parallel with Eze 21:21, where Nebuchadnezzar is said to have decided his course by belomantia, together with consultation of teraphim and looking into the liver (extispicium). It is possible that Michal may have been divining by means of a sacrifice to the teraphim: when Saul's messenger arrived, and that she put the yet palpitating liver on the bed with the image, which in a small, dark, narrow recess might well enough pass for a human being. Josephus, with his usual want of honesty, omits all mention of the teraphim, and only says that she put the liver under the bedclothes, hoping that its motion would make the men more easily believe that David was gasping! (Ant. 6:11, 4). Theodoret (Quaest. 49, in 1 Reg.) repeats this preposterous notion.

On every revival of the knowledge of the written Revelation of God the teraphim were swept away, together with the worse forms of idolatry (2Ki 23:24): “The workers with familiar spirits, and the wizards, and the images (teraphim), and the idols, and all the abominations that were spied in the land of Judah land in Jerusalem, did Josiah put away, that he might perform the words of the law which were written in the book that Hilkiah the priest found in the house of the Lord.”...

4. The next passage in historical order about the teraphim is Hos 3:4, which is encompassed by difficulties. The prophet, purchasing Gomer to himself, bids her be chaste for many days, “for the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a sacrifice, and without an image (matsebâh), and without an ephod, and without teraphim.” Here it would certainly be the prima facie impression of every unbiased reader that the matsebâh and the teraphim are mentioned without blame as ordinary parts of religious worship. Without, however,-entering into the question (which, perhaps, cannot be decided) whether Hosea did or did not mean to commend or tolerate these material adjuncts to a monotheistic worship, it is certainly not surprising that the reverence paid to the teraphim should have continued in Israel side by side with that paid to the calves, which beyond all doubt: were intended to be mere Elohistic symbols; and this is  the less surprising when we remember that one of these cherubic emblems was set up in the very city (Dan) to which the teraphim of Micah had been carried; and probably, indeed, because of the existence there of the irregular worship established by Moses' grandson. But here, again, the Sept. version is curious and perplexing, for it uses the word δῆλοι (sc. λίθοι, bright gems), a word which, like δήλωσις, it uses elsewhere of the Urim and Thummim (Num 27:21; 1Sa 28:6); and Aquila seems to have had the same. notion in adopting the word φωτισμούς, and it is even countenanced by Jerome, who in this passage includes the teraphim among the “instrumenta sacerdotalis habitus.” This is one starting-point for the theory, supported with such a mnass of splendid but unconvincing learning by Spencer (De Legg. Hebr. lib. 3, dissert. 7 p. 920- 1038), that the teraphim and urim were identical. He argues not only from this rendering δῆλοι, but also

(1) from the frequent union of ephod with teraphim;

(2) from the supposition that urim means “fires,” and that teraphim means the same, being a mere Aramaic equivalent for seraphim, the burning ones

(3) from the constant use of terapihim for oracular purposes.

He concludes, therefore, that they were small images, permitted as a kind of necessary concession to deeply rooted idolatry, placed in the folds of the ephod and believed to emit predictions of the divine will. How ill the theory accords with the data before us will be obvious at once. This passage seems to indicate that as the use of teraphim, like that of the Penates and Lares among the Romans, was connected with nationality, it necessarily perished with; the nationality itself.

5. The teraphim were consulted even after the Captivity by persons upon whom true religion had no firm hold, in order to elicit some supernatural omina, similar to the auguria of the Romans. Thus (Zec 10:2): “For the idols (teraphim) have spoken vanity,” etc. In like manner at a previous age, in connection with the haruspicia instituted by the king of Babylon, we read (Eze 21:21; Eze 21:26) that he consulted images (teraphim).

The main and certain results of this review are that the teraphim were rude human images; that the use of them was an antique Aramaic custom; that  there is reason to suppose them to have been images of deceased ancestors; that they were consulted oracularly; that they were not confined to Jews; that their use continued down to the latest period of Jewish history; and lastly, that, although the more enlightened prophets and strictest-later kings regarded them as idolatrous, the priests were much, less averse to such images, and their cult was not considered in any way repugnant to the pious worship of Elohim; nay, even to the worship of him “under the awful title of Jehovah,” as in the case of Aaron, Jonathan, Uriah, etc. (See some acute remarks on this subject in Nicolas, Etudes Crit. sur la Bible, p. 129-135.) In fact, they involved a monotheistic idolatry, very different indeed from polytheism; and the tolerance of them by priests as compared with the denunciation of them by the keener insight and more vivid inspiration of the prophets offers a close analogy to the views of the Roman Catholics respecting pictures and images as compared with the views of Protestants. It was against this use of idolatrous symbols and emblems in a monotheistic worship that the second commandment was directed, whereas the first is aimed against the graver sin of direct polytheism. But the whole history of Israel shows how early and how utterly the law must have fallen into desuetude. The worship of the gold pin calf and of the calves at Dan and Bethel, against which, so far as we know, neither Elijah nor Elisha said a single word; the tolerance of high places, teraphim, and baetytila; the offering of incense for centuries to the brazen serpent destroyed by Hezekiah; the occasional glimpses of the most startling irregularities sanctioned, apparently, even in the Temple worship itself, prove most decisively that a pure monotheism and an independence of symbols were the result of a slow and painful course of God's disciplinal dealings among the noblest thinkers of a single nation, and not, as is so constantly and erroneously urged, the instinct of the whole Shemitic race; in other words, one single branch of the Shemites was, under God's providence, educated into pure monotheism only by centuries of misfortune and series of inspired men. In fact, we have most remarkable proofs that the use of teraphim coexisted with the worship of Jehovah even in comparatively pious families; and we have more than one instance of the wives of worshippers of Jehovah not finding full contentment and satisfaction in the stern moral truth of spiritual worship, and therefore carrying on some private symbolism by fondling the teraphim. It seems, however, that this swerving from truth was comparatively innocent. It was never denounced and suppressed with the same rigor as the worship of Moloch. There is, in fine, no positive evidence that the teraphim ever were  actually worshipped. They seem rather to have been cherished as talismans than as idols. SEE MAGIC.

III. Opinions of Later Scholars. — Besides Spencer's theory, to which we have already alluded, we may mention others, utterly valueless indeed, yet curious as bearing on the history of the subject.

1. Rabbins. — According to the great rabbi Eliezer, who was the son of Hyrcanus and the brother-in-law of Gamaliel II, who seems to have been the tutor of Paul (in Pirke Aboth, and the Targum of Jonathan on Gen 31:19), the worship of teraphim was connected with atrocities. “The makers of teraphim slaughtered a man who was a first-born, cut his head off and salted it, and cured it with spices and oil. After this, they wrote the name of an impure spirit and sentences of divination on a golden plate, which they placed under the tongue of the head which was fastened to the wall, and lighted lamps before it, and knelt down in adoration, upon which the tongue began to utter divinations.” Rabbi Salomo, or Rashi (2Ki 23:24), says, “The teraphim uttered divinations by magical and horoscopic- arts.” ‘On 1Sa 19:13 sq., he adduces the opinion that the teraphim were horoscopic and astrological instruments made of brass; but he confesses that this opinion, to which he is himself much inclined, is not consistent with the account of Michal, from which it is evident that the teraphim had the shape of man. On Genesis 31 Aben-Ezra adduces the opinion that the teraphim were automata, made by astrologers so as to show the hours and to mutter divinations. Hence the Persian Tawas in Genesis 31 translates astrolabia. Aben-Ezra also adduces the opinion that Rachel stole the teraphim of Laban in order to prevent him from idolatry, and from asking the teraphim whither his children had fled. Rabbi Levi ben- Gersom (on Genesis) states that the teraphim were human figures, by which the imagination of diviners was so excited that they supposed they heard a low voice speaking about future events with which their own thoughts were filled, although the image did not speak, an. operation which can only be performed by such natural organs as God has provided for that purpose.

2. Moderns. — Michaelis, in Commentationes Societati Göttingen si oblatae (Brem. 1763), p. 5 sq., compares the teraphim to the Satyri and Sileni, referring to the statement of Pausanias (6, 24, 6), that there were graves of Sileni in the country of the Hebrews; and alluding to the hairy ones (“devils,” שְׂעירים) of Lev 17:7. Creuzer asserts that the  teraphim had something of asses in them (Commentationes Herod. 1, 277; Symb. 3, 208 sq.); and refers to the old calumny that the Jews worshipped the head of an ass (Tacit. Hist. 5, 4 Rutilius, 1, 387). Creuzer appeals also (Symb. 2, 340) to Genesis 31 in order to prove the fertilizing, or rather fecundizing, power of the תרפים, which scarcely can be proved from Gen 31:19 (comp. here Rosenmüller Scholia; Jahn, 3, 506 sq.).

IV. Recent Illustrations. — M. Botta found in cavities under the pavement of the porch of the palace at Khorsabad several small images of baked clay of frightful aspect, sometimes with lynx head and human body, and sometimes with human head and lion's or bull's body. Some have a miter encircled at the bottom with a double pair of horns, and others have their hair rolled in large curls. In front of several doors he saw the same cavities, of the size of one of the bricks, and about fourteen inches in depth, lined with tiles, and having a ledge round the inside, so that they might be covered by one of the bricks of the pavement, without betraying the existence of the cavity. It has been suggested that these images are the teraphim, or household gods, of the ancient Assyrians, which, being secreted under the pavement near the doors, were intended to protect the entrances of the palace from the admission of evil. See Bonomi, Nineveh- p. 156.

Figures somewhat similar but less hideous have been found among the Egyptian ruins and elsewhere, which seem to have been employed with a like significance. See Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 25.

V. Literature. — The principal authorities concerning the teraphim are Michaelis, De Teraphis, in the Comment. Soc. Gött. (Brem. 1763), p. 5 sq.; Hersen, De Teraphim (Viteb. 1665); Wickmannshahsen, De Teraphim (ibid. 1705); also in Ugolino, Thesaur. 23:7; Antast, De Diis Familiae Jacobi (Lips. 1744); Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. p. 2660-64; Pfeiffer, Exerc. Bibl. p. 1-28; Hottinger, Hist. Orient. p. 296; Selden, De Diis Syris Syntagm. 1, 2' Spencer, De Legg. Hebr. p. 920-1038; Bochart, Hieroz. 1, 623; Carpzov, Appar. Crit. p. 537546; Jurieu, Hist. Crit. des Dogmes, 2, 3; Gesenius, Thesaur. s.v.; Winkler, Anim. advers. Philol. 2, 351 sq. SEE IDOLATRY.

## Terebinth[[@Headword:Terebinth]]

             a majestic Oriental tree, which has been made by many a rival of:the oak. as a representative of the Heb. אִלָּה, אֵלָה, אֵיל, or אִלּוֹן. SEE PLAIN. So Celsius (Hierob. 2, 34-58), and' naturalists generally since. Travelers frequently confound the two trees. They are, however, quite different in many particulars. The bark, shape, and general character are remarkably alike, but the wood, the leaf, and the blossom differ very obviously. SEE TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS.

The terebinth is the Pistacia terebinthus of botanists, called by the Arabs the betm or butni, and well known in the Greek islands as the turpentine-tree. SEE TEIL. In Chios especially a considerable quantity of turpentine is extracted from it by tapping the trunk; but this is not practiced in Palestine, where the inhabitants seem to be ignorant of its commercial value. It is a very common tree in the southern and eastern parts of the country, being generally found in situations too warm for the oak, whose place it there supplies, although they are occasionally found immediately adjoining, as at Tell el-Kady. (Tristram, Land of Israel, p. 581). It is seldom, seen in clumps or groves, never in forests, but stands isolated and weird-like in some bare ravine or on a hillside, where nothing else towers above the lower brushwood. The but is not an evergreen, as is often represented, but its small feathered lancet-shaped leaves fall in the autumn and are renewed in the spring. They are pinnate, the leaflets larger than those of the lentisk, and their hue is a very dark reddish-green, not quite so somber as the locust-tree. The flowers are in clusters like those of a vine, inconspicuous, and are followed by small oval berries, hanging in clusters from two to five inches in length, resembling much the clusters of the vine when the grapes are just set. They are of a ruddy purple and remarkably juicy. Another fruit, or rather excrescence, is found on the tree, scattered among the leaves, of the size of a chestnut, of a putrid color variegated with green and white. The people of Cyprus believe that it is produced by the puncture of a fly; when opened it appears full of worms (Mariti, 1, 209; 2, 114). From incisions in the trunk there flows a sort of transparent balsam, constituting a very pure and fine species of turpentine, with an agreeable odor, like citron or jessamine, and a mild taste, and hardening gradually into a transparent gum. It is called Cyprus or Chian turpentine, and is obtained in July by wounding the bark in several places, leaving a space of about three inches between the  wounds. From these the turpentine is received on stones, upon which it becomes so much condensed by the coldness of the night as to admit of being scraped off with a knife, which is always done before sunrise. It is again liquefied in the sun and passed through a strainer, in order to free it from all extraneous matters. The quantity produced is very small, four large trees, sixty years old, only yielding two pounds and a half: it may be somewhat more in favorable situations. In consequence of this, and its superior qualities, the turpentine is very costly, and is often adulterated with inferior substances (Kitto, Phys. Hist. of Palest. p. 238). The tree is found also in Asia Minor (many of them near Smyrna), Greece, Italy, the south of France, Spain, and in the north of Africa, and is there described as not usually rising to the height of more than twenty feet. It often exceeds that size, however, in the mountains, and in the plains of Syria it is very much larger. SEE OAK.

Many terebinths remain to this day objects of veneration in their neighborhood, and the favorite burying place of a Bedawin sheik is under a solitary tree. Eastern travelers will recall the “Mother of rags” on the outskirts of the desert-a terebinth covered with the votive offerings of superstition or affection. The “oak of Mamre,” near Hebron, was said to be a terebinth, which remained till the 4th century (Jerome, De Loc. Heb. 87; Sozomen, Eccles. Hist. 2, 4; comp. Josephus, War, 5, 9, 7), and on its site Constantine erected al church, the ruins of which still remain. It is said that the tree dried up in the reign of Theodosius the Younger; but that the trunk produced a new tree, from which Brocard (7, 64), Salignac (10, 5), and other old travelers declare that they brought slips of the new and old wood to their own country (Zuallart Voyage de Jerusalem, 4,: 1) The tree was accidentally destroyed by fire in A.D. 1646 (Mariti, p. 520). Its modern representative, however, is a true oak, as is proved both by its leaves and actual acorns. The tree on which Judas hanged himself is said to have been a terebinth, and its descendant is yet shown to the credulous, overhanging the valley of Hinnom. Towards the north of Palestine the tree becomes more scarce; but in ancient Moab and Ammon, and in the region around Heshbon, it is the only one that relieves the monotony of the rolling downs and boundless sheep walks; and in the few glens south of the Jabbok there are many trees of a larger size than others which remain west of the Jordan (Tristram, Nat. Hist. of the Bible,. p. 401). In Turkey the burial-grounds of Christians, particularly the Armenians, are planted with terebinth-: trees,  the cypress being reserved for the Mohammedans (Calcott [Lady], Script. Herbal, p. 504). SEE TURPENTINE-TREE.

## Teresh[[@Headword:Teresh]]

             (Heb. id. תֶּרֶשׁ, prob. Pers. strictness; Sept. [in some copies only] Θάρας or Θάῤῥας; Vulg. Thares), the second-named of the two eunuchs who kept the door of the palace of Ahasuerus, and who were hanged, their plot to assassinate the king being discovered by Mordecai (Est 2:21; Est 6:2 ). B.C. 479. Josephus: calls him Theodestes (Θεοδέστης, Ant. 11:6, 4 and 10), and says that, the conspiracy having been detected by Barnabazus, a servant of one of the eunuchs, who was a Jew by birth, and who revealed it to Mordecai, the conspirators were crucified.

## Terminism and the Terministic Controversy[[@Headword:Terminism and the Terministic Controversy]]

             The word Terminism has reference to the terminus of the period of grace accorded to man as an individual or in the mass. The basis of the dispute which arose upon this matter was the Middle-Age, Augustinian theory, that the end of this earthly life is in every in-stance the end of gracious opportunity, so that even unbaptized children become at death the prey of hell.. The Reformation led the consciousness of Christians back to the dynamic conditions of salvation, namely, on the one hand, to the free grace of God, and, on the other, to the internal, religious, and moral state of repentance. In the light of the former condition it was possible to suppose that the terminus gratiae might be extended beyond the terminus vitae; under the latter it could be contracted to even narrower limits than the duration of earthly life. A recognition of the possibility of widening the period of grace led to the development of the doctrine of the Apocatastasis (q.v.), while its contrary gave rise to Terminism.

The leading promulgators of Terminism were the Friends, who taught that every person has a special day of visitation, which is but transient and may end. before the close of the life of earth (see. Winer, Comp. Darstellung, p. 87). The Pietists also contributed towards the growth of that idea by their depreciation of the worth of repentance late in life. The controversy upon the subject was fairly opened by the appearance of a work by J.G. Bise, deacon at Sorau (died 1700), entitled Terminus Peremptorius Salutis Humanoe, etc. (1698). A number of responses were written, the more important of them- by Neumann, professor at Wittenberg, Diss. de Term. Salut. etc. (Viteb. 1700), and Diss. de Tempore Gratiae, etc. (1701); also  Ittig, professor at Leipsic, Vortrage iib. d. prophet., apostol. u. evang. — luth. Lehre, etc., With other works. Rechenberg, the son-in-law of Spener, came to the assistance of Bapse with his Diss. de Grat. Revocatricis Termino (Lips. 1700). The dispute was dropped on the death of Ittig, in 1710, and the advance of rationalism deprived the question of interest. For the theology of our time, the only importance of the discussion lies in its possible influence in occasioning profounder determinations with regard to the possibility of becoming hardened against grace in this life, and the infinite consequences depending upon the hour of death and the free sovereignty of God.

The literature of the controversy is largely given in the works of Rechenberg and Ittig. See also Winer, Theol. Literatur, p. 446; Bretschneider, Systemat. Entwickl. p. 693. On the dispute itself. see Einem, Kirchengesch. d. 18. Jahrh. 2, 737; Walch, Einl. in d. Religionsstreitigk. d. evang. — luth. Kirche, 2, 551 sq.; Baumgarten, Geschichte d. Religionsparteien, p. 1282 sq. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Terms[[@Headword:Terms]]

             in law, are the periods in England when the courts of law hold their sittings at Westminster for the discharge of their judicial functions. There are four in every year, namely, Hilary term, Easter term, Trinity term, and Michaelmas term; but the last of these is usually at the commencement of the legal year. They were supposed by Selden to have been established by William the Conqueror; but Spelman has shown that they originated in the observances of the Church, and were no more than those leisure periods when there was neither fast nor festival nor rural avocation to withhold the suitor from attending the court. At first the courts in Christian countries continued open all the year round, but the Church interposed. The sacred season of Advent and Christmas originated the winter vacation; the time of Lent and Easter gave rise to that of the spring; the third we owe to Pentecost; and the requisitions of agricultural pursuits account for the long space that intervenes between Midsummer and Michaelmas. Sundays and other holydays were included in the prohibition which, in 517, was established by a canon of the Church, and, says Blackstone, fortified by an imperial constitution of the younger Theodosius, comprised in the Theodosian Code. In the commencement and duration of these terms, these regulations of the Church were kept in view. Edward the Confessor, in one of his laws, says that from Advent to the octave of Epiphany, from  Septuagesima to the octave of Easter, from the Ascension to the octave of Pentecost, and from four in the afternoon of every Saturday until the end of the succeeding Monday, the peace of God and holy Church should be kept throughout the realm (Ancient Laws and Institutions of England, p. 190). We learn from Britton that in the reign of Edward I no secular plea could be held, nor .any man sworn on the evangelists, during Advent, Lent, Pentecost, or the times of harvest and vintage, and the days of the great litanies and all solemn festivals. The bishops, however, he adds, granted dispensations that assizes and juries might be taken at these seasons; and afterwards, by statute Westminster 1, 3 Edward I, c! 51, it was enacted that assizes of novel disseisin mort d'ancester and darrein presentment should be taken in Advent, Septuagesima, and Lent. The portions not included in the prohibitions became what are called terms, and were denominated according to the saint to whose feast they occurred most nearly.

## Terms Of Communion[[@Headword:Terms Of Communion]]

             those conditions on which the members of a particular Church are agreed, and which are the basis of their fellowship. Terms of communion are not to be identified with terms of salvation; nor should terms of lay communion be as comprehensive and theological as those of clerical fellowship.

## Terpsichore[[@Headword:Terpsichore]]

             one of the nine Muses (q.v.); she presided over choral song and dancing.

## Terrace[[@Headword:Terrace]]

             (מְסַלָּה, mesillah, 2Ch 9:11; Sept. ἀνάβασις; a highway, as elsewhere usually rendered), a staircase, constructed by Solomon for his edifices out of the algum-trees imported from the East Indies. SEE PALACE; SEE TEMPLE.

## Terrasson, Andre[[@Headword:Terrasson, Andre]]

             a French clergyman, and first of a literary family of considerable note in France, was born at Lyons in 1669, became a priest of the Oratory, preacher to the king, and afterwards preacher to the court of Lorraine. His pulpit services were much applauded, and attended by crowded congregations. His exertions during Lent in the metropolitan church at Paris threw him into an illness from, which he died, April 25, 1723. His Sermons were printed in 1726 (4 vols. 12mo) and 1736. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Terrasson, Gaspard[[@Headword:Terrasson, Gaspard]]

             brother of the preceding, was born at Lyons, Oct. 5, 1680, and was sent, at the age of eighteen, to the house of the Oratory at Paris. He resided afterwards in different houses of his order, chiefly at Troyes, where he delivered a funeral oration for the dauphin, son of Louis XIV. For some time he, employed himself in delivering exhortations in the seminaries, but after Andre's death he accepted solicitations to preach, and soon acquired a reputation superior to that of his brother. He preached in Paris during five years; but Various circumstances, particularly his attachment to the Jansenists, obliged him to leave both the Congregation of the Oratory and the pulpit at the same time. He was appointed curate of Treigny in 1735; but, persecution still following him, he was sent to the Bastile, which he, left in 1744 to be confined with the Minims at Argenteuil. He was at length set at liberty, and died in Paris, Jan. 2, 1752, leaving Sermons (4 vols. 12mo), and an anonymous book, Lettres sur la Justice Chretienne, which was censured by the Sorbonne.

## Terrasson, Jean[[@Headword:Terrasson, Jean]]

             brother of the two preceding, was born at Lyons in 1670, where he also studied, and entered the Oratory. In 1707 he was admitted into the Academy of Sciences, and he entered into the literary discussions of the day. In 1721 he became professor of philosophy in the College of France, and in 1732 he was made a member of the French Academy. Towards the end of his life he lost his memory. He died in. Paris, Sept. 15, 1750. He published a number of historical works. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Terrier[[@Headword:Terrier]]

             a formal survey and plan or schedule of Church property, ordered by English canon law to be made and preserved in the bishop's registry. A terrier of glebe lands made under queen Elizabeth is preserved in the British Exchequer.

## Territorial System[[@Headword:Territorial System]]

             This title is applied to that theory of Church government which assumes that the ruler of a country possesses, by virtue of his sovereignty, the right to govern the Church, if Protestant, which has been established within his  realm. The Middle Ages had witnessed a constant association of the Church with the State, which was at times carried so far as to include the one under the other as one of its parts. When the principles of the Jewish theocracy could be asserted, the Church would attempt to subject the State to its authority; but when a relapse into heathen principles took place, the State was ready to enforce the authority of the civil power over the religion of the land. When the reformatory movements of the 15th century had failed, the renewed agitation, of which Zwingli, Luther, etc., were the representatives, addressed itself to the princes and estates of the land. The sovereign powers of either party assumed the right to dictate the creed of their subjects. The Roman Catholic prince who became a Protestant sought to carry his country with him over to Protestantism; the Lutheran who passed over into the Reformed Church assumed to transfer his subjects also. The belief of the prince was to determine the creed of the land. The Peace of Westphalia ended this anomalous practice, but expressly recognized the sovereignty of the prince as the source of the jus reformandi. The dangerous character of the principle which derived all the rights belonging to an evangelical Church from the head of the State was soon recognized, and led to the development of the theory which is usually known as the episcopal system.

The territorial system was formulated at the close of the 17th century as a foil to that theory, finding its leading advocates in Christian Thomasius (q.v.) and his pupil Brenneisen (De Jure Principis circa Adiaphora [Halse, 1675], in Thomasius, Auserlesene deutsche Schriften, 1696, p. 76 sq.), and its principal opponent in Johann Benedikt Carpzov (q.v.). As formulated by Thomasius, the reigning prince possesses, as a natural right, the authority to regulate the ecclesiastical affairs of his country, and of banishing persons who disturb the peace of the Church. He may dismiss a preacher who dispenses false teachings, and may forbid the introduction of new confessions, etc.; but he cannot impose his own creed upon his subjects, nor finally determine in matters of religion. The theory found many supporters, jurists as well as theologians, among them J. H. Bohmer and Job. Jac. Moser (q.v.). It has been defended in quite recent times, in connection with their liturgical disputes, by Miller, Marheinecke, Augusti, and others. The collegial system deprived the territorial theory of every support; and the present tendency towards an entire separation between State and Church is wholly antagonistic to its prevalence. Both legislation and praxis have suffered from its influence to the present day.  On the entire subject, see Stahl, Kirchenverfassung nach Lehre u. Recht d. Protestanten, p. 22 sq.; Richter, Gesch. d. evang. Kirchenverfassung in Deutschland, p. 212 sq. — , Friedberg, De Finibus inter Ecclesiam et Civitatem, etc. (Lips. 1861); Lehmann, De Pace Religiosa, 1, 23; Nettelbladt, Observatt. Juris Ecclesiastici (Halse, 1783, 8vo); the works of Thomasius, Carpzov, etc.; Bohmer, Consilia et Decisiones, tom. 1, pars 1, respons. 15. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. SEE CHURCH AND STATE; SEE COLLEGIAL SYSTEM.

## Terry, Parschal[[@Headword:Terry, Parschal]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Aquebogue, Long Island, N. Y., Nov. 3, 1806; was licensed to preach by the Methodist Protestant Church of New York; preached at Aquebogue for two years; was ordained, by the Congregational Convention of Long Island in 1831, and labored for a number of years at Patchogue; but, feeling the need of a more thorough course of theology, studied in the seminary attached to Yale College, graduated in 1840, and became a member of Onondaga Presbytery. In 1843 he was editor of the Religious Recorder at ‘Syracuse, N. Y.; in 1848 removed to Marathon, N. Y., and was received by Cortland Presbytery; thence, in 1853, to Painesville, O., where he ministered three years. He subsequently labored, in 1857, at Unionville, 0.; 1858, Thompson; 1861, Hudson; 1862, Franklin Mills; 1863, Troy. He died Oct. 20, 1865. ‘He was a man of more than usual talents, which he improved by culture. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p.322.

## Tersteegen, Gerhard[[@Headword:Tersteegen, Gerhard]]

             the mystic aid sacred poet, was born at-Meurs, on Nov. 25,1697. He early acquired a thorough knowledge of ancient languages, including the Hebrew, and friends advised his preparation for a. learned career; but, his father having died, his mother was induced, from domestic considerations, to choose a mercantile life for him instead. He was apprenticed to his brother-in law at Mülheim in 1713, and in the following year was powerfully wrought upon by the grace of God. Mülheim was at that time the scene of an exalted and vigorous piety which was kept alive through, the holding of weekly convocations, and made itself felt in all the affairs of life. These convocations became an occasion of offence to the Church at large, and Hoffmann, the Mülheim pastor, was cited before the Classis of Duisburg, which decided that he must refrain from holding them in future, and induced the Synod of Cleves to take similar action. Nothing has been found, however, to show that Hoffmann was guilty of heterodoxy, or that the convocations served any other purpose than that of leading many souls to Christ. In spite of these inquisitorial measures, the convocations. were obstinately continued at Mülheim, and Tersteegen, for his part, was alienated from the Church to such a degree as to refrain from participating in the public worship, and particularly in the sacrament of the Lord's supper, of which evident sinners were allowed to partake. He finished his apprenticeship, but two years afterwards, in 1719, under the impulse of religious sentiment, renounced his business for one of a more retired character. He now became a ribbon-weaver and an ascetic. He had no companion save the girl who wound his silk. His clothing was poor, his food scanty and simple; but his charities, whatever might be his income, were numerous. He considered this ascetical, hermit life the ideal condition  of a Christian on the earth, and for a time endured its trials and privations with unwavering confidence in the care of his heavenly Father; but gradually he became the prey of internal anxieties which tortured him during five years with but occasional and transient interventions of hope. But in 1724 that period of suffering came to its close. He celebrated the return of his Savior's smile in the hymn Wie bist Du mir sonnig gut, mein Hohepriester Du and entered into a covenant with his Lord which he signed with his own blood-probably in imitation of the marquis de Renty, whose life he had treated with great pleasure in his book Leben heiliger Seelen, 1, 3.

With the conclusion of this period of spiritual dark-: ness his preparation came to an end. He was thenceforward, though much against his will, thrown among men and obliged to take an active part in the affairs of religion. He resided with his brother, and while employed in the tuition of that brother's children was led to undertake a work which initiated his career as a mystical writer-the Unparteiischer Abriss christlicher Grundwahrheiten, a catechetical manual, first printed in 1801 and again in 1842. In this book he evidently leaned on the French mystic Pierre Poiret (q.v.) as respects both its arrangement and matter. The first three centuries of the Church are represented as having been pure, and the succeeding ages, from n Constantine to the 15th century, as a period of great apostasy. The light broke through with power in the Reformation, but afterwards again declined. Christianity exists more generally in name than in fact. Upon this work followed a number of translations and' prefaces, in the preparation of which Tersteegen was accustomed to spend the time after six o'clock in the evening. The list includes Labadie, Manuel de Piett (with preface dated Mülheim, May 21, 1726); Jean de Bernieres Louvigny's works (Das verborgene Leben mit Christo in Gött, etc., with preface dated Dec. 18, 1726); Thomas a Kempis, Imitatio Christi; Gerlach Petersen, Soliloquia (1727). In 1733 he began the publication of the work entitled Auserlesene Lebensboschr. heil. Seelen, the final (third) volume of which appeared in 1753, followed by a second edition of the whole work in the next year. The saints so commemorated belong altogether to the Roman Catholic communion a fact which Tersteegen excused on the ground that others had rendered a similar service to Protestantism but there is satisfactory proof that he possessed an especial fondness for the peculiar piety cultivated by the mystical ascetics of the former Church. In 1749 he published a translation of a poetical composition by Madame Guyon  illustrative of the inner life, and with this work completed the series of his mystical writings. In them all he takes Poiret-sometimes Godfrey Arnold (q.v.) also for his master. His mystical tendency is sometimes exaggerated into Quietism (q.v.) in them, so that he can speak in glowing terms of approval of a state of perfect rest for the soul which begins and continues through the direct operation of God on the soul without any mediation whatever, even though it be that of Scripture or of Christ.

Tersteegen yielded to the persuasions of Hoffmann and others, and began to address public assemblies at about the time when his first literary efforts were put forth. In 1728 he renounced his handicraft and gave himself wholly to the care of souls. His wants were supplied by the contributions of friends and by several legacies, so that he was even able to exercise a liberal benevolence. His advice was desired by great numbers of people living everywhere in the territories of Cleves and Berg. Otterbeck, a farm between Mülheim and Elberfeld, became a station where a number of his' adherents lived together in the practice of industry, self renunciation, and piety. He furnished them twelve rules of conduct (given at the close of vol. 3 of his letters), and watched over them with jealous care. A work written in their behalf in 1727 became a bulwark against Antinomianism (q.v.), and saved them from the excesses into which other, but kindred, associations were drawn. A second center of his influence was Elberfeld, and subsequently Barmen. This region was troubled with the fanatical influence of Eller (q.v.) and his supporters. To counteract that influence, Tersteegen wrote an effectual admonition (comp. Wegder Wahrheit, 11). Solingen was a third station, and it was there that Tersteegen delivered the only sermon ever preached by him. At Crefeld extraordinary manifestations accompanied a work of grace, which were controlled through his judicious counsel. He was also brought into relations with the Moravian Brotherhood, and was solicited by Zinzendorf, Dober, and other leaders to cast in his lot with theirs, but he steadily refused, less on the ground of their unusual methods than because he believed their teachings to be erroneous. He charged them with identifying sanctification with justification and with misrepresenting the legal and the evangelical elements of religion. He found in them no earnest striving in the way of a progressive sanctification, and no willingness to receive the doctrine of the necessity for thorough going self-denial and persistent watchfulness and prayer, which they denounced as legalism. His position hindered the  Moravians from securing an establishment in the regions of the Lower Rhine.

In 1740 an occurrence at Solingen led the authorities to issue a positive prohibition of conventicles, and Tersteegen saw his extended and successful labors interrupted. During ten years he was able to hold public gatherings only in Holland, whither he frequently journeyed; but his correspondence and private labors increased enormously. He regarded the prohibition as a trial, and counseled submission. But when in 1750 a new awakening took place, he began once more to assert the right of “private assemblies.” He wrote an awakening sermon at this time on 2Co 5:14, which was favorably received and led to the ultimate publication of a series of discourses under the title Geistliche Briosamen, etc. (1773, 2 vols. in 4 pts.). They represent the culmination of his powers, and are equaled in contents and method by but few of the productions of his contemporaries.

The favor with which these sermons were received brought their author into general notice, and led to the appointment of a royal commissioner to inquire into, the work of Tersteegen among his adherents. The person selected for this duty was a member of the high consistory named Hecker, a native of the Rhine provinces and a friend to Tersteegen. Through him the latter was induced to draw up a confession of his faith, and subsequently a critique of the Cuvres du Philosophe de Sans-souci, which elicited the approval of the king. A steady approximation on the part of Tersteegen and his friends towards the State Church is noticeable from this period, but he was never formally identified with it because of its tolerance of open sinners as communicants. He discussed this question in a tract issued in 1768, shortly before his decease. A feeble and, broken constitution troubled him all his days; but he attained to the age of seventy- two years, passing away in a quiet slumber April 3,1769.

As a poet, Tersteegen was prolific, and thoroughly, though evangelically, mystical. His apprehension of the idea of self-renunciation and a blessed loss of self in God was so profound as to prevent the Church of his day from appreciating his merit. His hymns are now found, however, in the collections of every German Church. His principal collection of hymns was published in 1729 under the title Geistliches Blumengdrtleins (15th ed. Essen, 1855). He also rendered the mystical poems of Labadie into German, and contributed to the collection known as Gottgeheiligtes  Harfenspiel d. Kider, etc. His works have been published in Germany by G. D. Badecker.. His life was written by Dr. Kerlem; (Mülheim, 1853), and Gobel in his Geschichte d.christl. Lebens, etc., 3, 289-447. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Tertia[[@Headword:Tertia]]

             (Lat. third), the name given in the early Church to the third hour of prayer; that is, nine in the morning. Different theories are given of its origin; some saving that it was observed in regard to our Savior's being condemned by Pilate at that time, others that it is in. memory of the Holy Ghost coming upon the apostles at that hour. This is the reason assigned by Cassian and Basil. On all festivals? this service was omitted, because on Sundays the communion was used, which always began at this hour. See Bingham, Christ. Antiq. bk. 13 ch. 9, § 11.

## Tertiana[[@Headword:Tertiana]]

             the term applied to the third part of all Church revenues in the Isle of Man, which third part was received by the bishops of that island. See Bingham,; Christ. Anti. bk. 9 ch. 8,§ 6.

## Tertiaries[[@Headword:Tertiaries]]

             (TERTIUS ORDO DE POENITENTIA; TERTIARII; FRATRES CONVERSI; also SORORES TERTH ORDINIS) is the name given to the members of a unions organized primarily in connection with the mendicant orders, but subsequently connected also with other orders. They are not required to live in the convent or undergo the three principal vows, and Were designed to retain their place in the world and represent the order in whose privileges they shared in the common walks of life. Their origin is, traced back to Norbert, the founder of the Order of Remonstrance's. The Templars, too, had a similar institution connected with their organization. The actual introduction of the-Order of Tertiaries was due, however, to Francis of Assisi, and dates back to 1221, the occasion for its creation being the effect produced by his preaching at Carnario, where men and women in great numbers dissolved the matrimonial relation in order to give themselves to repentance. All virtuous ant-orthodox persons were received into the order. The rule forbade participation in festivities, disputes, and offensive wars, and required works of charity, diligent religious exercises, an annual convocation for penance, and masses for the souls of the  Tertiaries, living or dead. The order was governed by superiors periodically chosen. Its costume was to be of inferior stuff, neither wholly white nor black, and without ornament-an ash-colored coat and rope being finally chosen, over which ordinary secular clothing is permitted to be worn. The female tertiaries adopted a similar rule and costume, with the occasional addition of a white veil. The rule was confirmed by popes Honorius III, Gregory IX, and Nicholas IV. The order grew rapidly, and found favor in the highest circles, having numbered among its members the emperor Charles IV, kings Louis of France, Bela of Hungary, and Philip of Spain, queen Blanca of Castile, princess Anna of Austria, etc.

Towards the close of the 13th century a branch order was established among the male, and a century later among the female, Tertiaries to satisfy the craving of some for a stricter rule the Regulated Order of Tertiaries (Tertiari Regulares). After a rapid extension, this secondary order separated into different congregations, which, in substance, followed the Franciscan rule. The latter, in turn, gave rise to a series of congregations of Hospital Brothers and Sisters. They take the simple vows, and an additional one which binds them to care for the sick, and to live in hospitals or unions known as “families” and amenable to the bishops.

Tradition credits Domini with the founding of an order of Tertiaries, male and female. An association of nobles and knights was formed by him, after the conversion of the Albigenses, to recover the alienated property of the Church and convents. They were accordingly styled Milites de Militia Christi. Their vow bound them to that work, to diligent attendance on public worship, etc., and to the wearing of a garb of ashy hue. Their wives were pledged to promote the objects of the order, and were not allowed to marry again after becoming widows. In the middle of the 13th century this association became an order of penitents, assumed the Dominican rule, and was placed under the Dominican general, receiving the title of “Brothers, and Sisters of the Penanceof St. Dominic.” Other orders, e.g. the Augustines, Minims, Servites, Trappists, etc., subsequently organized associations of Tertiaries. See Musson, Pragmat. Gesch. d. vornehmst. Monchsorden, etc. (Paris, 1751 sq.). — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Tertius[[@Headword:Tertius]]

             (Τέρτιος, Graecized from the Lat. tertius, third; Vulg. Tertius) was the amanuensis of Paul in writing the Epistle to the Romans (16, 22). A.D. 55. He was at Corinth, therefore, and Cenchrese, the port of Corinth, at the  time when the apostle wrote to the Church at Rome. It is noticeable that Tertius intercepts the message which Paul sends to the Roman Christians, and inserts a greeting of his own in the first person singular (ἀσπάζομαι ἐγὼ Τέρτιος). Both that circumstance and the frequency of the name among the Romans may indicate that Tertius was a Roman, and was known to those whom Paul salutes at the close of the letter. Secundus (Act 20:4) is another instance of the familiar usage of the Latin ordinals employed as proper names. The idle pedantry (indulged in by Burmann, Exercit. Theol. 2, 161 sq.) which would make him and Silas the same person because tertius and שְׁלַישַׁיmean the same in Latin and Hebrew, hardly deserves to be mentioned (see Wolf,. Curae Philologicae, 3, 295); and equally idle is Roloffs conjecture (De Trib. Nomin. Pauli [Jen. 1731]) and Storck's (Exercit. de Tertio, in the Fortges. niutzl. Samml. p. 23) that Tertius is but a pseudonym for Paul himself. In regard to the ancient practice of writing letters from dictation, see Becker's Gallus, p. 180. No credit is due to the writers who speak of him as bishop of conium (see Fabricius, Lux Evangelica, p. 117). — Smith. See also Briegleb, De Tertio (Jen. 1754); Eckhard, De Signo Pauli (Viteb. 1687); Hertzog, De Subscriptionibus Pauli (Lips. 1703). SEE PAUL.

## Tertre, Jacques (as a priest Jean Baptiste) du[[@Headword:Tertre, Jacques (as a priest Jean Baptiste) du]]

             a French missionary, was born at Calais in September, 1610. After traveling for some time, he returned to France, and entered the Dominican order at Paris in 1635. Five years after he was sent as a missionary to the American islands, returned to France in 1658, and died at Paris in 1687. He published Histoire Géneralé des Antilles Habitees par les Francois (1667- 71, 4 vols. 4to). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Tertullian(us), Quintus Septimius Florens[[@Headword:Tertullian(us), Quintus Septimius Florens]]

             is the most ancient of the Latin fathers whose works are now extant, and one of the most noteworthy personages belonging to the early Church. Our knowledge of his personal history is extremely limited. He was born at Carthage in A.D. 160, or near that date, his father being a Roman centurion in the service of the proconsul of Africa. His natural endowments were great, and they were supplemented by a comprehensive course of studies whose fruit appears in the wealth of historical, legal, philosophical, physical, and antiquarian elements contained in his writings. ‘He was destined for the civil service of the empire, and was accordingly trained in  Roman jurisprudence and the art of forensic eloquence (comp. Eusebius, H.E. 2, 2, where Tertullian is described as one of the most ‘highly esteemed Romans—not as Rufinus renders it, “one of the most distinguished writers of the Latin Church” inter nostros scriptores admodum clarus”). ‘His mode of argumentation and terminology everywhere reveal the legal turn of his mind, and his writings in many places throw light on disputed points of the Roman civil law. Tertullian was ‘converted to ‘Christianity when between thirty and forty years of age, and he immediately became its fearless champion against pagans, Jews, and heretics, especially Gnostics. He was the first religious teacher after the apostles who attained to a clear recognition of the mighty contrast between sin and grace, and who presented it in all it force to the mind of the Church. He was married (see his tract Ad Uxorem), but nevertheless entered the ranks of the clergy.' Jerome, says that he was first a presbyter of the Catholic Church, but his own writings do not determine whether he was a member of the spiritual order prior to his lapse into Montanism or not. It is certain, however, that he sojourned for a time in Rome (see De Cultu Fen. c. 7; Eusebius, H. E. 2, 2).

The transition to ‘Montanism' occurred a few years after Tertullian's conversion, and about A.D. 202. The act doubtless had its origin in his eccentric disposition and rigorous moral views, which predisposed him to regard that heresy with favor and to dislike the Roman Church. Jerome attributes it to personal motives excited by the jealousy and envy of the Roman clergy, and modern writers have ascribed it to disappointed ambition. We know, however, that the penitential discipline of the Church was administered at Rome with exceeding laxity, and that such indifference was an abomination in the eyes of Tertullian (Philosophumena [ed. Miller, Oxon. 1851], 9:290). Assuredly he did not regard Montanus as the Paraclete. He recognized in the latter simply an inspired organ of the Spirit. He, rather than Montanus, became the head of the Montanistic party in Africa, giving to their undefined views a theological character and a conceded influence over the life of the Church, and establishing it on foundations sufficiently firm to enable it to protract its being down to the 5th century. He died in old age, between A.D. 220 and 240. The assertion that he returned to the Catholic Church before he died is sometimes made, but cannot be substantiated, and the continued existence of the sect of Tertullianists would seem to contradict the assumption (see Neander, Tertull. [2d ed.], p. 462; August. De Haer. H. 86). It is a significant fact,  and an argument in behalf of the liberal interpretation of ancient Church history for which Protestantism contends, that it was precisely this great defender of Catholic orthodoxy against Gnostic heresy who was a schismatic to such a degree that he has never been included by the Church of Rome among the number of her saints, or among that of the patres as distinguished from the mere scriptores ecclesiastici.

As a writer, Tertullian was exceedingly fresh and vigorous, but also angular, abrupt, and impetuous. He possessed a lively imagination, a fund of wit and satire, as well as of acquired knowledge, and considerable depth and keenness; but he was deficient in point of logical clearness and self- possession, as well as of moderation, and of a thorough and harmonious culture. He was a speculative thinker, though the bitter opponent of philosophy. His aspiring mind sought in vain for adequate language in which to express itself, and struggled constantly to force the ideas of Christianity within the forms of the Latin tongue. His style thus became exceedingly forcible, nervous, vivid, concise, and pregnant. His adversaries were assailed without mercy and with all the weapons of truth and of art, and nearly always appear in his writings in ridiculous plight. He was the direct opposite to Origen, holding the extreme position of realism on the borders of materialism. He was, furthermore, the pioneer of orthodox anthropology and soteriology, the teacher of Cyprian, and forerunner of Augustine, in the latter of whom his spirit was reproduced in twofold measure, though without its eccentricities and angularities. It is possible, also, to trace resemblances between him and Luther with respect to native vigor of mind, profound earnestness, unregulated passion, polemical relentlessness, etc.; but the father lacked the childlike amiability of the Reformer, who was both a lion and a lamb.

Tertullian's writings are usually of brief extent, but they traverse nearly all fields of the religious life, and they constitute the most prolific source for the history of the Church and of doctrines in his time. No satisfactory classification of them can be executed, because but few of them afford the necessary data on which to base a scheme. The classification here presented rests upon the nature of the several writings as being either Catholic or Anti-Catholic, in which light the former are considerably more numerous than the latter.

(I.) Catholic Writings, or such as Defend Orthodox Christianity against Unbelievers and Heretics. — Most of these works date from the Montanist era of the author's life.

1. Apologies against Pagans and Jews. — First of all, the Apologeticus, addressed to the Roman magistracy, A.D. 198 (Mohler) or 204 (Kaye), and forming one of the best rebuttals of the charges raised by the heathen of the time against Christianity. Similar in character are the Ad Nationes Libri II. In De Testimonio Animae the author develops an argument for the unity of God and the reality of a future state from the innate perceptions and feelings of the soul. In the work Ad Scapulam he remonstrates with the African governor of that name, who was bitterly persecuting the Christians. The Adversus Judmeos Liber draws from the Old-Test. prophets the proof that the Messiah has appeared in the person of Jesus of Nazareth (comp. Hefele, Tertull. als Apologet, in the Tub. Quadrtalschriff, 1838, p. 30-82).

2. Doctrinal and Polemical Writings Aimed against Heretics. — Here belongs, first, the De Praescriptione Haereticorum, or rules to be observed by Christians in dealing with heretics. The argument involves, as its fundamental principle, the idea that heretics, as innovators, are under the necessity of proving their positions, while the Catholic Church is assured in its sole right to the allegiance of-Christendom by the uninterrupted current of apostolical tradition and an unimpaired succession, so that it need not enter into controversy with heretics. After the defection to Montanism, Tertullian wrote against various individual heretics, e.g. in the fifteenth year of Septimius Severus (A.D. 207 or 208), Adversus Marcionem Libri V, his most extensive and learned polemico-dogmatical work, and a principal source for the study of Gnosticism: — Adversus Hermogenem, a painter at Carthage, who had adopted the dualistic theory of the eternity of matter: — Adversus Valentinianos, a tragico-comical representation of the Valentinian Gnostics: and Scolpiace, an antidote against the scorpion- poison of such heretics.

Particular Gnostical doctrines are, assailed in De Baptismo, a defense of water-baptism against the Cainites and their peculiar theory of a mystical spiritual baptism: — De Anima, an inquiry into the nature, etc., of the soul: — De Carne Christi, a defense of the true humanity of Christ: — and De Resurrectione Carnis, a confutation of the heresy which denied the resurrection of the body. The tract Adversus Praxeam assails the Phrygian  Antimontanist Praxeas, and confutes his patri-passionist errors in the interest of the orthodox view of the Trinity.

3. Ethical and Ascetical Writings. — This class is composed of works of small size, but of considerable value to the regulation of practical life and the administration of ecclesiastical discipline. The list includes, De Oratione, an exposition of the Lord's Prayer and rules for prayer and fasting: — De Spectaculis, a warning against theatrical exhibitions: — De Idololatria: — Ad Uxorem Libri I., advice to his wife to govern her action in case she should outlive him: — De Paenitentia, a Catholic and Anti- montanistic presentation of the doctrine of repentance, dating from the earlier period of his Christian life: De Patientia, a commendation of the virtue of patience, accompanied with a lamentation because of his own lack of that virtue: — Ad Martyros, an exhortation addressed to the confessors who in the time of Septimius Severus awaited. in prison the martyr's death.

(II.) Anti-Catholic Writings, in which Montanistic Divergences from Catholic Customs are Expressly Defended. De Pudicitia, a retraction of the principles laid down in the earlier work De Paenitentia and violent advocacy of the rigoristic view on which deadly sins, like murder, adultery, and flight from persecution, should never be condoned: — De Monogamia, an emphatic denunciation of second marriages (comp. Hauber, in Stud. u. Krit. 1845, No. 3): — De Exhortatione Castitatis, in which three degrees of chastity are distinguished the first, absolute and lifelong restraint; the second, continence from the time of baptism; the third, refraining from contracting a second marriage: — De Virginibus Velandis, denouncing the habit of unmarried women appearing in public unveiled as being contrary to nature, the will of God, and the discipline of the Church generally: — De Habitu Muliebri et de Cultu Feminarum condemns the adorning of the person by females with ornaments, etc.: — De Jejuniis adversus Psycliicos (Catholics) is a defense of exaggerated fasting: — De Fuga denies the right of Christians to flee from persecution: — De Corona Militis commends a Christian soldier who refitted to wear the festive chaplet on a great occasion and suffered punishment for his act: — De Pallio is a witty explanation of his conduct in wearing the pallium instead of the ordinary Roman toga, difficult for us to understand because of its numerous allusions to obscure customs of the time.

The earliest edition of the collected works of Tertullian was that of Beatus Rhenanus (Basle, 1521). It was followed by those of Pamelius (Antw.  1579), Rigaltius (Paris, 1634; Venice, 1744), Semler (Halle, 177073, 6 vols.), Leopold in Gersdorf, Bibl. Patr. Eccl. Latin. Selecta (Lips. 1839- 41), parts 4-7, and Migne (Paris, 1844). The latest and best edition is that of Oehler, Q. Sept. Florent. Tertull. etc. (Lips. 1853, 3 vols.). Vol. 3 contains the dissertations on Tertullian of Pamelius, Allix, Nic. de Nourry, Mosheim, Nosselt, Semler, and Kaye. The life of Tertullian has been written by: Neander, Antignosticus, Geist des Tertul. u. Einl. in dessen Schrifen (Berl. 1825; 2d ed. 1849); Hesselberg, Tertullian's Lehre (Dorpat, 1848), pt. 1, “Life and Writings;” Kaye [Anglican bishop of Lincoln], Eccl. Hist. of the 2nd (and 3rd Centuries, Ilust. from the Writings of Tetullian (Lond. 1845; 3rd ed. 1848). See. Moiler, Pafulogie (ed. Reithmayr, Ratisbon, 1840), 1, 701-790S; Bhuringer, Kirche Christi (Zurich, 1842), I, 1, 270-374; Hase, Kirchengesch. (7th ed.), 84, p. 109; Kurtz, Handb. d. Kirchesgesch. (3rd ed.), 1, 307; Hauck, Tertullian's Leben und Werke (Erlang. 1877); Herzog, Real- Encyklop. s.v.; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. s.v.

## Tertullus[[@Headword:Tertullus]]

             (Τέρτυλλος, a diminutive from the Roman name Tertius, analogous to Lucullus from Lucius, Fabullus from Fabius, etc.), “a certain orator” (Act 24:1) who was retained by the high-priest and Sanhedrim to accuse the apostle Paul at Caesarea before the Roman procurator Antonius Felix. A.D. 55. SEE PAUL.

He evidently belonged to the class of professional orators, multitudes of whom were to be found not only in Rome, but in other parts of the empire, to which they had betaken themselves in the hope of finding occupation at the tribunals of the provincial magistrates. Both from his name, and from the great probability that the proceedings were conducted in Latin (see especially Milman, Bampton Lectures for 1827, p. 185, note), we may infer that Tertullus was of Roman, or at all events of Italian, origin. The Sanhedrim would naturally desire to secure his services on account of their own ignorance, both of the Latin language and of the ordinary procedure of a Roman law-court; for the Jews, as well as the other peoples subject to the Romans, in their accusations and processes before the Roman magistrates, were obliged to follow the forms of the Roman law, of which they knew little. The different provinces, and particularly the principal cities, consequently abounded with persons who, at the same time advocates and orators, were equally ready to plead in civil actions or .to harangue on public affairs. This they did, either in Greek or Latin, as the place or occasion required.  The exordium of his speech is designed to conciliate the good will of the procurator, and is' accordingly overcharged with flattery. There is a strange contrast between the opening clause— πολλῆς εἰρήνης τυγχάνοντες διὰ σοῦ—and the brief summary of the procurator's administration given by Tacitus (Hist. 5, 9): “Antonius Felix per omnem saevitiam ac libidinem,jus regium servili ingenio exercuit” (comp. Tacit. Ann. 12:54). But the commendations of Tertullus were not altogether unfounded, as Felix had really succeeded in putting down several seditious movements. SEE FELIX.

It is lot very easy to determine whether Luke has preserved the oration of Tertullus entire. On the one hand, we have the elaborate and artificial opening, which can hardly be other than an accurate report of that part of the speech; and, on the other hand, we have a narrative which is so very dry and concise that, if there were nothing more, it is not easy to see why the orator should have been called in at all. The difficulty is increased if, in accordance with the greatly preponderating weight of external authority, we omit the words in Act 24:6-8, καὶ κατὰ τὸν ἡμέτερον...ἔρχεσθαι ἐπὶ σέ. On the whole, it seems most natural to conclude that the historian, who was almost certainly an ear- witness, merely gives an abstract of the speech, giving, however, in full the most salient points, and those which had the most forcibly impressed themselves upon him, such as the exordium and the character ascribed to Paul (Act 24:5).

The doubtful reading in Act 24:6-8, to which reference has already been made, seems likely to remain an unsolved difficulty. Against the external evidence there would be nothing to urge in favor of the disputed passage, were it not that the statement which remains after its removal is not merely extremely brief (its brevity may be accounted for in the manner already suggested), but abrupt and awkward in point of construction. It may be added that it is easier to refer παῤ ου (Act 24:8) to the tribune Lysias than to Paul. For arguments founded on the words καὶ κατὰ...κρίνειν (yet. 6.) arguments which are dependent on the genuineness of the disputed words see Lardner, Credibility of the Gospel History, bk. 1, ch. 2;: Biscoe, On the Acts, 6:16.

We ought not to pass over without notice a strange etymology for the name Tertullus proposed by Calmet, in the place of which another has been suggested by his English editor (ed. 1830), who takes credit for having rejected “fanciful and improbable” etymologies, and substituted improvements of his own. Whether the suggestion is an improvement in  this case the reader will judge: “Tertullus, Τέρτυλλος, liar, impostor, from τερατολόγος, a teller of stories, a cheat. [Q.y. — Was his true appellation Ter-Tullius, ‘thrice Tully,' that is, extremely eloquent, varied by Jewish wit into Tertullus?]”

## Teschenmacher, Werner[[@Headword:Teschenmacher, Werner]]

             a minister of the Reformed Church in Juliers-Cleves-Berg, and a writer of some prominence in ecclesiastical and political literature, was born at Elberfeld in September, 1589. He was educated at Herborn and Heidelberg, and afterwards served the Church from 1610 or 1611 until 1633 in her pulpits, where he gained the reputation of an eloquent and able preacher of the Word. His services were much in request by the churches, Elberfeld, Cleves, and Emmerich, at that time the seat of the Brandenburg government, being his principal fields of labor. He was also greatly esteemed for his fine tact and skill in diplomacy, qualities that led to his selection for the conduct of many affairs in which the preservation and welfare of the Protestant churches of the duchy were at stake during that stormy period of religious wars. He was, however, of hasty temperament and exceedingly self-willed, so that he frequently came into conflict with other clergymen, and occasioned the government, which wished him well, considerable trouble in the effort to sustain him. His retirement from the pulpit was the result of a collision with Stover, a newly appointed colleague to his charge. He removed to Xanten and gave himself to literary labors until his death, on Good-Friday, April 2, 1638. Teschenmacher's writings are chiefly historical in character, and of brief extent. They are, Repetitio Brevis Cathol. et Orthodox. Religuae Singularis Dei Beneficio ante Sceculum a Papatu Reform. in Clivic, Julice, Montium. Ducatibus, etc. (Veselise, 1635, 43 pp.): — Annales Eccles. Reformationis AEcclesiarum Cliviae, etc. (1633): — Annales Cliviae, etc. (1638; 2d ed. by Dithmar, Frankf.-on-the-Oder, 1721), a political work which is still valuable. Works in MS.: Sermons: — A Commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians, in Latin: — Annalium Eccl. Epitome in qua precipue Gravissima Quaestio explicatur de Successione et Statu Eccl. Christ, etc. An autobiography in extenso, and a biography by P. Teschenmacher, are both lost. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Tesserae[[@Headword:Tesserae]]

             (tokens). The early Christians, when compelled to travel, were careful to secure a recognition by their fellow-Christians wherever they went. They were always provided with letters of recommendation; and when arriving in a strange town had only to inquire for the church, and to produce these letters, when they were received as brethren, and provided with every accommodation during their stay.

## Test[[@Headword:Test]]

             the imposition of an oath, or any other act by which the religious principles of any individual are put to proof. Tests and disabilities are distinct from penalties properly so called: it would be absurd to talk of punishing any one for being a woman, a minor, a person destitute of natural capacity, or opportunities of education, etc., on the ground that these are excluded as unfit for certain offices and privileges. Yet test laws do operate as a punishment; not because they are cause of pain, but inasmuch as they tend to produce that change of conduct which punishment is designed to produce.

## Test Acts[[@Headword:Test Acts]]

             also called CORPORATION ACTS, the popular name given to two English statutes imposing certain oaths on the holders of public offices. Acts 13 Charles II, c. 2, directs that all magistrates shall take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, as well as an oath renouncing the doctrine that it is lawful to take arms against the king; and provides that they must receive the communion according to the rites of the Church of England within a year before election. Acts 25 Charles II, c. 1., imposed the like conditions on the holders of all public offices, civil and military, and obliged them, in addition, to abjure all belief in the doctrine of transubstantiation. These acts which were practically evaded to a large extent by means of an act of indemnity passed every year, were repealed by 9 George IV, c. 17, in so far as regarded the administration of the sacrament, for which a declaration set forth in that act was substituted. A statute of William IV substituted a declaration for an oath in most government offices. A new form of oath has been substituted for the oaths of supremacy, allegiance, and abjuration by 21 and 22 Victoria, c. 48. — Chambers's Encyclop. s.v.; see Skeats, Hist. of Free Churches of England (see Index).

## Testament[[@Headword:Testament]]

             is the frequent rendering, in the New Test., of the Greek διαθήκη (literally a disposal), and both are used in two distinct senses (see Cremer, Lex. of N.T. Greek, p. 576 sq.).

1. The natural, and in classical Greek, as in ordinary English, the only, signification is a devisement by will or legacy (Plutarch, De A dulat. 28; Plato, Legg. 922; Demosth. 1136, 12), and in this sense the word occurs in Heb 9:16-17. SEE INHERITANCE.

2. But the more common signification in the New Test. is one that has come over from the Sept., which often uses διαθήκη. as a rendering of the Heb. בַּרַית, or covenant; and in this sense “testament” is the rendering in the A.V. of the Greek word in Heb 7:22; Heb 9:20; Rev 11:19; and especially in the phrase the new testament (Mat 26:28; Mar 14:24; Luk 22:20; 1Co 3:6; Heb 9:15 [i.e. “new covenant,” as ill Heb 8:8; Heb 12:24]), which has gained currency as the title of the Christian Scriptures as a whole. See New- Englander; May, 1857, Lond. (Wesleyan) Quar. Rev. July, 1857. SEE COVENANT.

## Testament, Old And New[[@Headword:Testament, Old And New]]

             When the books written by the apostles of Jesus Christ, or by apostolic men, came to be placed alongside the sacred books of the Hebrews, as comprising the entire scriptural canon, it became necessary to distinguish the two divisions by appropriate designations. A usage which already prevailed furnished the designations required. The gracious engagements into which God was pleased to enter with individuals and communities bear in the Old Test. the name of בְּרַית, or covenant (q.v.), and to this corresponds the Greek διαθήκη in the Sept. and New Test. Of these covenants two stand out from all the rest as of pre-eminent importance- God's covenant with Israel mediated by Moses, and that covenant which he promised to establish through the Messiah. ‘In the Jewish Scriptures this latter is designated בְּרַית חֲדָשָׁה, ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη (Jer 31:31), and this, adopted by our Lord (Mat 26:28), and familiarly used by the apostles (2Co 3:6; Heb 9:15, etc.), would naturally suggest the application of the phrase ἡ παλαιὰ διαθήκη to the former. Among the Jews such expressions as הִבְּרַית לוּחוֹת, πλάκες τῆς  διαθήκης, for the tablets on which the law was inscribed (Deu 9:9); סֵפֶי הִבְּרַית, βιβλίον τῆς διαθήκης (Exo 24:7; 2Ki 23:21; 1 Macc. 1, 5.7), βίβλος διαθήκης (Sir 24:23), were in common use. From these it is an easy transition to such an expression as that of the apostle (2Co 3:14), ἡ ἀνάγνωσις τῆς παλαιᾶς δίαθήκης, where the name appropriate to the thing contained is used of that which contains it. There thus arose in the Greek Church the usage of the phrases ἡ παλαιὰ διαθήκη and ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη as designations of the Jewish and Christian sacred writings respectively. In the Latin Church the usage prevailed of calling these Vetus et Novum Testamentum. Why the word Testamentum was selected to represent διαθήκη rather than Foedus or Pactum may be explained by the fact that the former rather than the latter is the proper equivalent of the Greek word. Hence in the old Italia made from the Sept. it is always used where the Greek has διαθήκη; and in the-Vulgate it is used similarly in those books that remain in the old version, whereas in those which Jerome translated from the Hebrew בויתis represented by feedus orpactum. That this usage was an early one in the Latin Church is evident from the words of Tertullian (Adv. Marc. 4:1): “Duos Deos dividens (Marcion) alterum alterius Instrumenti vel, quod magis usui est dicere, Testamenti.” The use of Testamentum, however, does not seem to have leeln universally accepted till a much later period. In the passage quoted Tertullian evidently gives the preference to the word instrumentum, a term used technically to denote a writing by which anything is to be attested or proved (comp. Quintil. Inst. Orat. 12:8; 12); and this is the word he generally uses (comp. Adv. Marc. 4:2; De Pudic. c. 12, etc.). Rufinus also has “novum et vetus instrumentum” (Expos. Symb. Apostol.); and Augustine uses both instrumenturn and testamentum in the same context (De Civ. Dei, 20:4). Lactantius, however, freely uses testamentum as a well accredited term when he wrote (Inst. Div. 4:20).

From the Vulgate and the usage of the Latin fathers, Testament has naturally passed into the title of the two divisions of the Scriptures in the English and most of the European versions. SEE NEW TESTAMENT; SEE OLD TESTAMENT.

## Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the[[@Headword:Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the]]

             is one of the seventy-two Apocryphal books of the Old Test. which were at one time in circulation, and, according to Epiphanius (Lib. de Mensuris et  Ponderibus, § 10), it formed one of the twenty-two canonical books sent by the Jews to Ptolemy, king of Egypt. SEE APOCRYPHA.

I. Author of the Work and his Object. — There can be no dispute that the writer's main object and purpose was the conversion of the Jewish nation to the Christian faith. To gain his object his appeal is based not on the authority of Moses or the law of Sinai, but is referred back to the earlier period of the patriarchs, where, underlying the simple covenant between God and man, were latent the first germs of Christianity. From this it has been inferred that the writer-himself was a Jew. Grabe, the first who treated at length of the Testaments, thought that the writing in question was the work of a Jew shortly before the Christian era; and to account for the presence of passages which no Jew could possibly have written, he had recourse to the theory of interpolation. This opinion, however, has found but little favor, and critics have generally agreed to the conclusions of Nitzsch, who definitely attributed the work to a Judaeo-Christian writer, an opinion adopted now even by Ritschl, who in 1850 maintained that author was a Christian of Pauline tendencies. Without entering upon the different views advanced on this point, we pass on to the

II. Time of Composition. — That it was not composed before A.D. 70 we may infer from the author's allusion to the destruction of Jerusalem, which assigns to the Testaments a date subsequent to this event. On the other hand, it is already quoted by Tertullian (Adv. Marc. 5, 1; Scorp. c. 13) and Origen (Horn. in Joshua 15 :c. 6); and thus we may safely infer, without quoting the different opinions, that the most probable date for its composition is 80-110 or 120 of our era.

III. Language in which the Work was Written. — The Testaments, as we have it now, was no doubt written in the Hellenistic Greek, in which we now possess the work. Grabe maintained that it was originally written in Hebrew and was translated into Greek with the canonical books of the Old Test. But against this view it has been argued that already the title of the book, αἱδιαθῆκαι τῶν ιβ Πατριαρχῶν, indicates its Greek original, because the Hebrew בַּרְבּוֹתor עֵדוֹתwould have been presented by the Greek εύλογίαι, ἐντολαί, or μαρτύρια. We also find a number of instances of paronomasia, hardly possible on the hypothesis of a Hebrew original. Such are ἀθετεῖν...νουθετεῖν, ἀφαίρεσις ..ἀναίρεσις (Test. Judah, note 23), λιμὸς...λοιμός (ibid.); ἐν τάξει...ἄτακτον (Napht. note  2), τάξις... ἀταξία (ibid. 3). We find various expressions pertaining to the Greek philosophy, as διάθεσις, αἴσθησις, φύσις τέλος, διαβούλιον, συμβουλεῦειν τινί. Taking all in all, we are led to the supposition that it was originally written in Greek (see Nitzsch, De Test. XII Patr. [Wittemb. 1810], p. 16; Vorstman, Disquis. de Testam. XII Patriarch. p. 8 sq.).

IV. Contents of the Testaments: — The work professes to be, as its name implies, the utterances of the dying patriarchs, the sons of Jacob, to their children. In these are given, more or less briefly, the narrative of their lives, with some particulars not to be found in the scriptural account, and there are built thereon various moral precepts for the guidance of their descendants, who may thereby be preserved from the sires into which their fathers fell. “Still,” says Vorstman, “all the patriarchs are convinced that their children will deal wickedly, falling away from God, defiling themselves with the sins of every nation. They therefore prophesy what is to come; they foretell the troubles impending on: their children. But they venture to raise more joyous strains than these. God himself is to put an end to their troubles; he will visit his people; he will break the power of sin. Prophecies of a Messiah are brought forward by the patriarchs. With such hopes they die. Their discourses, therefore, may justly be called Testaments when at the point of death they speak to their children their last words. They leave to them nothing save injunctions and prophecies. The words of Benljamin (c. 10) will apply equally to all: ταῦτα γὰρ ἀντὶ πάσης κληρονομίας ὑμᾶς διδάσκω.”

V. Messianic Ideas of the Book. — The Messianic views are strongly. tinged by national feeling. The Messiah, combining in himself the functions of high-priest and of king, is to arise from the tribe of Levi as well as from the tribe of Judah. Still there is a tendency throughout which aims at teaching that' his high-priestly office is greater than his kingly one. The Messianic passages having reference to the promised Messiah of Israel may be divided into such as speak of him as divine-as God coming into the world in the likeness of man-and into such as refer to him as man alone. Of the latter we read in Test. Levi, c. 16. “And the man (ἄνδρα) who reneweth the law by the power of the Most High shall ye call a deceiver; and at last as ye suppose, ye will slay him, not knowing his resurrection (ἀνάστημα), wickedly taking the innocent blood upon your own heads. And because of him shall your holy places be desolate.” . . . Judah (c. 24) says, “And after these things a star shall arise to you out of Jacob in peace,  and a man (ἄνθρωπος) shall rise up of my seed, as a sun of righteousness, walking with the sons of men in meekness and righteousness, and no sin ‘shall be found in him.” Naphtali says (c. 4), “Until the compassion (σπλάγχνον) of the Lord shall come, a man (ἄνθρωπος) working righteousness and showing mercy to all that are afar off and to those that are near.”

Such are the only passages which dwell merely on the human nature of the Messiah. Let us look at those which refer to his divine nature. Thus the patriarch Dan (c. 6) bids his children “draw near to God and to the angel that intercedeth for you (τῷ Θεῷ καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῷ παραιτουμένῳ ὑμᾶς). He is called “the mediator between God and men” (ουτός ἐστι μεσίτης Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων). “His name shall be in every place in Israel, and among the Gentiles, Saviour” (τὸ δὲ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἔσται ἐν παντὶτόπῳ Ι᾿σραὴλ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι Σωτρή). Levi (c. 4) speaks of the Messiah as υἱὸς Κυρίου. Simeon (c. 6) speaks of “the Lord, the ῥGreat God of Israel, who shall appear upon the earth as man, and who shall save all the Gentiles and the race of Israel.” Judah (c. 22) tells his children, “Among the Gentiles shall my kingdom be consummated, until the salvation shall have come to Israel; until the appearing of the God of righteousness to give quietness in peace to Jacob and all nations.” Asher (c. 7) tells his children that they should be dispersed throughout the world until “the Most High should visit the earth, himself coming as a man (ἄνθρωπος), eating and drinking with men.... He shall save Israel and all the Gentiles; God speaking in the person of man” (Θεὸς εἰς ἄνδρα ὑποκρινόμενος). Joseph (c. 19) says to his children, “And I saw that from Judah was born a virgin wearing a linen garment, and from her went forth a lamb without spot” (ἀμνὸς ἄμωμος). That reference is here made to the sinlessness of the Messiah there can be no doubt. Hagenbach (in his Dogmengeschichte, p. 143, ed. 3) refers to Hippolytus as furnishing the first instance of the application of the word “spotless” to our Lord, but we have here an earlier example. Thus Benjamin (c. 3) speaks of “the Lamb of God and the Savior of the world,” that “spotless he shall be delivered up for the wicked, and sinless shall he die for the ungodly.” Levi tells his children that they shall slay the Messiah and “wickedly take the innocent (ἀθῷος) blood upon their heads.” Judah (c. 24) says, “No sin shall be found in him.”

As to the office of the Messiah, he is continually spoken of both as king and high-priest (Sim. c. 7; Gad, c. 8; Dan, c. 5; Jos. c. 19). As king  springing from the tribe of Judah (Sim. c. 7), he is to wage war and to triumph over Beliar, the personification of the kingdom of evil (Levi, c. 18; Dan, c. 5, 6; Benj. c. 3). As high-priest he was to have no successor (Levi, c. 18), i.e. with him the offering of sacrifices was to come to an enj. The Messiah is a Savior; Levi is bidden to “proclaim concerning him who shall redeem Israel” (c. 2; Dan, c. 5; Jos. c. 19; Benj. c. 3); and another patriarch adds, “He that believes in him shall reign in truth in the “heavens” (Dan, c. 5). The Messiah was to suffer: “Thy sons shall lay hands upon him to crucify him” (Levi, c. 4); “and he shall enter into the front of the Temple (τὸν πρῶτον ναόν), and there shall the Lord be treated with outrage and he shall be lifted up upon a tree (Benj. c. 9; see also Levi, c. 10,14,16). The rending of the Temple vail is alluded to as the act in which the Spirit of God went over to the Gentiles: “‘The vail of the Temple shall be rent,” says Benjamin (c. 9), “and the Spirit of God shall be removed unto the Gentiles as fire poured forth.” Levi (c. 10) says, “The vail of the Temple shall be rent, that it shall not cover your shame.” As to the Messiah's ascension and triumphant reception into heaven, see Levi, c. 18; Benj. c. 9. That he was to return to future judgment, comp. Levi, c. 16.

VI. Dogmatical and Ethical Ideas. — The salvation of the Messiah is to be obtained by faith as the means of justification with God: The kingdom of evil is to come to an end “on the day on which Israel shall believe” (Dan, c. 6). “As many as have believed in him on earth shall rejoice with him when all shall rise again, some to glory and some to shame” (Benj. c. 10). Allusion is made to the importance of baptism for this end. Thus Levi (c. 16) tells his children the punishment that shall befall them for their treatment of the Messiah: “Ye shall be a curse among the Gentiles and shall be scattered abroad until he shall again visit you and in pity shall take you to himself ἐν πίστει καὶ ὕδατι.” The same patriarch (c. 18) again says of the Messiah, “In water shall he himself give the glory of the Lord of his sons in truth forever.” Both the righteous and the wicked shall rise again; the former to rejoice with the Messiah, the latter to weep and lament and to be destroyed forever (comp. Judah, c. 25; Sim. c. 6; Levi, c. 18; Zeb. c. 10). Benjamin declares (c. 10), ‘“Then shall ye behold Enoch, Noah, Shem, and Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, arising on the right hand in joy; then shall we also arise, each one in our tribe, and worship the king of heaven.... And as many as believed on him upon earth shall rejoice with him when all shall arise, some to glory and some to contempt. And the Lord shall judge Israel first, even for the wrong they did to him; for when he came as a  deliverer, God in the flesh, they believed him not. And then shall he judge all the nations, as many as believed him not when he appeared upon earth.”

Man, who has been formed in the image of God (Napht. c. 2), is composed of two parts, body and spirit, conformable to each other. To man seven spirits were given at his creation by God, in themselves not necessarily either good or bad, referring, as they do, mainly to external sensations. These spirits were ζωή (i.e. the נפש, the mere animal life), ὅρασις, ἀκοή, ὄσφρησις, λαλιά, γεῦσις, and σπορά, all of which, as ζωή, refer exclusively to the mere animal life of man, as does also a supplementary eighth spirit, that of ὕπνος. Superadded to these are seven other spirits, given to man by Beliar, representing seven principal evil tendencies (Reub. c. 2, 3). The latter, which are spoken of generally as τὰ πνεύματα τῆς πληάνης, are wholly bad, and represent different evil tendencies of humanity. They are the spirits of πορνεία, ἀπληστία, μάχη, ἀρεσκεία or μαγγανεία, ὑπερηφανία, ψεῦδος, and ἀδικία. Within man war is waged by his two selves. Judah speaks of the two spirits that “attend (σχολάζουσι) upon man, the spirit of truth and the spirit of error; and in the midst is the spirit of the understanding of the mind,” which may turn to either side it will (c. 20). The spirit of truth seems to be almost equivalent to conscience, for it is added, “The spirit of truth testifieth all things, and accuseth all.” Reuben, too, speaks, of his conscience (συνείδησις) troubling him all his life long for his crime of incest. Man has a free will to choose between the two ways that God has given to him. He can choose either “the darkness or the light, either the law of the Lord or the works of Beliar” (Levi, c. 19); and, though man is weak and ever prone to error, yet if he'persevere in his attempts to do right, “every spirit of Beliar will fly” (Sim. c. 2, 5; Judah, c. 18,19, 21; Issach. c. 7; Zeb. c. 9; Gad, c. 4) from him.

Sin, therefore, being especially regarded as proceeding from τὰ πνεύματα τῆς πλάνης, is constantly spoken of as ἄγνοια, τύφλωσις, and the like, for which pardon is readily granted by God. Ignorance, however, though affording a plea for pardon, cannot of itself be accounted an excuse for the sin; the appeal is still to be made to the mercy of God. But as from sins ignorantly committed man passes on to those done against light and knowledge, so is there a deeper cast of sins than ἄγνοια. Thus it was ἄγνοια on the part of Zebulon (c. 1; comp. Dan, c. l; Gad, c. 2) not to reveal to his father his brethren's crime of selling Joseph; that crime,  however, was ἀνομία on their part. And this is alike true for a sin actually committed and for one as yet in embryo in the thoughts of the heart; ‘for Simeon (c. 2), whose hatred for Joseph had led him to contemplate the sin of murder, is accounted in God's sight guilty of that crime, and therefore punished. We see here the doctrine of the apostle endorsed: “He that hateth his brother is a murderer.”

The doctrine of God's retributive justice is fully believed in. Sin brings its own punishment in this world (comp. Reub. c. 1; Sim. c. 2; Gad, c. 5), therefore man should follow God's laws (comp. Reub. c. 4; Sim. c. 4; Levi, c. 13' Benj. c. 3; Zeb. c. 8). The fear of God appears as the chief motive for the fulfillment: of righteousness (comp. Reub. c. 4, πορεύεσθε ἐν ἁπλότητι καρδαίς ἐν φόβῳ Κυρίου; Simn. c. 3, ἡ λύσις τοῦ φθόνου διὰ φόβου Κυρίου γινεται; Gad, c. 5, ὁ φόβος τοῦ θεοῦ νικᾶ'/ τὸ μῖσος; Benj. c. 3, γὰρ φοβούμενος τὸν θεόν, καὶ ὰγαπῶν τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ, ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀερίπυ πνεύματος τοῦ Βελιὰρ οὐ δύναται πληγῆναι; Jos. c. 11; Levi, c. 13). It is also, worthy of remark that most of the patriarchs dwell more especially on some one particular form of vice to be shunned, ordinarily that vice wherein each severally had succumbed to temptation. Thus the system of ethics which prevails throughout, the Testaments presents a very high and noble code of morals to us, not unworthy of a teacher who sought to win over his countrymen to the Christian faith.

VII. Sources. — Having given, in the main, an outline of the most important points contained in the Testaments, the question as to the sources for the work cannot be superfluous. From the work itself we infer that the book of Enoch must have been known to the author. Thus seven Testaments out of twelve allude to it as γραφὴ Ε᾿νώχ, βίβλος (βιβλίον, βιβλαί, λόγοι)Ε᾿νώχ τοῦ δικαίου, γραφὴ νόμου Ε᾿νώχ (see Sim. c. 5; Levi, c. 9,10,14 16; Napht. c. 4; Judah, c. 18; Dan, c. 5; Benj. c. 9), and other similar expressions. Zebulon refers to the γραφὴ πατέρων (c. 9), and Levi (c. 5) and Asher (c. 7) refer to αἱ πλακὲς τῶν οὐρανῶν, “heavenly tablets.” As to the latter, whether they were a book containing what is foreknown and foreordained in heaven as to the course of the future, and were appealed to when some oracular declaration of weighty import was needed, or whether the y were something else, we are at a loss to state, although they are often quoted in the book of Enoch, and Jubilees. Besides the works mentioned, there can be no doubt that the author of the Testaments knew the book of Jubilees, since the amount of coincidence  between the two writings is very great (comp. e.g. Reub. c. 3 with Jubilees, c. 33; Levi, c. 2,4, 5,8 with Jubilees, c. 32; Levi, c. 9 with c. 31; c. 11 with c. 34; Judah, c. 3-7 with c. 34,38; c. 9 with c. 37; c. 10 with c. 41; c. 19 with c. 41; Reub. c. 7, Sim. c. 8, Levi, c. 19, Judah, c. 26, Zeb. c. 10, Dan, c. 7, Napht. c. 9, Gad, c. 8, Asher, c. 8, Betj. c. 12 with Jubilees, c. 46, etc.). He also made use of the Targums, Josephus, the Midrashim, and the like. Of greater importance is it to know that the author also made use of the New Test., and for the latter fact we refer to the elaborate article of Warfield, The Apologetical Value of the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs, in the (N. Y.) Presbyterian Review, Jan. 1880, p. 57 sq.

VIII. History of the Work. — Habent sua fata libelli.” It is remarkable that this work, which was known to Tertullian (Adv. Marcionem, 5, 1; Scorpiace, c. 13) and Origen (Horn. in Josuam 15 c. 6), became first known to the world at large through the Latin version of Robert Grosseteste, or Greathead, bishop of Lincoln, of the 13th century. This version soon spread over Europe, and, in the course of time, translations into a large number of languages were made from it into English, French, German, Dutch, Flemish, Danish, Bohemian, and Armenian. More than four centuries had passed since Grosseteste's Latin version, when at last the Greek text was for the first time published by Grabe, in his Spicilegium Patrum et Haereticorum (Oxford, 1698), from a MS. in the university library of Cambridge, collated with one at Oxford. In 1713 Fabricitls published the Greek text in his Codex Pseudepigraphus V.T. (Hamburg), adding but slightly to the criticism of the text. In 1714 Grabe published a second edition, relating the true text in several passages, but in many places altering Grosseteste's Latin version, which witnessed to the true reading, to suit Grabe's incorrect text. Fabricius also published a second edition in 1722, on the whole less accurate than his first. Afterwards the text and notes as given in Grabe's second edition were reprinted, with but few additions, by Galland, in his Bibliotheca Veterum Patruni (Venice, 1765), i, 193 sq. In 1869 Robert Sinker published an accurate transcript of the Cambridge MS., carefully collated with the Oxford, to which he added, in 1879, a collation made from two other MSS., viz. a Roman MS. in the Vatican Library (Cod. Grsec. 731), and a Patmos MS. in the library of the Monastery of St. John the Evangelist (Cod. 411).

IX. Versions. — As already indicated, there existed versions in different languages before the Greek text was published. The editions of the Latin  version are numerous. That which is presumably the edilio princeps bears neither date, printer's name, nor place of printing, The title is Testamenti duodecim I Patriarcharul Filiorutm Jacob. I e Greco in Latini versa Roberato Linconiensi I Episcopo Interprete. From this was taken the edition printed at Hageniau in 1532 by John Secerius, at the instance of Menrad Molther. The work of Julianus Pomerius Contra Judaeos is published in the same volume. Besides the separate editions, the Testaments is published in the Bibliotheca Patrum.

In English there exist at least three independent translations one from the Latin, the others from the Greek. The translation from the Latin first appeared in 1577, and was often reprinted, especially in the 17th century. The first edition is of great rarity, and there exists no copy of it even in the British Museum. The second edition, of 1581, of which there is a copy in the British Museum, has the following title-page:

“The Testamentes of the Twelue Patriarches, the Sonnes of Jacob: translated out of Greeke into Latine by Robert Grosthed, sometime Bishop of Lincolne, and out of hys copy into French and Dutch by others: Now englished by A.G. To the credit whereof an auncient Greeke copye written in parchment, is kept in the Vninersity Library of Cambridge. At London Printed by John Daye, dwelling ouer Aldersgate. 1581. Cum priulegio Regiae Maiestatis.”

There are about forty other English editions printed after the year 1581. A translation was made directly from the Greek (of Grabe and Fabricius) by Whiston in his Collection of Authentic Records belonging to the Old and New Testament (Lond. 1727), i, 294 sq. In Clark's Ante-Nicene Christian Library (vol. 22), Mr. Sinker published a translation from his edition of the Greek text. It may be mentioned here that the Muggletonians (q.v.) in England receive the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs as inspired, together with the Old and New Tests., the book of Enoch, and the works of Reeve and Muggleton. From the English a Welsh version was published at Carnarvon (1822), Testament y deuddeg Patriarch, sef Meibion Jacob....

There are at least two translations in French, both taken from the Latin. One was published in 1548 at Paris, another in 1713. The latter was also republished in Migne's Encyklopèdie Theologique, vol. 23 (Dict. des Apocryphes, vol. 1), coll. 854 sq.  In Germany the testaments have evidently been very popular, as may be inferred from the number of editions that have appeared. The oldest German translation is the one published in 1559 at Basel: Das Testament der zwolf Patriarchen der Sunen Jacobs; the latest the one published at Tübingen in 1857 Aechte apocryphische Bucher der Heiligen Schrift… (2) Das T.d. zwolf Patriarchen.

The Dutch and Flemish editions are also very numerous. There are two editions without any date, but which must have appeared before 1544, since an edition was published in that same year. Altogether there exist about fourteen editions in Dutch and Flemish, the last published in 1679.

The Testaments was translated into Danish by Hans Mogensson, and four editions of his translation, were published, the first in 1580, the last in 1701.

In the Icelandic there exist some MS. translations; but whether one or the other has ever been printed we are at a loss to state.

The Bohemian version can claim to be the first of the translations from the Latin, having been made long before the invention of printing. It is referred to by Thomas Stitny about the year 1376. There exists a MS. at Breslau, in the library of the Dominicans at St. Adalbert, dated 1491, and another in the university library at Prague (17, B. 15, No. 6) dated 1465. The oldest printed translation bears the date 1545. Only two copies, each of a different edition, are extant-one in the library of the National Museum at Prague, and the other in the university library there.

An Armenian version exists in MS., dated 837, i.e. A.D. 1388, in the library of the Mechitarists at Vienna, which appears not to have been printed.

X. Literature. — Besides Grabe, see Vorstman, Disquisitio de Testamentorum XII Patriarchaurm Origine et Pretio (Rotterdam, 1857)'; Nitzsch, Commentatio Critica de Testamentis XII Patriarcharum, Libro V. T. Pseudepigrapho (Wittenb. 1810); Ritschl, Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche (Bonn, 1850); Kayser, in Reuss und Cunitz's Beitrdgge zu den theol. Wissenschaften (Jena, 1851), p. 107-140; Wieseler, Die 70 Wochen und die 63 Jahrwochen des Propheten Daniel (Gott. 1839); Langen, Das Judenthum in Paldstina zur Zeit Christi (Freiburg, 1866), p. 140 sq.; Geiger, Jüdische Zeitschrift jür Wissenschajt  und Leben (Bresl. 1869), p. 116 sq.; Warfield, The Apologetical Value of the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs, in the (N. Y.) Presbyterian Review, Jan. 1880, p. 57 sq.; but, above all, Sinker, Testamenta XII Patriarcharum (Camb. and Lond. 1869); and his Appendix (ibid. 1879). (B. P.)

## Testes Synodales[[@Headword:Testes Synodales]]

             persons chosen to help the church-wardens in fulfilling their duties, and in promoting order, quiet, and decorum at visitations, synods, and clerical meetings. They were also called SIDESMEN, synodsmen, or QUESTMEN SEE QUESTMEN (q.v.).

## Testimonial[[@Headword:Testimonial]]

             Every candidate for admission to holy orders in the Church of England is required to present to the bishop a testimonial of good conduct from his college, or from three beneficed clergymen. The usual form of this document is as follows: “Whereas our well-beloved in Christ, A. B., hath declared to us his intention of offering himself a candidate for the sacred office of [a deacon], and for that end hath requested of us letters testimonial of his learning and good behavior, we, therefore, whose names are hereunto subscribed, do testify that the said A. B., having been previously known to us for the space of [three] years last past, hath, during that time, lived piously, soberly, and honestly, and diligently applied himself to his studies: nor hath he at any time, so far as we know and believe, held, written, or taught anything contrary to the doctrine or discipline of the united Church of England and Ireland; and, moreover, we believe him in our consciences to be a person worthy to be admitted to the sacred order of Deacons. In witness whereof,” etc.

A similar testimonial is required from candidates by the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. As this is one of the safeguards which ecclesiastical rule has established to preserve the purity of its ministers, it would be a fatal error to allow it to become a mere matter of form. No conscientious man can safely sign such a document unless fully assured of-the facts to which he bears such solemn testimony.

## Testimony of Disownment[[@Headword:Testimony of Disownment]]

             an official document issued by the monthly meeting of the Society of Friends against an obdurate and impenitent member. The testimony of disownment is a paper reciting the-offence, and sometimes the steps which  have led to it; next, the means unavailingly used to reclaim the offender; after that a clause disowning him, to which is usually added an expression of desire for his repentance and for his restoration to membership. In case the expelled member repents, he is bound to send in a written acknowledgment of his offense, his penitence, and his desire for restoration to the membership of the society.

## Teta[[@Headword:Teta]]

             (Τητά v.r. Α᾿ττητά; Vulg. Topa), a corrupt Graecized form (1 Esdr. 5; 28) of the name HATITA SEE HATITA (q.v.) of the Heb. lists of Temple doorkeepers (Ezra 2, 42; Neh 7:45).

## Tetragrammaton[[@Headword:Tetragrammaton]]

             (τέτταρα, four, and γράμμα, letter), a term to designate the sacred name of the Deity, Jehovah, in four letters, יהוה. By the possession of this name the early Jewish opponents of Christianity declared that the miracles of Christ were performed. Tile mystical word Om of the Buddhists of India and Thibet is supposed to possess similar virtues to the present day.

## Tetrapla[[@Headword:Tetrapla]]

             a Greek term used to designate a certain edition of the Holy Scriptures, being four independent and separate Greek versions, ranged side by side, viz. those of Aquila, Symmachus, the Seventy-two, and Theodotion.

## Tetrapolitana Confessio[[@Headword:Tetrapolitana Confessio]]

             (also SUEVIA. and ARGENTINENSIS) is the title by which the confession of faith submitted to the Diet of Augsburg in 1530 by the four cities of Strasburg, Constance, Memmingen, and Lindau is known.

The endeavor to construct a confession which should fairly represent the views of all the sections of the evangelical party failed through the stubborn refusal of the Saxons to unite in any way with the Zwinglians of the cities, and the Strasburg deputies consequently invited Bucer and Capito to prepare a separate symbol for the use of the latter. Capito had previously prepared a sketch of the Reformed faith by order of the Council of Strasburg, and this paper became the basis of the new confession. The latter was completed by July 11, 1530, and, after having been submitted to the confederated cities and received their signatures (with the single  exception of Ulm), was placed in the hands of the imperial vice-chancellor, Merkel, for transmission to the emperor.

The confession contains twenty-three articles, and is characterized by great clearness and moderation of statement, completeness, and thoroughness of elaboration. Its first article asserts the chief formal principle of Protestantism, wholly wanting in the Augustana, that the Bible is the only source and rule of doctrine. It teaches that the disciples of Christ partake of his body and blood in the sacrament in a spiritual sense only. The form of expression, however, is everywhere conformed to that of the Augustana—a feature which reveals the hand of Bucer (q.v.), who was already at work upon plans for the promotion of union among Protestants.

A reply to this confession, written by Eck, Faber, and Cochlseus, was returned Oct. 24. This Confutation was filled with perversions and insults, and was read before deputies and theologians of the four cities. A copy of this reply was denied them, but they succeeded in obtaining one, which was appended to the first edition of the Tetrapolitana, published in German by Bucer at Strasburg in 1531. A Latin edition followed a month later, in September. Bucer was compelled to publish the confession in order to put an end to false representations of its character; but his own persistent efforts in behalf of union between the Protestant churches contributed to subordinate it to the Saxon confession. In 1532 the Strasburgers consented to subscribe the Augustana, though with the express understanding that the Tetrapolitana should be regarded as their proper symbol. Finally, when Bucer was dead and Martyr (q.v.) was gone from Strasburg, a rigid Lutheranism took possession of the city. An attempted reprint of the first edition of the Tetrapolitana by Sturm in 1580 was prevented by a decree of the council. The last edition, which includes the Confutation and Apology, appeared, so far as is known, at Zweibrucken in 1604.

For the literature and editions, see Niemeyer, Collectio Confession (Lips. 1840), p. 83 sq.; comp. Baum, Capito und Bucer (Elberfeld, 1860), p. 486 sq., 595; Planck, Gesch. d. prot. Lehrbegriff (2d ed. Leips. 1796). III, 1, 68 sq. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Tetrarch[[@Headword:Tetrarch]]

             (τετράρχης, from τέτταρα, four, and ἀρχή, government), properly denotes the governor of a province or district which was regarded as the fourth part of a larger province or kingdom, while the district itself was  called a tetrarchy (τετραρχία or τετραδαρχία). The earliest use of the word which seems to have been discovered is in connection with the division of Thessaly as originally constituted (Eurip. Alcest. 1154; Strabo, 9:5) and as reconstructed in the time of Philip of Macedon (Demosth. Phil. 3, 26), and of Galatia before its conquest by the Romans, B.C. 189. The first of these countries was then divided into four parts, each of which was named a tetrarchy, and its ruler a tetrarch, subordinate to the tagus (Thirlwall, Hist. of Greece, 6:13 sq.). The second was divided into three sections, each of which was again subdivided into four smaller ones, to which and to their governors the same terms were applied (Fischeri Prolusiones, p. 428, note); and these were ultimately fused into one ἐπαρχία under Deiotarus, cir. B.C. 54 (Strabo, 566; Plutarch, De V. M. [ed. Wytt], vol. 2). In the later days of the Roman republic, and during the empire, the etymological meaning was almost entirely lost sight of, and it was applied, like “ethnarch” and “phlylarch,” to the petty tributaries,” the creatures of a proconsul's breath, and the puppets of his caprice” (Merivale, Hist. of the Rom. 4:167), whose importance did not warrant their receiving the title of “king” (see Sallust, Cath. 20:7; Cicero, Milo, 28:76; Vatin. 12:29; Horace, Sat. 1, 3, 12; Veil. Pat. 2, 51; Tacitus, Ann. 15:25). It is in this secondary sense that in all probability the word is used in the New Test. of the tetrarchs of Syria, the heirs and successors of Herod the Great. Niebuhr (Hist. of Rome, 2, 135) compares them to the zemindars of Bengal after their recognition by lord Cornwallis (179L-93) as proprietors of the soil, and enjoying some amount of sovereign rights within the limits of their zemiudary. The title of tetrarch was certainly given by Antony to Herod the Great in the early part of his career (B.C. 41) and his brother Phasael (Josephus, Ant. 14:13, 1), without reference to territorial divisions; and though it appears that the tetrarchs Antipas and Philip did actually receive a fourth part of their father's dominions, while Archelaus as “ethnarch” inherited half (ibid. 17:11, 4; War, 2, 6, 3), this correspondence of the name and the share may be considered accidental, or, at furthest, the exact use of the term in the New Test. must be confined to Antipas and Philip.

In the New Test. we meet with the designation, either actually or in the form of its derivative τετραρχεῖν, applied to three persons:

1. Herod Antipas (Mat 14:1; Luke 3, 1, 19; Luke 9, 7; Act 13:1), who is commonly distinguished as “Herod the tetrarch,” although the title of “king” is also assigned to him both by Matthew (Mat 14:9) and  by Mark (Mar 6:14; Mar 6:22 sq.). Luke, as might be expected, invariably adheres to the formal title which would be recognized by Gentile readers. This Herod is described by the last-named evangelist (3, 1) as “tetrarch of Galilee;” but his dominions, which were bequeathed to him by his father, Herod the Great, embraced the district of Peraea beyond the Jordan (Josephus, Ant. 17:8, 1): this bequest was confirmed by Augustus (War, 2, 6, 3). After the disgrace and banishment of Antipas, his tetrarchy was added by Caligula to the kingdom of Herod Agrippa I (Ant. 18:7, 2). SEE HEROD ANTIPAS.

2. Herod Philip (the son of Herod the Great and Cleopatra, not the husband of Herodias), who is said by Luke (Luk 3:1) to have been “tetrarch of Itursea and of the region of Trachonitis.” Josephus tells us that his father bequeathed to him Gaulonitis, Trachonitis, and Paneas (Ant. 17:8, 1), and that his father's bequest Nas confirmed by Augustus, who assigned to him Gaulonitis, Trachonitis, and Auranitis, with certain parts about Jamnia belonging to the “house of Zenodorus” (War, 1, 6, 3). Accordingly, the territories of Philip extended eastward from the Jordan to the wilderness, and from he borders of Persea northward to Lebanon and the neighborhood of Damascus. After the death of Philip his tetrarchy was added to the province of Syria by Tioerius (Ant. 18:4, 6), and subsequently conferred by Caligula on Herod Agrippa. I, with the title of king (ibid. 18:6, 10). SEE HEROD AGRIPPA I; SEE HEROD PHILIP I.

3. Lysanias, who is said (Luk 3:1) to have been tetrarch of Abilene, a small district surrounding the town of Abila, in the fertile valley of the Barada or Chrysorrhoas, between Damascus and the mountain range of Antilibanus. SEE ABILENE. There is some difficulty in fixing the limits of this tetrarchy, and in identifying the person of the tetrarch. SEE LYSANIAS. We learn, however, from Josephus (Ant. 18:6, 10; 19:5, 1) that a Lysanias had been tetrarch of Abila before the time of Caligula, who added this tetrarchy to the dominions of Hero Agrippa I — an addition which was confirmed by the emperor Claudius.

## Tetrastyle[[@Headword:Tetrastyle]]

             (τετράστυλον), a name given to the periphery of the area or court between the porch and the church building proper in ancient times. This court was without any covering except that each side had porticos or  cloisters, built upon columns. In the porch or in the porticos stood the first class of penitents to beg the prayers of the faithful as they went into the church. Tetzel, JOHANN, the notorious Dominican monk whose shameless traffic in indulgences impelled Luther to take the first step towards the Reformation, was born and reared at Leipsic, where his father, Johann Tietze, pursued the business of goldsmith. In 1487 Tetzel received the degree of bachelor of philosophy, having distinguished himself in the examination above all the other competitors. He possessed an imposing figure, a sonorous voice, and considerable skill in dialectics and oratory, and was accordingly selected to preach the indulgence connected with the year of jubilee, after he had associated himself with the Dominican fraternity in his native town, and had displayed great zeal in his monastic duties. He: entered on the traffic in indulgences in 1502, and prosecuted it to his own great pecuniary advantage and equal notoriety, making use of even blasphemies and obscenities to enforce his appeals for money. Nor was he more circumspect with regard to his conduct. The drinking-rooms of taverns were favorite places of resort in which to ply his trade; he permitted himself to commit crimes of violence; and an adulterous connection with the wife of a citizen led to his being sentenced to death by drowning at Innsbruck. Having been pardoned, and, after a time, liberated from imprisonment, lie resumed his traffic, and became, if possible, more bold and shameless than before.

When pope Leo X appointed commissaries for the sale of indulgences for the alleged purpose of obtaining funds with which to complete the edifice of St. Peter's at Rome, Tetzel was made an under-commissary. He held a special concession from the emperor for-the prosecution of his business, and after a time obtained a papal brief permitting him to sell indulgences everywhere in Germany. To these advantages he added that of being made an inquisitor. In 1517 he began to issue letters of indulgence in his own name, having previously acted as the agent of archbishop Albert of Mayence. He pronounced absolutions, for money, from the most heinous crimes, without regard to repentance and with the assurance of complete exemption from the fires of purgatory. His peculiarly impudent and frivolous bearing shocked all who possessed intelligence, without at all restraining his conduct, until he arrived on the borders of Saxony. At this point of Tetzel's progress Luther was made aware of the hurtful consequences of his operations through the confessional, and at once denounced the Dominican's business from the pulpit. Tetzel replied, and  Luther drew up the famous Ninety-five Theses, which Tetzel, for his part, burned in the market-place of Jitterbock. He then obtained the degree of licentiate and doctor of theology from Frankfort-on-the-Oder, in order to combat Luther from a more favorable position, and he enlisted the services of Wimpina, rector of that university, in his cause. The latter drew up 106 theses antagonistic to those of Luther, which were in turn burned by the students at Wittenberg, and afterwards fifty additional theses, upon which Tetzel disputed in January, 1518.

The dispute had in the meantime excited attention in Rome, and aroused the conviction that more positive measures must be employed to preserve the authority of the Church. The negotiations of Cajetan with Luther had failed, and the legate Miltitz was sent to Saxony to manage the affair. Having arrived at Altenberg, the legate cited Tetzel to appear before him; but the latter declined to obey, on the ground that the journey would involve his life in danger at the hands of Luther's adherents. He appeared, however, on the repeated summons of the legate, after the latter had reached Leipsic; and, having been found guilty of immoralities and shameless conduct, was harshly reprimanded and threatened with the anger of the pope and expulsion from his order. He wished to flee from the country in order to avoid the dangers which he now saw to be threatening his peace, but sickened before he could execute his purpose, and died ill the Dominican convent at Leipsic in July, 1519. Luther pitied the man in his wretchedness, and forwarded him a letter of consolation. The statement that Tetzel died of the plague is without support.

Literature. — Cyprian. Frid. Myconii Hist. Reforms. etc. (Lips. 1718); Loscher, Vollst. Ref. — Acta st. Documenta (ibid. 1720). 1, 415; the works and letters of Luther as gathered by Walch, De Wette, etc.; Hechtius, Vita Jo. Tezelii (Wittenb. 1717); Mayer, Diss. de Jo. Tezelio (Vitemb. 1717); Kapp, Disp. Hist. de Nolnullis ndulgent. Qucest. Scec. XV et XVI (Lips. 1720); and Exercit. in Ambros. Altamur. Elogium Joh. Tezelii (ibid. 1721); Kappen, Schauplatz des Tetzelischen Ablaiskcrams, etc. (ibid. 1720), and Sammung eiuiger Schrifjen über d. Ablass, etc. (ibid. 1721); Vogel, Leben... Joh. Tetzel's (ibid. 1717, 1727); Deutsche Bücher u. Schriften, pt. 8; Hofmann, Lebensbeschreibung... Tetzel's (ed. Poppe, ibid. 1844); Seidemann, Carl v. Miltitz (Dresd. 1844); id. Luther's Briefe, etc. (Berl. 1856), p. 10, 18, 699; Grone, Tetzel u. Luther, etc. (Soest, 1853). — Herzog, Real Encyklop. s.v. Texerants. A local name given to the ALBIGENSES SEE ALBIGENSES (q.v.) in those districts of Southern  France where the members of that wide-spread sect were mostly found among the weavers” ab usu texendi” (Ekbert, Adv. Cathar. in Bibl. Max. Lugd. 23:601).

## Text[[@Headword:Text]]

>

## Text[[@Headword:Text]]

             The application of the word text to the Word of God is derived from the Latin. From the similarity between spinning and weaving, and the art of composition, both in prose and verse, the Latin authors applied to the latter several expressions proper to the former. Horace says, “Tenui deducta pematafilo;” and Cicero uses the terms texere orationem and contexere carmen. Among later Roman writers, textus occurs often in the sense of a piece or composition; and, by excellence, came to denote the Word of God, just as the word Scriptura did. The meaning of the words text and gloss may be ascertained from the method of writing the Scriptures before the art of printing was invented. The following may be taken as a specimen: (Mat 7:23.) Et tunc colifitebor illis quia Non novit lux in nulla approbavi, sed reprobavi qui operamini, tenebras non dicit, qui aspicit, quas si nunqui lnu novi vos. disoperati estis, aspiceret, tene ne- tollat penibre non essent. tentiam, sed binonesset cedite a me omnes qui opera qui injudici quia licet non hanon hos novit, ergo eos, qui mandata beatis facultaejus custodiunt tom peccandi tamen habetis mini iniquitatem. affectum. The sentences at the sides are the gloss; the middle, which is in larger type, is the text; and between the lines of that is put the interlinear gloss, in which place a translation, or version, in some ancient manuscripts in the Cottonian and other libraries, is sometimes inserted. The text here means the Word of God, as opposed to the gloss; and because the text was usually written in a large and strong hand, hence such writing was called text-hand. By gloss was generally meant a commentary or exposition taken out of the Latin fathers; but afterwards it came to signify any exposition or larger commentary. Hence our English phrase, to put a gloss on anything, that is, a favorable construction; gloss, a shining outside; and to gloze, to flatter.

## Text Of Scripture[[@Headword:Text Of Scripture]]

             This term is used to signify a portion of the text; i.e. a short sentence out of Scripture, used either as the groundwork of a discourse from the pulpit, or brought forward to support an argument or in proof of a position; The custom of taking a text for a sermon is probably coeval with that of  preaching set discourses; and the use of texts as authority in doctrinal points is of the very essence of true theology, and was ever the custom even of those who, professing the name of Christians, denied the truth of Christ. One must therefore be on his guard against receiving everything for which a text is quoted, not accepting it as proof until its true sense is known; “otherwise, so many sentences, so many authorized falsehoods.” In the application of a text we should always consider its meaning in the passage with which it is connected, else we may be putting forward as truth what is in fact but an authorized falsehood; we should also guard against the practice of taking a text from Scripture in a sense which, however sound and true, is not that of the passage itself, as, for instance, “Hear the Church,” employed as if it were a precept, in the imperative mood. The non-observance of the latter caution has a tendency to lead others to the neglect of the former. Textus is a technical term for the book of the Gospels as used at the Christian sacrifice. Copies of the Gospels, richly illuminated, and bound in gold and silver, are often exposed on the high-altars of Continental churches. Sometimes they are kept in shrines, and only brought out for use in the mass at the highest and most important festivals. References to such exist in large numbers in early writers, and many remarkable examples are preserved in the sanctuaries on the Continent, two of which, at Aix-la-Chapelle and Mayence, are known to antiquaries. Numerous rich examples are reckoned up among the treasures of old St. Paul's in London, Lincoln Minster, and Salisbury Cathedral. That in the wood-cut at head of next column is from an early Flemish specimen.

## Textus Receptus[[@Headword:Textus Receptus]]

             (i.e. the received text), a phrase generally employed by critics to denote the currently accepted text of the Greek Testament. This is usually considered to be that of the Elzevirs especially the edition of 1633, the preface of which contains the expression “Editionem omnibus acceptam denuo doctorum oculis subjecimus,” referring to the edition of which that was a reprint. The most commonly printed text, however, is that of Stevens, usually Mills's edition. Sometimes the phrase fextus receptus is in like manner extended to the Masoretic text of the Hebrew Bible, especially Van der Hooght's edition, which has been reprinted by Hahn. SEE CRITICISM, BIBLICAL.

## Tezcatlipoca[[@Headword:Tezcatlipoca]]

             (Shining Mirror), the chief of the thirteen greater gods of the ancient Mexicans. On the monuments and in the paintings he is often represented as encircled by the disk of the sun. Lord Kingsborough (Antiquities of Mexico) states that “all the attributes and powers which were assigned to Jehovah by the Hebrews were also bestowed upon Tezcatlipoca by the Mexicans.” Mr. Hardwick, however, inclines to the belief that this deity was merely the deified impersonation of the generative powers of nature, and as such his highest type was the sun. A festival in his honor was held annually in May, when a young and beautiful person was sacrificed, and the heart of the victim, still warm and palpitating, was held up towards the sun, then thrown down before the image of the god, while the people bowed in adoration.

## Thaborium[[@Headword:Thaborium]]

             (Θαβώριον or Μεταμόρφωσις, Festum Tranfigurationis, s. Patefactionis Christi), the Feast of the Transfiguration of Christ. It was exalted to a feast of universal observance by pope Calixtus III in 1457, the day assigned to it being August 6. The ancient Church had not altogether ignored, but none the less greatly neglected, its observance. The purpose of its modern revival was the commemoration, first, of the transfiguration of Christ, and, second, of the defeat of the Turks at the siege of Belgrade in 1456. See Augusti, Christl. Archäologie (Leips. 1820), 3, 292 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Thacher, George, D.D[[@Headword:Thacher, George, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Hartford, Conn., July 25,1817. His early education was received at Hopkins Grammar-school, Hartford. He was graduated from Yale College in 1840, and in the same year entered Yale Theological Seminary, where, after a full three years course of study, he was regularly graduated in 1843. His first pastorate was at Derby, Conn., where he went in June, 1843; on Jan. 4, 1844, he was ordained, preaching there until Oct. 10, 1848, when he was dismissed. He next received and accepted a call to Nantucket, Mass., where he was installed Nov. 14, 1848, and remained until May 14,1850, when he was dismissed to the pastorate of the Allen Street Presbyterian Church, New York city, where he was installed May 26, 1850, and dismissed Oct. 9, 1854. He was then successively in stalled at the First Church, Meriden, Conn., Nov. 16,  1854, dismissed Sept. 18, 1860; Keokuk, Io., Oct. 30, 1860, dismissed April 8, 1867. At this latter date he went to Europe, where he spent a few months. Returning to New York in 1868, he supplied Mercer Street Church from May to October of tie same year. He was then acting pastor at Waterloo, Io., from October, 1868, to March, 1871. In 1871 he was elected president of the State University of Iowa, in which position he remained until June, 1877. He was then, from 1877 to 1878, acting pastor at Iowa City. In 1871 he received the honorary degree of D.D. from Iowa and Knox colleges. He died in Hartford of disease of the brain and heart, Dec. 27,1878. Dr. Thacher published Two Sermons at Meriden, one of which was suggested by the career of John Brown: — A Sermon: “No Fellowship with Slavery” (Keokuk, 1861): — Inaugural Address, as president of Iowa University (1871). (W. P. S.)

## Thacher, Peter (1)[[@Headword:Thacher, Peter (1)]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Salem, Mass., in 1651, and was the son of Rev. Thomas Thacher, first pastor of the Old South Church, Boston. He graduated at Harvard College in 1671, and was tutor there for several years following. He then went to England to prepare himself more fully for his profession, but his friend Samuel Danforth dying shortly after, Mr. Thacher returned to America. He refused several tempting offers to enter the Established Church; and in September, 1681, was ordained pastor of the Church in Milton, Mass. Here he labored effectively until a week before his death, which occurred Dec. 17,1727. “He was a person of eminent sanctity, of a most courteous and complaisant behavior, cheerful, affable, humble, and free of speech to the meanest he met.” He published- several theological treatises and single sermons (1708-23), for a list of which see Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1, 196.

## Thacher, Peter (2)[[@Headword:Thacher, Peter (2)]]

             a Congregational minister, the son of Thomas Thacher, Jun., and grandson of Thomas Thacher, the first minister of the Old South Church, was born in Boston in 1677. He graduated at Harvard in 1696, and immediately after his graduation began to teach at Hatfield, and is supposed to have studied divinity under the Rev. William Williams of that place. On Nov. 26, 1707, he was ordained pastor of the Church at Weymouth, where he remained between eleven and twelve years. In January, 1720, he returned to Boston and was installed pastor of the New North Church as colleague with Mr.  Webb. Here he labored until his death, Feb. 26,1738. Mr. Thacher published an Election Sermon (1726), and a Sermon on the Death of Mrs. Gee (1730). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1, 266.

## Thacher, Peter (3)[[@Headword:Thacher, Peter (3)]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in 1688, and graduated at Harvard College in 1706. He was ordained pastor of the Church in Middleborough, Mass., in 1709, and died there April 22, 1744. He published an account of the revival of religion in Middleborough, in Prince's Christian History. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Thacher, Peter (4), D.D[[@Headword:Thacher, Peter (4), D.D]]

             an eminent Congregational minister, was born at Milton, Mass., March 21, 1752. He graduated at Harvard College in 1769, and was ordained pastor Sept. 19. 1770, at Malden, Mass., from which charge he was dismissed to allow his acceptance of a call from Brattle Street Church, Boston, Dec. 8,1784. He entered upon his new charge Jan. 12, 1785, and there continued until his health failed. He died in Savannah Dec. 16, 1802. He was an active member of the convention which met in Boston in 1780 to frame a state constitution, and opposed the retention of the governor's office. The University of Edinburgh made him D.D. in 1791. He published, An Oration against Standing Armies (1776): — Three Sermons in Proof of the Eternity of Future Punishments (1782): — Observations on the State of the Clergy in New England, with Strictures upon the Power of Dismissing them Usurped by some Churches (1783): — A Reply to Strictures upon the Preceding: (1788): — Memoirs of Dr. Boylston (1789): — and several occasional sermons. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1, 718.

## Thacher, Samuel Cooper[[@Headword:Thacher, Samuel Cooper]]

             a Unitarian preacher and son of Peter (4), was born in Boston, Mass., in 1785. He graduated at Harvard College in 1804, and immediately after his graduation commenced his theological studies under the direction of Rev. William E. Channing. In the early part of 1805 Mr. Thacher took charge of the Boston Latin Grammar-school, but in the summer of 1806 was chosen to be the traveling companion of Rev. Mr. Buckminster. Returning in September, 1807, he was shortly after appointed librarian of Harvard College, and entered on his duties in 1808. He prosecuted his theological  studies at Cambridge, and succeeded Dr. Kirkland as pastor of the New- South Church, May 15, 1811, retaining this connection until his death, at Moulins, France, Jan. 2, 1818. His principal publications were, Apology for Rational and Evangelical Christianity, a discourse (Bost. 1815, 8vo): — Unity of God, a sermon (Liverpool, 1816, 8vo; 2d Amer. ed. Worcester, 1817, 8vo): — Sermons, with a Memoir by Rev. F. W. P. Greenwood (Bost. 1824, 8vo): — Evidence Necessary to Establish the Doctrine of the Trinity (1828, 12mo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 8:435 sq.

## Thacher, Thomas[[@Headword:Thacher, Thomas]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Salisbury, England, May 1, 1620. He declined the offer of his father to send him to an English university, preferring to emigrate to America. On June 4, 1635, he arrived at Boston, Mass., and soon after entered the family of the Rev. Charles Chauncy, of Scituate. He was ordained pastor of the Weymouth Church, Jan. 2, 1644, where he labored for more than twenty years. He then removed to Boston, where he preached occasionally, but was principally engaged in the practice of medicine, till he was chosen first pastor of the Third (Old South) Church. His installation took place Feb. 16,1669, and after a happy ministry he died Oct.. 15, 1678. He wrote, A Brief Rule to Guide the Common People of New England how to Order Themselves and Theirs in the Small Pocks or Measles (Bost. 1677; 2d ed. 1702), said to be the first medical tract published in New England: — A Fast of God's Choosing, a sermon (1674, 4to; 1678). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1, 126.

## Thacher, Tyler[[@Headword:Thacher, Tyler]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Princeton, Mass., Sept. 11, 1801:. “His ancestors for several generations, both in this country and in England, had been Puritan ministers, some of them of high distinction. Among them were Rev. Peter Thacher, of Salisbury, England; Rev. Thomas Thacher, of Boston, Mass.; Rev. Peter Thacher, of Milton, Mass.; and Rev. Peter Thacher, of Attleborough, Mass. In all not less than nine generations of the family have had representatives in the Christian ministry either in England or in America.” ‘The subject of this sketch was a graduate of Brown University in the class of 1824, and was licensed to preach April 26, 1825, and ordained as an evangelist in Wrentham, Mass., Dec. 4, 1827. He did  not permanently settle in the ministry until May 14, 1834, when he became colleague pastor with Rev. Jonathan Grant over the Congregational Church at Hawley, Mass., where he remained about nine years (1834-43) and then returned to Wrentham. For several years he supplied the Church in North Wrentham, until he moved to California in 1851. Here he remained the rest of his life, teaching and preaching, and engaged in such employments as suited his tastes. “He was distinguished among his brethren for his theological and literary attainments, and even in the wilderness where he made his home he kept up his studies in the Hebrew and Greek languages and in philosophy. He was a man of quiet, scholarly, and devout habits, and much given to the study of nature and the problems of theology.” Mr. Thacher died at Cache Creek, Cal., Dec. 4, 1869. (J. C. S.)

## Thacher, Washington[[@Headword:Thacher, Washington]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Attleborough, Mass., Feb. 23, 1794. He received his classical education under the Rev. Lyman Richardson; studied theology under the Rev. John Truair; was licensed to preach by the Otsego Presbytery in 1821; was ordained in 1822; officiated as stated supply at Morrisville, N.Y., 1822-26; was pastor of the Church in Jordan, N. Y., 1826-42; resigned his charge on account of ill-health; was afterwards a stated supply at Eaton, N. Y., three years; was appointed secretary and agent of the Central Agency of the American Home Missionary Society in July, 1847; and died June 29, 1850. He was an eminently devout man and an earnest and effective preacher.

## Thaddaei Acta[[@Headword:Thaddaei Acta]]

             The mission of Thaddaeus to king Abgar of Edessa, the correspondence between Christ and Abgar, and the picture of Christ which purports to have been taken for Abgar are very old traditions, first mentioned by Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. 1, 13. Whether these Acts formed the basis for these traditions cannot be decided. Tischendorf has published the Greek text from a codex Paris of the 11th century in his Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha (Lips. 1851), p. 261-265. (B. P.)

## Thaddeei Evangelium[[@Headword:Thaddeei Evangelium]]

             mentioned in the Decret. Gelasii de Libris Apocryphis (in Jus Canonicum, 15:3). Unless there is an erroneous reading for Matthew, it would either  belong to the apostle Judas Thaddaeus or to a Judas belonging to the seventy whom Thomas sent to Edessa to king Abgar (Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. 1, 13; see Fabricius, Codex Apocryphus, 1, 136, 379). But tradition does not determine whether Thaddaeus who was sent to Abgar belonged to the twelve or the seventy, on which point Eusebius and Jerome disagree. See Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. (ed. Reading), p. 38, note 5, 6.

On the correspondence between Abgar and Jesus, see especially Hofmann, Leben Jesu nach den Apokryphen (Leips. 1851), p. 307 sq, (B. P.)

## Thaddeeus[[@Headword:Thaddeeus]]

             (Θαδδαῖος; Vulg. Thaddceus), a name in Mark's catalogue of the twelve apostles (Mar 3:18) in the great majority of MSS. In Matthew's catalogue (10, 3) the corresponding place is assigned to Θαδδαῖος by the Vatican MS. (B), and the Sinaitic (א), and to Λεββαῖος by the Codex Bezae (D); while the received text, following the first correction of the Codex Ephraemi (C)- where the original reading is doubtful as well as many fragmentary uncial and several cursive MSS., reads Λεββαῖος ὁ ἑ πικληθεὶς θαδδαῖος. We are probably to infer that Λεββαῖος alone is the original reading of Mat 10:3, and Θαδδαῖος of Mar 3:18 (so Tischendorf; but Tregelles has Θαδδαῖος in both passages). By these two evangelists the tenth place among the apostles is given to Lebbaeus or Thaddaeus, the eleventh place being given to Simon the Canaanite. Luke, in both his catalogues (Mar 6:15; Act 1:13), places Simon Zelotes tenth among the apostles, and assigns the eleventh place to Ι᾿ούδας Ι᾿ακώβου. As the other names recorded by Luke are identical with those which appear (though in a different order) in the first two gospels, it seems scarcely possible to doubt that the three names of Jilas, Lebbeus, and Thaddaeus were borne by one and the same person. SEE JUDE; SEE LEBBEUS; SEE THADDAEI ACTA and SEE EVANGELIUM.

## Thahash[[@Headword:Thahash]]

             (Heb. Tach'ash, תִּחִשׁ, badger [q.v.]; Sept. Τοχός; Josephus, Ταύαος. Ant. 1, 6,5; Vulg. Thahas), third named of the four sons of Nahor by his concubine Reumah (Gen 22:24). B.C. cir. 2050.

## Thalemann, Christoph Wilhelm[[@Headword:Thalemann, Christoph Wilhelm]]

             a Lutheran divine, was born in 1727 at Weberstadt, in Thuringia, and died, as doctor and professor of theology, at Leipsic, March 10, 1778.' He wrote, Tractatus de Nube super Airco Feederis Commento Judaico (Lips. 17-52): — Tactatus de Philonis et Josephi Auctoritate inl istoria Rituum Sacrorum (ibid. 1771): — De Sensu Veri et Fulsi in Inter. pretatione Librorum Sacrorum (ibid. 1775): — Dissertatio de Eruditione Pauli Apostoli Judaica non Graeca (ibid. 1769): — Versio Laina Evangeliorum Matth., Luc., et Joh., itemque Act. App., edita a K. Ch. Tittmann (Berlin, 1780). See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 419; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 1, 138, 165, 569, 896; 2, 799. (B. P.)

## Thales[[@Headword:Thales]]

             a celebrated Greek philosopher, and the first of the seven wise men of Greece, was born at Miletus about B.C. 640. After acquiring the usual learning of his own country, he traveled into Egypt and several parts of Asia' to learn astronomy, geometry, mystical divinity, natural knowledge, or philosophy; etc. Returning to his own country, he communicated the knowledge he had acquired to many disciples, among the principal of whom were Anaximander, Anaximenes, and Pythagoras. He was the founder of the Ionian sect of philosophers. Laertes and several other writers agree that he was the father of the Greek philosophy, being the first that made any researches into natural science and mathematics. His doctrine is that water is the principle of which all the bodies in the universe are composed; that the world is the work of God; and that God sees the most secret thoughts in the heart of man. He taught that in order to live well we ought to abstain from what we find fault with in others; that bodily felicity consists in health; and that of the mind in knowledge. That the most ancient of beings is God, because he is uncreated; that nothing is more beautiful than the world, because it is the work of God; nothing more extensive than space, quicker than spirit, stronger than necessity wiser than time. He used to observe that we ought never to say that to any one which may be turned to our prejudice; and that we should live with our friends as with persons that may become our enemies. In geometry Thales was a considerable inventor as well as an improver; while in astronomy his knowledge and improvements were very considerable. His morals were as just as his mathematics well-grounded, and his judgment in civil affairs equal to either. He died about B.C. 550. Concerning his writings, it  remains doubtful whether he left any behind him; at least, none have come down to us. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Smith, Dict. of Class. Biog. s.v.

## Thalia[[@Headword:Thalia]]

             one of the nine Muses (q.v.); regarded in later times as presiding over comedy. She became the mother of the Corybantes, by Apollo.

## Thamah[[@Headword:Thamah]]

             (Heb. Te'mach, תֶּמִח, in pause Ta'mach, תָּמִח, laughter [Gesenius], or combat [Fürst]; Sept. Θεμά; Vulg. Thema), one of the Nethinim whose “children” returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:53;” Tamah,” Neh 7:55). B.C. ante 536.

## Thamar[[@Headword:Thamar]]

             (Mat 1:3). SEE TAMAR.

## Thamer, Theobald[[@Headword:Thamer, Theobald]]

             a theological agitator in the time of the Reformation in Germany. He was a native of Rossheim, in Alsace, and studied at Wittenberg under Luther and Melancthon, taking the degree of master in 1539. He had been supported while a student by the landgrave Philip of Hesse, who wished to train the youth for service in his employment; and after a time spent as professor of theology at Frankfort-on-the-Oder, Thamer responded to the landgrave's call and became professor and preacher at Marburg. To the chagrin of his prince, however he showed himself a rigid Lutheran, whose influence was directly opposed to the compromises which Philip hoped to bring about between the contending evangelical factions. In the Smalcald war Thamer served in the field as a chaplain. He there saw reason to lose faith in the cause of the Reformation, and to discover the occasion of all the troubles of the situation in the Lutheran doctrine of justification; and on his return to Marburg he assailed that doctrine in the pulpit and the lecture room. He emphasized the ethical side of Christianity, and separated it from the doctrinal side, thus gradually coming to occupy rationalistic ground. The government dealt with him mildly, at first transferring him to Cassel, and then entering into extended negotiations with him; but as he persisted in disturbing the peace of the Church, he was dismissed from all his offices Aug. 15, 1549. He secured a position as preacher at Frankfort-on-the- Main, whence he continued to asperse the Lutheran doctrines, until he exhausted the patience of his new patrons. He then turned to the landgrave with the offer to defend his views before competent judges, and he actually visited Melancthon, Gresser, Schnepf, and Bullinger. No settlement was reached in their discussions, however, and Thamer was dismissed from the dominions of Hesse. He went to Italy and in 1557 entered the Romish Church. In time he was made professor of theology at Freiburg. He died May 23, 1569. See Neander, Theobald Thamer, etc. (Berl. 1842); id. Hist. of Dogmas, p. 631; Pestalozzi, Bullirger, p. 461 sq.; Schenkel, Wiesen d. Protestantismus, 1, 144 sq.; Hochhuth, De Th. Thameri Vita et Scriptis (Marb. 1858), and the article in Niedner's Zeitsch. hist. Theologie, 1861, No. 2. Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Thamnatha[[@Headword:Thamnatha]]

             (ἡ θαμναθά; Vulg. Thamnata), one of the cities of Judea fortified by Bacchides after he had driven the Maccabees over the Jordan (1Ma 9:50); no doubt an ancient TIMNATH, possibly the present Tibneh, half-  way between Jerusalem and the Mediterranean. Whether the name should be joined to Pharathoni, which follows it, or whether it should be independent, is a matter of doubt. SEE PHARATHON.

## Thane, Daniel[[@Headword:Thane, Daniel]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Scotland and received his classical education at Aberdeen. After, coming to America, he entered the Princeton Theological Seminary, from which he graduated in 1748. He was ordained by the New York Presbytery and installed pastor at Connecticut Farms, N.J., Aug. 29, 1750. In 1754 he was sent by the Synod of New York to Virginia and the Carolinas. Ramsey, in his History of South Carolina, says that he preached on the fork of Broad and Saluda rivers, where there were only six families. These were driven away by the Indians between the years 1755 and 1763, but they returned and set up congregations, served in aftertimes by Dr. Joseph Alexander and others. In 1808 there was a flourishing congregation, with a meetinghouse on the spot where Thane preached, in 1754, under a tree. He was dismissed in 1757, and left at liberty to join the Presbytery of Newcastle or Lewes. He was settled in the united congregations of Newcastle and Christina Bridge, where he remained until 1763, when the pastoral relation was dissolved. He died soon after. Dr. Hosack, in his Memoir of DeWitt Clinton, says that this eminent man was under Thane's tuition, and that he was minister of New Windsor, N.Y. (W. P. S.)

## Thank-offering[[@Headword:Thank-offering]]

             (זֶבִה תּוֹדָה, Lev 22:29; or briefly תּוֹדָה, 2Ch 29:3; Psa 56:13; Jer 17:26; literally praise or thanksgiving, as often rendered), a variety of the peace-offering (hence the full expression זֶבִה תּוֹדִת הִשְּׁלָמַים, Lev 7:13; Lev 7:15), the other two kinds being the votive offering, specifically such (זֶבִה נֵדֶר), and the ordinary free-will offering (נְדָבָה זֶבח). As its name implies, it was a bloody or animal sacrifice, and its specific character was the praise which it embodied towards God. Like all the other divisions of the peace-offering, it was entirely voluntary, being placed in the light of a privilege rather than a duty. It is intimately associated with the “meat-offering” (q.v.).

The nature of the victim was left to the sacrificer; it might be male or female, of the flock or of the herd, provided that it was unblemished; the  hand of the sacrificer was laid on its head, the fat burned, and the blood sprinkled as in the burnt-offering; of the flesh, the breast and right shoulder (the former of which the offerer was to heave and the latter to wave) were given to the priest; the rest belonged to the sacrificer as a sacrificial feast (1Co 10:18), to be eaten, either on the day of sacrifice or on the next day (Lev 7:11-18; Lev 7:29-34), except in the case of the firstlings, which belonged to the priest alone (Lev 23:20). The eating of the flesh of the meat-offering was considered a partaking of the table of the Lord;” and on solemn occasions, as at the dedication of the Temple of Solomon, it was conducted on all enormous scale, and became a great national feast, especially at periods of unusual solemnity or rejoicing; as at the first inauguration of the covenant (Exo 24:5), at the first consecration of Aaron and of the tabernacle (Lev 9:18), at the solemn reading of the law in Canaan by Joshua (Jos 8:31), at the accession of Saul (1Sa 11:15), at the bringing of the ark to Mount Zion by David (2Sa 6:17), at the consecration of the Temple, and thrice every year afterwards, by Solomon (1Ki 8:63; 1Ki 9:25), and at the great Passover of Hezekiah (2Ch 30:22). In two cases only (Jdg 20:26; 2Sa 24:25) are these or any other kind of peace-offering mentioned as offered with burnt-offerings at a time of national sorrow and fasting. Here their force seems to have been precatory rather than eucharistic. The key to the understanding of this is furnished by Hengstenberg: “To give thanks for grace already received is a refined way of begging for more.” As prayer is founded on the divine promise, it “may be expressed in the way of anticipated thanks.”

Among thank-offerings, in the most extensive sense, might be reckoned the presentation of the first-born (Exo 13:12-13); the first-fruits, including the fruit of all manner of trees, honey, oil, and new wine (Lev 23:10-13; Num 18:12; 1Ch 9:29; Neh 10:37;. 2Ch 32:5); the second tithe (Deu 12:17-18; Deu 14:23); and the lamb of the Passover (Exo 12:3-17). Leaven and honey were excluded from all offerings made by fire (Lev 2:11); and salt was required in all (2, 13; Mar 9:49; Col 4:6). So also the Hebrews were forbidden to offer anything vile and contemptible (Deu 23:18; Mal 1:7-8). SEE PEACE OFFERING.

## Thanksgiving[[@Headword:Thanksgiving]]

             the act of giving thanks or expressing gratitude for favors or mercy received. It implies, according to Dr. Barrow (Sermons, 1, ser. 8,9),

(1) a right apprehension of the benefits conferred;

(2) a faithful retention of benefits in the memory, and frequent reflections upon them;

(3) a due esteem and valuation of benefits;

(4) a reception of those benefits with a willing mind, a vehement affection;

(5) due acknowledgment of our obligations;

(6) endeavors of real compensation, or, as it respects the Divine Being, a willingness to serve and exalt him;

(7) esteem, veneration, and love of the benefactor. The blessings for which we should be thankful are (1) temporal, such-as health, food, raiment, rest, etc.;

(2) spiritual, such as the Bible, ordinances, the Gospel and its blessings, as free grace, adoption, pardon, justification, calling, etc.;

(3) eternal, or the enjoyment of God in a future state;

(4) also for all that is past, what we now enjoy, and what is promised; for private and public, for ordinary and extraordinary blessings; for prosperity, and even adversity, so far as rendered subservient to our good.

The obligation to this duty arises

(1) from the relation we stand in to God; (2) the divine command; (3) the promises God has made; (4) the example of all good men; (5) our unworthiness of the blessings we receive; (6) the prospect of eternal glory.  Whoever possesses any good without giving thanks for it deprives him who bestows that good of his glory, sets a bad example before others, and prepares a recollection severely painful for himself when he comes in his turn to experience ingratitude. See Chalmers, Sermons; Hall, Sermons; Dwight, Theology.

## Thanksgiving Service[[@Headword:Thanksgiving Service]]

             There are various modes under the Old Test. of offering thanksgiving. Sometimes it was public, sometimes in the family. It was frequently accompanied by sacrifices (2Ch 29:31) and peace-offerings, or offerings of pure devotion, arising from the sentiments of gratitude in the offerer's own mind (Lev 7:12; Lev 7:15; Psa 107:23; Psa 116:7). It is usually connected with praise, joy, gladness, and the voice of melody (Isa 51:3), or (as Neh 11:17) with singing and with honor (Rev 7:12); but occasionally, if not generally, with supplication (Php 4:6) and prayer (1Ti 2:3; Neh 11:17).

In the Book of Common Prayer there are various forms of thanksgiving, particular and general, as especially the “General Thanksgiving,” which was added at the last revision, and appointed for daily use, and more particularly the “Office for the Holy Communion.” But there are, besides, particular thanksgivings appointed for deliverance from drought, rain, famine, war, tumult, and pestilence; and there is an entire service of thanksgiving for women after childbirth; and certain days on which are commemorated great deliverances of the Church and nation are marked also with a solemn service of thanksgiving.

## Thanksgiving-day[[@Headword:Thanksgiving-day]]

             an annual religious festival observed in the United States. It owes its origin to the desire of the Puritans for greater simplicity in the forms of worship of the Established Church, and a purpose not to celebrate any of the numerous festival-days observed by that Church. An occasional day of thanksgiving has been recommended by the civil authorities of Europe, and such a day was observed in Leyden, Holland, Oct. 3, 1575, the first anniversary of the deliverance of that city from siege. Before the adoption of an annual thanksgiving-day, we find mention of several appointed for special reasons. After the first harvest at Plymouth, in 1621,'Gov. Bradford sent four men out fowling, that they “might after a more special manner rejoice together.” In July, 1623, the governor appointed a day of thanksgiving for rain, after a long drought, and the records show a similar appointment in 1632 because of the arrival of supplies from Ireland. There is also record of the appointment of days of thanksgiving in Massachusetts in 1632, 1633, 1634, 1637, 1638, and 1639, and in Plymouth in 1651,1668, 1680 (when the form of the recommendation indicates that it had become an annual custom), 1689, and 1690. The Dutch governors of New Netherland in 1644, 1645, 1655, and 1664, and the English governors of New York in 1755 and 1760, appointed days of thanksgiving. During the Revolution, Thanksgiving-day was observed by the nation, being annually recommended by Congress; but there was no national appointment between the general thanksgiving for peace in 1784 and 1789, when president Washington recommended a day of thanksgiving for the adoption of the constitution. Since that time special days have been set apart both by presidents and governors until 1864, when the present practice was adopted of a national annual thanksgiving. The president issues an annual proclamation, followed by the governors of the several states and mayors of the principal cities. Custom has fixed the time for the last Thursday in November.

## Thanner, Ignaz[[@Headword:Thanner, Ignaz]]

             a Roman Catholic divine, was born Feb. 9, 1770, at Neumarkt, in Bavaria. In 1802 he was appointed professor of catechetics at Salzburg; in 1805 professor of philosophy at Landshut; in 1808 he was called to Innspruck, and in 1810 to Salzburg again, where he died, May 28, 1856. At first he belonged to the Kantian philosophical school, but soon became converted to that of Schelling. He wrote, Der Transcendentalismus in seiner drei. fachen Steigerung (Munich, 1805): —Die Idee des Organismus (ibid. 1806): —Handbuch der Vorbereitung zum selbststündigen wissenschaftlichen Studium (ibid. 1807, 2 vols.): —Darstellung der absoluten Identititslehre (ibid. 1810): —Logische Aphorismen (Salzburg, 1811): —Lehr und Handbuch der tuoeoretischen und praktischen Philosophie (ibid. 1811, 2 vols.): —Wissenschaftliche Aphorismen der kathol. Dogmatik (ibid. 1816). See Winer, Handb. der theol. Literatur, 1, 306; 2, 800; Regensburger Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Thara[[@Headword:Thara]]

             (Luke 3, 34). SEE TERAH.

## Tharra[[@Headword:Tharra]]

             (Vulg. Thara, for the Greek fails here), a corrupt form found in the Apocryphal addition to the book of Esther (12, 1) for TERESH SEE TERESH (q.v.).

## Tharshish[[@Headword:Tharshish]]

             a less exact form of Anglicizing the word TARSHISH SEE TARSHISH (q.v.), applied in the A. V. to

(a) the place (1Ki 10:22; 1Ki 22:48) and (b) the man (1Ch 7:10).

## Thassi[[@Headword:Thassi]]

             (θασσί, θασσίς; Vulg. Thasi, Hassii), the surname of Simon the son of Mattathias (1 Maccabees 2, 3). The derivation of the word is uncertain. Michaelis suggests תִּדְשַׁי(Chald.), “the fresh grass springs up,” i.e. “the spring is come,” in reference to the tranquility first secured during the supremacy of Simon (Grimm, Comment. ad loc.). This seems very farfetched. Winer (Realwb. s.v. “Simon” ) suggests a connection with תָּסִסfervere, as Grotius (ad loc.) seems to have done before him. In Josephus (Ant. 12:6, 1) the surname is written Ματθῆς, v.r. θαδής, θαθής. SEE MACCABEE.

## Thaumatopcei[[@Headword:Thaumatopcei]]

             (θαυματοποίοι), a term applied by the early Greek writers to those who pretended to work miracles by the power of magic, such as, James and Jambres, Simon Magus, and Apollonius Tyanaeus. See Bingham, Christ. Antiq. bk. 16:ch. v, § 7.

## Thaumnaturgy[[@Headword:Thaumnaturgy]]

             SEE MIRACLES, ECCLESIASTICAL.

## Thaxter, Joseph[[@Headword:Thaxter, Joseph]]

             a Unitarian minister, was born at Hingham, Mass., April 23, 1742. He graduated at Harvard College in 1768, expecting to enter the medical profession, but, deciding upon the ministry, he studied theology under Dr. Gay, and began to preach in 1771. On Jan. 23, 1776, he received a commission as chaplain in the army, and probably held that position for two or three years. He was installed pastor of the Church in Edgarton, Martha's Vineyard, in 1780. The last Sunday that he preached he fell in the pulpit, was assisted home, and died July 18, 1827. Mr. Thaxter acted as chaplain at the laying of the corner-stone of the Bunker Hill monument, July 17, 1825. His only publication, so far as known, was a Catechism for Sabbath-schools. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 8:83.

## Thayer, Elihu, D.D[[@Headword:Thayer, Elihu, D.D]]

             a Congregational preacher, was born at Braintree, Mass., March 29, 1747. He was, as a child, very forward in his studies, having read the Bible through three times at the age of seven years. He entered Princeton College, one year in advance, in 1766, and graduated in 1769. His theological studies were prosecuted partly under Rev. John Searle, Stoneham, and partly under Rev. Mr. Weld, Braintree. Licensed to preach, he supplied for nearly a year the church in Newburyport. He was then (Dec. 18,1776) set apart to take the pastoral care of the Church in Kingston, N. H. He was chosen president of the New Hampshire Missionary Society in 1801, and continued to hold the office till 1811. He died April 3,1812. A volume of his Sermons was published after his death (1813, 8vo). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 2, 104.

## Thayer, Nathaniel, D.D[[@Headword:Thayer, Nathaniel, D.D]]

             a Unitarian minister, was born at Hampton, N. H., July 11, 1769, studied at the Phillips Academy, Exeter, and graduated from Harvard College in 1789.. He immediately took charge of the grammar-school in Medford, and at the same time commenced the study of theology under Dr. Osgood. At the end of a year he returned to Cambridge, and continued to study under Dr. Tappan, divinity professor in the college. He held the position of tutor in college for about a year, and, being licensed to preach, spent the greater part of a year at Wilkesbarre, Pa., supplying a congregation there. On his return to Massachusetts, he preached to the New South Church, Boston, and at Dorchester. He was ordained and installed colleague pastor of the  Church in Lancaster, Oct. 9, 1793. The pastor, Rev. Timothy Harrington, lived about two years, and at his death Mr. Thayer succeeded to the sole charge of the Church. He was a man whose services were greatly esteemed and frequently employed; he was a member of no less than 150 ecclesiastical councils; preached the Artillery Election sermon in 1798, and the annual sermon before the Legislature of Massachusetts in 1823. He received his D.D. in 1817 from Harvard. When Lafayette made his tour through the United States in 1825, Mr. Thayer addressed him in behalf of the people of Lancaster. Being somewhat debilitated, he, in June, 1840, set out to travel. He reached Rochester on the 22nd of that month, retired to rest at his usual hour, and died at two o'clock the next morning. His remains were carried back to Lancaster. Mr. Thayer published a number of sermons and discourses, for a list of which see Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 8:246 sq.

## The Ancient Moravian Brethren[[@Headword:The Ancient Moravian Brethren]]

             or, more properly, "THE BOHEMIAN BRETHREN," an evangelical Church which flourished before the Reformation of the 16th century, and which was overthrown in the beginning of the Thirty-Years' War of Germany.

I. History.-John Huss (q.v.) was the precursor of the Brethren. They originated in that national Church of Bohemia into which the two factions of his followers, the Calixtines and the Taborites, were formed at the close of the Hussite War, and which was based upon the Compactata of Basle. These compactata were certain concessions, particularly the use of the cup in the Lord's Supper and of the vernacular in public worship, granted (1433) to the Bohemians by the council which met in that city. In 1456, some members of the Theyn parish at Prague, who recognised the corruptness of the national Church, and wished to further their own personal salvation, withdrew to a devastated and sparsely inhabited estate, called Lititz, on the eastern frontier, by permission of George Podiebrad, the regent of Bohemia, and through the intervention of John Rokyzan, their priest. He had eloquently inveighed against the degeneracy of the age, but  lacked courage to inaugurate reforms such as these parishioners longed for, although they entreated him to do so, and promised their support even to death.

Their object in retiring to Lititz was not to found a new sect. but to carry out, on the basis of the Articles of Prague, and of the Compactata of Basle, the reformation begun by Huss, confining their work, however, to their own circle, and forming a society within the national Church, pledged to accept the Bible as the only rule of faith and practice, and to maintain a scriptural discipline. Accordingly, in 1457, they adopted a formal declaration of principles, which was committed to the keeping and administration of twenty-eight elders. The association took the name of the "Brethren and Sisters of the Law of Christ." But as this title induced the belief that they were a new monastic order, it was changed into that of "The Brethren." At a later time the expressive name of "Unity of the Brethren" came into vogue, and was used indiscriminately both in its Bohemian and Latin forms, namely, Jednotat Bratrska, and Unitas Fratrum. The latter has remained the official denomination of the Moravians to the present day. At the head of the Brethren stood Gregory the Patriarch (q.v.); while Michael Bradacius (q.v.), and some other priests of the national Church, ministered to them in holy things. The association at Lititz soon began to exercise a great influence throughout Bohemia and Moravia. Its elders disseminated its principles, and received hundreds of awakened souls into its fellowship.

The first persecution, which broke out in 1461, did not stop its growth; and in 1464, at a synod held in the open air, among the mountains of the domain of Reichenau, three of the twenty- eight elders were chosen to assume a more special management of its affairs. In the discharge of this duty they were guided by a document drawn up at that synod, and containing the doctrinal basis of the society, as well as rules for a holy life. This document, which is the oldest record of the Brethren extant, opens as follows: "We are, above all, agreed to continue, through grace, sound in the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ; to be established in the righteousness which is of God, to maintain the bond of love among each other, and to have our hope in the living God. We will show this both in word and deed, assist each other in the spirit of love, live honestly, study to be humble, quiet, meek, sober, and patient, and thus to testify to others that we have in truth a sound faith, genuine love, and a sure and certain hope." This extract sets forth the tendency of the Brethren, to which they remained true throughout their history. The great object which they had in view was Christian life. They strove to be a body of believers who showed their faith by their works. They tenaciously upheld a scriptural discipline as  an essential feature of a true Church. Although, in the course of time, they defined their doctrines in regular Confessions of Faith, they always made practical Christianity prominent, and required personal piety, and not merely an adhesion to a creed, as a condition of Church-membership. The Synod of Reichenau not only gave expression to this tendency, but also decided a grave question. The Brethren felt the necessity of separating entirely from the national Church, and of establishing a ministry of their own. Yet they were so anxious to avoid a schism, and to do nothing contrary to the will of God, that they spent several years in debating this step, and, in view of it, frequently appointed special days of fasting and prayer. The result to which they were led was to leave the decision to the Lord, by the use of the lot. This directed the Brethren to organize a Church of their own. Three years more were passed in praying to God for his Holy Spirit; and then in 1467, at a synod held in the village of Lhota, on the domain of Reichenau, three men, Matthias of Kunwalde, Thomas of Prelouc, and Elias of Chrenovic, were appointed to the ministry, again by the lot. For the particulars, SEE MATTHIAS OF KUNWALDE.

Thereupon the subject of their ordination was discussed. The synod believed that presbyterial ordination had been practiced in the times of the apostles, but recognised the episcopacy as a very ancient institution. It was deemed important, moreover, to secure a ministry whose validity both the Roman' Catholics and the national Church would have to acknowledge. On the other hand, a primitive usage must not thereby be condemned. It was therefore determined to remain true both to the practice of the apostolical Church and to that of the Church immediately following the days of the apostles. Hence the nominees were ordained, on the spot, by the priests present at the synod; and then three of the latter, Michael Bradacius and two others, were sent to a colony of Waldenses, who were living on the confines of Austria, and who had secured the episcopal succession. For a history of this succession, SEE MICHAEL BIADACIUS.

The Waldensian bishops consecrated the three delegates to the episcopacy, who "returned to their own with joy," as the old record says. Another synod was called, at which they, first of all, reordained Matthias, Thomas, and Elias to the priesthood, and then consecrated Matthias a bishop. A well-matured ecclesiastical government was instituted, and the Church soon spread into every part of Bohemia and Moravia. But it had to contend with two evils. The one threatened it from within. This was an extravagant tendency to press the discipline to anti-scriptural extremes. It occasioned disputes which continued for fourteen years, from 1480 to 1494, and which were  finally settled in the interests of the liberal party. For an account of these disputes, as well as of the exploratory journeys of the Brethren, SEE GREGORY, LUKE OF PRAGUE, and SEE MATTHIAS OF KTUNWALDE.

The other evil approached from without. Two terrible persecutions occurred (1468 and 1508). The Roman Catholics and the national Church united in a bloody determination to root out the Brethren from the land. Imprisonment, confiscation, tortures, and death were the means employed. Many of the Brethren suffered martyrdom. But their blood was the seed of the Church. In both instances the persecution gradually came to an end; and the Unitas Fratrum renewed its strength and increased its numbers. A full history of these and subsequent persecutions is found in the Historia Persecutionum Ecclesice Bohemicce, published anonymously in 1648. This work was written by Amos Comenius (q.v.) and other exiled ministers of the Brethren, and has been translated into many languages. The English version is very rare. It came out in London in 1650, and was entitled "The History of the Bohemian Persecution." The latest German version is by Czerwenka, with notes: Das Persekutionsbichlein. (Giitersloh, 1869).

When Martin Luther began his Reformation, in 1517, the Church of the Brethren was prospering greatly. It counted 400 parishes; had at least 200,000 members, among whom were some of the noblest and most influential families of the realm; used a hymn-book and catechism of its own; had a Confession of Faith; and employed two printing-presses, in order to scatter Bohemian Bibles and evangelical books throughout the land. Hence the Brethren deservedly bear the name of the "Reformers before the Reformation." This position, however, did not prevent them from cordially fraternizing with the movement which Luther inaugurated. They corresponded with him, and sent several deputations to Wittenberg. It is true a personal estrangement between him and bishop Luke of Prague (q.v.) put an end for a time to this friendly intercourse; but it was soon resumed, and extended to the Swiss Reformers. Such fellowship was mutually beneficial. It purified the doctrinal system of the Brethren, who dropped some dogmas that still savored of scholasticism, and defined others more clearly. It gave the Reformers new ideas with regard to a scriptural discipline, and taught them the importance of union among themselves.

These were the two points which the Brethren steadfastly urged in all their negotiations with other Protestants. Touching the first, they entreated Luther to apply himself to a reform of Christian life, and not  merely of doctrine; and they gave to Calvin some important principles, which he subsequently introduced in his disciplinary system at Geneva. On the occasion of the last deputation to Luther, bishop Augusta warned him, almost like a prophet, of the evil which would result in the Protestant Church if the discipline were neglected this prediction was fulfilled by the dead orthodoxy into Which the Church was subsequently petrified in Germany, and by the Sociniasism which ate out the vitals of that in Poland. Touching the second point, the Brethren were a standing protest against the controversies which rent Protestantism; they strove to promote peace, and succeeded in bringing about an alliance among the Polish Protestants at Sandomir, where in 1570 the Unitas Fratrum, the Lutherans, and the Reformed conjointly issued the celebrated Consensus Sadomiriensis. The Brethren had established themselves in Poland in 1549, in consequence of the fourth great persecution which broke upon them in the reign of Ferdinand I, who falsely ascribed the Bohemian League, which had been formed against him during the Smalcald War, to their influence. In the course of this persecution a large number of them were banished from Bohemia and emigrated to East Prussia.

Thence came George Israel to preach the Gospel in Poland, and met with such success that at the General Synod of Slecza, held in 1557, the Polish churches were admitted as an integral part of the Unitas Fratrum. During the reign of Maximilian II (1564-1576) the Brethren enjoyed peace, and united with the Lutherans and Reformed in the presentation of the Confessio Bohensica to this monarch (1575). His successor, Rudolph II, was constrained by his barons to grant a charter which established religious liberty in Bohemia and Moravia (1609). An Evangelical Consistory was formed at Prague, in which body the Brethren were represented by one of their bishops. They were now a legally acknowledged Church. But the Bohemian revolution in 1619, caused by the accession of Ferdinand II, a bigoted Romanist, to the throne, brought about a change in the religious affairs of the kingdom. The Protestants and their rival king, Frederick of the Palatinate, were totally defeated at the battle of the White Mountain, near Prague, in 1620; the Bohemian revolution developed into a European war of thirty terrible years; and Bohemia and Moravia fell wholly into the power of the Roman Catholic Church. In 1621, Ferdinand II began the so-called "anti- Reformation" in those countries, after having executed a number of the leading Protestant nobles. Commissioners, accompanied by Jesuits and soldiers, were sent from place to place to force the inhabitants to embrace Romanism. Many were put to death; more than 30,000 families emigrated;  the rest were driven into an outward subjection to the Catholic faith.

The Unitas Fratrum, as well as the Lutheran and Reformed churches, were swept from the kingdom (1627). But the Brethren reappeared as a Church in exile. The contingent which they furnished to the emigration was, in proportion to the whole number of members in each body, three or four times larger than that either of the Lutherans or of the Reformed. About one hundred new parishes were organized, chiefly in Prussia, Hungary, and Poland; and the executive council which governed the Church was set up at Lissa, in the country last named. The hope of returning to Bohemia and Moravia at the close of the Thirty-Years' War was generally entertained by the Brethren; but the Peace of Westphalia (1648) painfully undeceived them. Their native land was excluded from the benefits of religious liberty. Eight years later, the colony which had been gathered at Lissa was broken up (1656) in the war between Poland and Sweden. The members of the council scattered; the Polish parishes united with the Reformed Church; while some sort of a superintendence over the rest was kept up by bishop Amos Comenius (q.v.), who had found an asylum at Amsterdam. This eminent divine hoped and prayed for the resuscitation of the Unitas Fratrum. To this end he published its history and a new catechism, republished the Ratio Discipline which had been adopted in 1616, and which was an official account of its constitution and discipline, and cared for the perpetuation of the episcopacy. After his death in 1670, the scattered parishes of the Brethren were gradually absorbed by other Protestant churches. But the episcopal succession was maintained in the midst of that union between the Reformed and the Brethren which had been brought about in Poland; while in Bohemia and Moravia a remnant secretly worshipped God according to the custom of their fathers, and never relinquished the hope of a renewal of their Church. This state of affairs continued for half a century; and then their expectations were fulfilled. SEE MORAVIAN BRETHREN, THE RENEWED (No. 2 below).

II. Ministry, Constitution, Worship, Ritual, and Discipline. — The ministry of the Brethren consisted of three orders: bishops, priests, and deacons. In the course of time assistant bishops were associated with the bishops. These latter were often called Seniors, also Antistites; and the assistants Conseniors. Acolytes were young men preparing for the ministry, who performed certain inferior functions in connection with public worship, but were not ordained. The deacons instructed the young, occasionally preached, baptized, when directed to do so by a priest, and  assisted at but never administered the Lord's Supper. A priest stood at the head of each parish, and exercised all the duties usually connected with the priesthood. In the bishops was vested the power to ordain, to appoint pastors to the various parishes, to hold visitations, to superintend the printing offices, and in general to oversee the Church. Each bishop had a diocese of his own, but all of them together — their number varying from four to six — were associated with from six to eight assistant bishops as a council. Of this council the primate among the bishops was president. He enjoyed certain prerogatives, but could undertake nothing of importance without consulting his colleagues. Another of the bishops was secretary of the council. It was his duty to care for the records of the Church, and to examine and answer, if necessary, the publications which appeared against it. Bishops and assistant bishops were elected by the ministers, and the council was responsible to the General Synod, which met every three or four years. In this synod all the bishops, assistant bishops, and priests of the Bohemian, Moravian, and Polish provinces, into which the Unitas Fratrum was gradually divided, had seats. The deacons and acolytes, as also lay patrons of the churches, likewise attended, but without a vote. The bishops and their assistants constituted the upper house, and the priests the lower. Each house met by itself. Diocesan synods were held in order to legislate for a particular diocese, but their acts were reported to the council, and by it to the General Synod. Owing to the frequent persecutions that occurred, and to the idea that the cares of a family would interfere with the usefulness of the ministers, they were, for the most part, unmarried. There was no law enjoining celibacy; it was a usage, which gradually fell into desuetude. Towards the end of the 16th century an unmarried priest or bishop was the exception.

The membership of a parish was divided into beginners, that is, children and new converts from Romanism; proficients, or full members; and perfect, or such as were "so established in faith, love, and hope as to be able to enlighten others." From this last class were elected the civil elders, who constituted the advisers of the priest in spiritual things; the cediles, who managed the external affairs of a parish; and the almoners, who administered the poor fund. Turning to worship and ritual, we find that four regular services were held every Sunday; the second one in the morning being "the great service," when a sermon on the Gospels was delivered. In the early service the prophets, and in the afternoon service the apostolic writings, were explained; while the evening was devoted to the  reading of the Bible in order, with instructive remarks. Throughout the summer, the young were taught the Catechism at noon. The Holy Communion was celebrated four times a year, but could be held more frequently. Confirmation took place generally at the time of the bishop's annual visitation. The principal festivals of the ecclesiastical year were observed, and special days for fasting and prayer appointed. There were three degrees of discipline. Private admonition and reproof constituted the first, public reproof and suspension from the Lord's Supper the second, and total exclusion from the Church the third. The official account of the constitution and discipline of the Brethren opens with the following general principles: "There are in Christianity some things essential (essentialia), some things auxiliary (ministerialia), and some things accidental (accidentalia). Essentials are those in which the salvation of man is immediately placed," i.e., cardinal doctrines; "auxiliaries are means of grace, the Word, the keys, and the sacraments; accidentals are the ceremonies and external rites of religion." For a more thorough study of this subject, consult Lasitii Historice de Origine et Rebus Gestis Fratrusn Bohemicorum, Liber Veterus, edited by Comenius in 1649, and containing a full description of the constitution and discipline — a very rare work; J.A. Comenii Ecclesiae Fratrum Bohenorum Episcopi, Historia Fratrum Bohemorum, eorum Ordo et Disciplina Ecclesiastica (republished at Halle in 1702, by Buddaeus); Koppen, Kirchenordnung u. Disciplin der Hussit. B. Kirche in B.u.M. (Leipsic, 1845); Seifferth, Church Constitution of the Boh. and Morav. Brethren, the original Latin, with a Translation and Notes (Lond 1866).

III. Schools and Literary Activity. — The Brethren devoted themselves to education. Their earliest schools were found in the parsonages of the priests. Many of these, instead of families, had classes of young acolytes living with them, whom they trained for the ministry. Next were instituted parochial schools, in which a thorough elementary education was given, including Latin, and which were frequented by large numbers of pupils not connected with the Church. In 1574 a classical school or college, with professor Esrom Riidinger, from Wittenberg, as its rector, was founded at Eibenschttz, in Moravia; soon after another at Meseritsch, in the same country; and in 1585 a third at Lissa, in Poland. Of this last Amos Comenius subsequently became the rector. These colleges were attended by many young nobles, not excepting such as were of the Catholic faith. In 1585 three theological seminaries were opened at Jungbunzlau, in  Bohemia, and at Prerau and Eibenschtitz, in Moravia. The training of acolytes in the parsonages was, however, not given up.

By the side of such efforts to promote education may well be put the literary activity of the Brethren. This was extraordinary, far surpassing that of the national and Roman Catholic churches, and competing even with that of the Reformers. The Unitas Fratrum had four publication offices: three in Bohemia, the first established in 1500, and one in Poland. From these offices, and from several public presses, which were often used, came forth a multitude of publications in Bohemian, Polish, German, and Latin, comprising the Holy Scriptures, hymn-books and catechisms, confessions of faith, exegetical and doctrinal works, books and tracts of a devotional character, polemical writings, and in the time of Comenius schoolbooks, didactic works, and philosophical treatises. In addition to this prolific author, whose works numbered over ninety, the principal writers were Luke of Prague (eighty works), Augusta, Blahoslav (twenty-two works, among them a Bohemian Grammar, still in use), Lorenz, AEneas, Turnovius, Ephraim, Aristo, Rybinski, etc. Their Latin diction was often rough, but their Bohemian style pure, elegant, and forcible. In this respect they reached a standard which has never been surpassed. Excepting the writings of Comenius, the literature of the Brethren was mostly lost in the anti-Reformation, when evangelical books of every kind were committed to the flames.

The most important of those works which have been preserved are the Kraliz Bible (q.v.), the catechisms, the confessions of faith, and the hymnbooks. The first Catechism in Bohemian appeared in 1505; the second, in Bohemian and German, in 1522 republished by Zezschwitz in 1863, translated into English by Schweinitz in 1869; the third, in German, by J. Gyrck, in 1554 and 1555; the fourth, the “Greater Catechism," in Latin, in 1616; the fifth, the "Shorter Catechism," in German and Polish; and the sixth, the Catechism of Comenius, in German, in 1611. Several others are mentioned, of which, however, little is known, except that one of them was a tetraglot — in Greek, Latin, Bohemian, and German — published in 1615. There were twelve different confessions of faith, in Bohemian, German, Latin, and Polish. Gindely counts up thirty- four, but of these the majority were merely new editions of the same Confession. The most important are, the Confession of 1533, printed in German at Wittenberg, preface by Luther, presented to the margrave of Brandenburg-very rare, a copy in the Bohemian Museum at Prague; the Confession of 1535, in Latin, with a historical introduction, presented by a  deputation of bishops and nobles to Ferdinand II at Vienna, found in Niemeyer's Collectio, pages 771-818, published in a revised form at Wittenberg in 1538, together with a Latin version of the Confession of 1533, both in one volume, under the supervision of Luther, who supplied the work with a preface, found in Lydii Waldensia, 2:344, etc.; and the Confession of 1573, in Latin and German, based upon all the previous confessions, giving the matured doctrines of the Church, embracing a historical procemium by Riidinger, and printed at Wittenberg, under the direction of the theological faculty of the university, the Latin Confession found in Lydii Waldensia, 3:95-256, and the German in Kocher, pages 161-256. The hymnology of the Brethren was one of the chief means which they used for spreading the Gospel and promoting spirituality. They gave to the national fondness for song a sacred direction. Their hymns were doctrinal; the German versification was hard, the Bohemian soft and smooth; the tunes, which were printed out in the hymn-books, were in part the old Gregorian, in part borrowed from the German, and in part popular melodies adapted. In spite of their roughness, the German hymns, whose simplicity and devotion, fervor and loving spirit, Herder highly commends, found favor in the churches of the Reformation, while the Bohemian expressed, says Chlumecky, "the deep religious feelings of the people, and were a blossom of the national life, showing forth the Slavonic ideal of a sanctified mind." The first Bohemian Hymn-book appeared in 1504; the second, which was the masterpiece of the Brethren's hymnology, containing 743 hymns, in 1661. This latter passed through a number of editions. The first German Hymn-book was published in 1531; the second in 1543; the third and best in 1566. This was dedicated to Maximilian II. contained 411 hymns, and was frequently republished. Polish hymn-books came out in 1554 and 1569.

IV. Doctrines. — For an exposition of the cardinal views of the Christian faith, as taught by the Brethren, the reader is referred to the works cited below. These doctrines agreed, in the nain, with those of the Reformers. Gindely (R.C.), Zezschwitz (Luth.), and some other writers, try to show that the Unitas Fratrum did not hold to justification by faith. Gindely asserts that its stand-point in this respect was altogether Romish; but this is disproved by the standards, although some of the private and polemical writings of Luke of Prague produce such an impression. In order to promote holy living, the Brethren strongly insisted on good works; but they taught that men are saved by faith, which they never understood in the  Romish sense, and they utterly rejected an opus operatum. In their earlier confessions and catechisms, following Huss, they distinguished between credere de Deo, credere Deo, and credere in Deum.

The first is faith in God's existence; the second faith in his revelation through his Word; the third that faith by which a man appropriates to himself God's grace in Christ, and consecrates himself to Christ's service. Prior to the Reformation, the Brethren accepted the seven sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church; after that, about 1530, they repudiated all but baptism and the Lord's Supper. Up to that time, moreover, their views of baptism were peculiar. They rebaptized converts from the Roman Catholic and national churches, because they deemed both to be idolatrous; and they extended this practice to the young, because they considered personal faith an essential condition of the baptismal covenant. But they did not on this account reject infant baptism. Children were baptized soon after their birth, and thus dedicated to God; then they were rebaptized, after a thorough course of instruction in the Catechism, when old enough to exercise personal faith, and thus brought into full communion with the Church.

This practice, however, was relinquished by a formal act of the General Synod of 1534, and confirmation substituted in the place of rebaptism. Touching the Lord's Supper, the Brethren taught that it is to be received in faith, to be defined in the language of Scripture, and every human explanation of that language to be avoided, except in so far that the spiritual, and not the real, presence is to be held. To this view they remained faithful, and were consequently often misunderstood both by the Catholics and the Utraquists on the one part, and by the Lutherans and the Reformed on the other. The great aim of the Brethren was to discountenance speculations and controversies with regard to this point. Finally, from the earliest times, they rejected purgatory, the adoration of the saints, and the worship of the Virgin Mary. For a further investigation of their doctrinal system, the following works are specially important: Balthasar Lydii Waldensia (tom. 1, Rotterdam, 1616; tom. 2, Dordrecht, 1617), containing a number of their confessions; Kocher, Glaubensbekenntnisse der Bohmn. Briider (Frankfort and Leipsic, 1741); Ehwalt Alte u. neue Lehre der Bohn. Briider (Dantzic, 1756); Kocher, Katechetische Geschichte (Jena, 1768); Niemeyer, Collectio Confessionumn in ecclesiis reformatis publicatarum (Leipsic, 1840); Gindely, Ueber die dogmat. Ansichten d. Bohsma. Briider, in the 13th vol. of the Transactions of the Akademie der Wissenschaften (Vienna, 1854, from the Roman Catholic stand-point); Zezschwitz, Katechismen d. Waldenser u. Bohm. Briider (Erlangen, 1863,  from the ultra-Lutheran stand-point); The Catechism of the Boh. Brethren, translated from the old German by E. de Schweinitz (Bethlehem, 1869); Die Lehrweise d. Bohm. Briider, by Dr. Plitt, in the Theol. Stud. u. Krit. of 1868.

V. Literature. — Until comparatively recent times the only sources of the history of the Bohemian Brethren were the following: A History in Latin, in Eight Books, by J. Lasitius, a Pole, written in 1560-70, but never published — two MSS. extant. at Herrnhut and Gottingen; Historica Narratio de Fratrum Orthodoxorum ecclesiis in Bohemia, Moravia, et Polonia, written between 1570 and 1574, by Joachim Camerarius, published, after his death, at Heidelberg, 1605; Regenvolscii (Adrian Wengersky) Systema historico-chronologicum ecclesiarum Slavonicarum (Utrecht, 1652; Amsterd. 1679,); J.A. Comenii Ratio Disciplince, etc. (Lissa, 1632; Amsterdam, 1660; Halle, 1702). On these sources were based, Cranz, Ancient Hist. of the Brethren (Lond. 1780); Gedenktage d. alten Briiderkirche (Gnadau, 1821); Holmes, Hist. of the Prot. Church of the U.B. (London, 1825, 2 volumes); Rieger, Die alten u. neuen Bohm. Brider (St. Ziillich, 1734); Lochner, Entstehung, etc., d. Briidergenzeine in Bohmen2 u. Mdhren (Nirnb. 1832); Carpzov, Religions-Untersuchung d. Bohnm. Brider (Leipsic, 1742; a bitter enemy of the Brethren); Bost, Hist. of the Boh. and A Morav. Brethren (Lond. 1848). In 1842 a Moravian clergyman discovered, in one of the churches at Lissa, thirteen folio volumes of MSS., which proved to be the long-lost archives of the Bohemian Brethren, and which were purchased by the Moravian Church, and removed to Herrnhut.

They are known and cited as the Lissa Folios. The 14th volume was subsequently discovered at Prague. About the same time other original records were found: Jaffet's Hist. MSS. in the library at Herrnhut, Blahoslaw's MSS. at Prague, etc. These various documents have thrown an entirely new light upon the history of the Bohemian Brethren, and have been used particularly by Professor A. Gindely, a Roman Catholic, who has produced: Geschichte der Bodhmischen Bruder (Prague, 1857, 2 volumes); Quellen zur Geschichte d. B.B. (Vienna, 1859; very important, containing many of the documents of the Lissa Folios); Dekreten d. Bruder Uniatt (Prague, 1865, being the enactments of the General Synod, in the original Bohemian); Rudolph II u. seine Zeit (Prague, 1868, 2 volumes); Gesch. d. 30 jahrigen Krieges (Prague, 1869, 2 volumes); Ueber des J.A. Conenius Leben (Vienna, 1855, in the 15th vol. of the Transactions of the Akademie). Other works based upon the  new sources are: Palacky, Geschichte v. Bhomen (Prague, 1844-67,10 vols.); J. Fiedler, Todtenbuch der Geistlichkeit der Bohm. Bruder (Vienna, 1863, being the official necrology of the ministers of the U.F., in Bohemian; transl. into German in 1872); H. L. Reichel, Geschichte d. alten Briiderkirche (Rothenb. 1850); Croger, Geschichte d. alten Briiderkirche (Gnadau, 1865, 2 volumes; reviewed in The Moravian February 14, 1867); Benham, Origin and Episcopate of the Bohemian Brethren (Lond. 1867); Schweinitz, Moravian Episcopate (Bethlehem, 1865); Schweinitz, Moravian Manual (ibid. 1869); Benham, Life of Comenius (Lond. 1858); Czerwenka, Geschichte d. Evang. Kirche in Bohmen (Bielefeld and Leipsic, 1869 and 1870, 2 volumes, containing the best history of the Brethren that has yet been written); Pescheck, Ref. and Anti-Reformation in Bohemia (Lond. 1845, 2 volumes, from the German). Consult the following periodicals: Lond. Qu. Rev. April 1857, art. 10; Amer. Presb. Qu. July 1858; July 1864, art. 2; Ch. Rev. July 1865; April, 1866; Meth. Qu. Rev. July 1863, page 516; April 1870, page 265; Princeton Rev. 7:77; Christian Exnaminer, 66:1 sq. Compare also the works cited in the body of this article. Sources for the history of the Brethren in Poland are: Jablonski, Hist. Consensus Sandomiriensis (Berlin, 1731); Krasinski, Reformation in Poland (Lond. 1840, 2 volumes); Fischer, Geschichte der Ref. in Polen (Gratz, 1856, 2 volumes). The article in Herzog's Encyklopadie, by Dieckhoff, entitled "Bohmische Bruider," was written without any knowledge of the new sources. It was consequently supplemented by Zezschwitz, in the article "Lukas v. Prag," volume 20, conceived from an ultra-Lutheran point of view. (E. de S.).

## The Fountain-Gate[[@Headword:The Fountain-Gate]]

             (שִׁעִר הָעִיִן, sha'ar ha-A'yi; Sept. πύλη τοῦ Α᾿ϊvν, or αἰνεϊvν, Vulg. porta fontis; A.V. “gate of the fountain”) at Jerusalem was in the first or old wall, along the Valley of Hinnom, south of the Dung-gate, and adjoining the Pool of Siloam (from which it doubtless derived its name), at the mouth of the Tyropaeon (Strong's Harm. and Expos. Append. page 11), SEE JERUSALEM.

## The Renewed Moravian Brethren[[@Headword:The Renewed Moravian Brethren]]

             SO called because they form the resuscitated Church of the Ancient Moravian Brethren (see No. 1, above). They are commonly known as "The Moravians," and "The Moravian Church," inasmuch as they originally came from Moravia. Their official title is "THE UNITED BRETHREN," or Unitas Fratrum.

I. History. — At the close of the Bohemian anti-Reformation (1627), a remnant of the Brethren remained concealed in Bohemia and Moravia, and for many years kept up religious services in secret according to the faith and usages of the fathers. This "hidden seed," as it is generally called, was revealed in 1722, when two families, named Neisser, escaped from Moravia under the guidance of Christian David, “the servant of the Lord,"  and settled on the domain of Berthelsdorf, in Saxony, by the invitation of its young owner, count Nicholas Lewis de Zinzendorf (q.v.). In the course of the next seven years (1722-29), about three hundred other Brethren from Moravia and Bohemia emigrated in little companies to the same place, leaving their houses and lands to be confiscated by the Austrian government, and braving the punishments which were inflicted on those refugees who fell into its hands. They built a town called Herrnhut, or "The Watch of the Lord," to which godly men from various parts of Germany were soon attracted, so that its population rapidly increased. In the midst of this colony the Church of the Brethren was renewed, through the introduction of the ancient discipline, preserved in the Ratio Discipline of Amos Comenius, and through the transfer of the venerable episcopate, which had been kept up with such care, in spem contra spem, even after the ancient Church, as a visible organization, had ceased to exist. This transfer was made at Berlin, March 13, 1735, on which day David Nitschmann was consecrated as the first bishop of the Renewed Church, by Daniel Ernst Jablonski and Christian Sitkovius, the two surviving bishops of the ancient line.

In considering this renewal, two points are important. First, it was not a scheme of man, but altogether a work of God. Hence it bears a reality, and assumes its place in history with an authority, for both of which we would look in vain had a mere human plan been carried out. When Zinzendorf offered his estate as a refuge for the Brethren, he had not the remotest idea of renewing their Church, of which he knew little or nothing. Long before they came to his domain his aims in the interests of the Gospel had received an entirely different direction through the pietism of Spener. Nor did the Moravians themselves, when they began to emigrate, agree to reorganize in some other land. They left the issue of their flight in the hands of God. It was only by degrees that both parties were led to understand the divine will. The failure of his own plans, and other circumstances beyond his control, at last induced Zinzendorf to identify himself with the Brethren, and to labor for the resuscitation of their Church; while the gradual increase of their number at Herrnhut, and the opportunity which they there had to consult and to tell each other of the pious hopes of their fathers, gave them courage to maintain their independence, and to look for a new Unitas Fratrum. Secondly, this renewal involved a union of the German element of pietism with the Slavonic element of the ancient Brethren's Church. Thus arose some principles which were not found in the latter, and  a polity of exclusivism that gave a peculiar tendency for more than a century to the Moravians of the modern period. Zinzendorf was a Lutheran by birth, education, and conviction. He was devoted to the system of Spener, who had been one of his sponsors at his baptism, and especially to the project of establishing "little churches in the Church" (ecclesiolae in ecclesia), in other words, unions or associations of converted persons within a regular parish, for the purpose of personal edification. Hence the great aim which shaped his course was not to interfere with the State Church, but to develop Spener's idea in such a way that the Brethren would constitute, on the one hand, an independent Church, and yet, on the other, be a union of believers within the ecclesiastical establishments of the various countries in which they might settle. Accordingly, wherever they spread, exclusive towns were founded, in which religion controlled not only spiritual, but also social and industrial interests; from which the vices and follies of the world were banished, and where none but Brethren were allowed to hold real estate. That the Church could not, with such a system, enlarge its borders to any great extent in its home-field is evident. That its avowed purpose was to remain small is equally clear. The Moravian element, indeed, which drew its life from the old Unitas Fratrum, struggled for a time to gain free scope and expand. But Zinzendorf's views prevailed in the end, and were consistently carried out. Here and there Moravian villages were planted, as a leaven in Christendom. Such villages were to know nothing of a mere nominal Church-membership. All their inhabitants were to be true followers of Christ; and within their secure retreats they were to cultivate simplicity and lowly-mindedness, to foster holiness and love, to show forth a guileless spirit and a beautiful brotherhood. This constituted Zinzendorf's ideal, which was crowned with wonderful success.

At the time of Zinzendorf's death (1760), the Brethren were established in most of the Protestant states of Germany, in Holland, Great Britain, and North America, and after his decease they spread to Russia, Denmark, and Baden. In all of these countries they were represented by exclusive settlements; in Great Britain and America they had, besides, a number of churches in which their peculiar system did not prevail. The various governments granted them liberal concessions, and made them independent of the State Church; the Parliament of Great Britain, with the full concurrence of the bench of bishops, acknowledged them in 1749 as "an ancient episcopal Church," and passed an act encouraging them to settle in the North American colonies. On the part of the theologians of the day,  however, the same fraternal spirit was not always manifested. Lutheran divines, especially, began to publish bitter attacks upon the Brethren. That these, in this early period of their history, gave just cause of offence, at least to some extent, cannot be denied. In the first place, the controlling influence of the Church was carried to unreasonable extremes, particularly as regards the sacred rights of the marriage relation and of the family. These were interfered with. In order to educate a chosen generation for work in the kingdom of God, the Church Undertook the training of the children almost to the exclusion of parental rule. In the second place, about the year 1745 there began to appear in the churches of Middle Germany a spirit of fanaticism, which spread to some other Moravian' towns on the Continent, and even to Great Britain. Those in America were not affected. It was a fanaticism which grew out of a one-sided view of the relation of believers to Christ. The Brethren spoke of him in a fanciful and antiscriptural style. A new religious phraseology, unwarranted by the Bible, gained the supremacy. The wounds of Jesus, and particularly the wound in his side, were apostrophized in the most extravagant terms. Images were used more sensuous than anything found in the Song of Solomon. Hymns abounded that poured forth puerilities and sentimental nonsense like a flood. This state of affairs, which in Moravian history is designated "the time of sifting," continued for about five years, reaching its climax in 1749. When Zinzendorf and his coadjutors awoke to a sense of the danger which was threatening the Church, they adopted the most energetic measures to bring back the fanatics to the true faith. By the blessing of God they succeeded; the Church was fully restored to sound doctrine and scriptural practice. This is an experience without a parallel in ecclesiastical history, and shows how firmly it was founded upon Christ as its chief corner-stone. This, too, is the sufficient answer to those assaults which were then made upon it by Rimius, by the author of The Moravians Detected, and by a legion of other writers, whose publications have been collected by the librarian of the archives at Herrnhut, where they fill up a large book-case, and are examined as literary curiosities by the visitor of the present day.

The best evidence of the entire suppression of fanaticism is the fact that the Moravian settlements, subsequent to 1750, not only continued to be centres of a widely spread influence for good, but also exercised such influence in an ever-increasing degree throughout the world. However exclusive their system, they were not market-places in which the people stood idle all the day; on the contrary, there were various ways in which  these towns made their power to be felt. They gave a direction to chosen men of God, who became illustrious leaders in other parts of Christendom- as, for instance, to John Wesley, to Schleiermacher, and to Knapp; they were cities of refuge for the pure Gospel during the long reign of rationalism in Germany; they educated in their boarding-schools thousands of young people not connected with the Moravian Church; they originated a vast home missionary work, which will be described below, under the head of "'Diaspora;" and they sent out so large an army of missionaries into heathen lands that by common consent the Moravians are recognised as the standard-bearers in the foreign missionary work of modern times.

Since the beginning of the present century various modifications have been introduced in the Church, especially such as set aside any undue interference on its part with the rights of the family. The General Synod of 1857 undertook a thorough revision of the Constitution, on the basis of local independence in the three "provinces" of the Unitas Fratrum.

II. Moravian Towns. — There still exist fifteen exclusively Moravian settlements on the Continent of Europe, and four in Great Britain. In such settlements the membership is divided into seven classes, called "choirs," from the Greek χορός. These classes are: the married couples, the widowed, the unmarried men, the unmarried women, the boys, the girls, and the little children. Each class is committed to the supervision of an elder. Growing out of this system, we find in every Moravian town a Brethren's, a Sisters', and a Widows' House. In a Brethren's House, unmarried men live together and carry on trades, the profits of which go to support the establishment, as also the enterprises of the Church in general. A Sisters' House is inhabited by unmarried women, who maintain themselves by work suited to their sex. In each house there is a prayer-hall, where daily religious services are held. A common kitchen supplies the inmates with their meals. There is nothing monastic in the principles underlying these establishments, or in the regulations by which they are governed. The inmates are bound by no vow, and can leave at their option. A Widows' House is a home for widows, supplying them with all the comforts which they need at moderate charges, and enabling the poorest to live in a respectable manner. Each house has a spiritual and a temporal superintendent. The settlements in general are governed by two boards: the one, called the 'Elders' Conference," with the senior pastor at its head, attends to the spiritual affairs; the other called the "Board of Overseers," with the "warden" as its president, to financial and municipal matters. On  business of importance, a general meeting of the adult male members is convened. These towns at present count among their inhabitants not a few who are not members of the Moravian Church. Such residents, until recently, were not permitted to own real estate. This fundamental principle is now undergoing a change which will, without doubt, gradually lead to the abolition of the entire system of exclusivism.

III. The American A Moravian Church. — The Moravians settled in Georgia in 1735, but left that colony in 1740, on account of the war which had broken out with Spain. In the following year they founded Bethlehem, and subsequently Nazareth, in Pennsylvania. These towns, together with several smaller settlements, not only adopted exclusive principles, but also instituted a communism of labor. "The lands were the property of the Church, and the farms and various departments of mechanical industry were stocked by it and worked for its benefit. In return, the Church provided the inhabitants with all the necessaries of life. Whoever had private means, retained them. There was no common treasury, such as we find among the primitive Christians." This peculiar social system, which bore the name of" Economy," and which has given rise to the erroneous idea that there prevailed at one time a community of goods among the Moravians, existed for twenty years (1742-62). It accomplished great results. Each member of the "Economy"' was pledged " to devote his time and powers in whatever direction they could be most advantageously applied for the spread of the Gospel." Hence, while there proceeded from the Moravian settlements an unbroken succession of itinerants, who traversed the colonies and the Indian country in every direction, preaching Christ Jesus and him crucified, there labored at home a body of farmers and mechanics in order to maintain this extensive mission. After the abrogation of the Economy," the Church for eighty years continued to uphold its foreign exclusive polity. It is true there were a number of organizations not exclusive, but these were looked upon as of secondary importance, and were characterized as mere "city and country congregations." Consequently the Moravians of the United States could expand as little as their brethren in Europe. From 1844 to 1856, however, the old system was gradually relinquished, and has now ceased to exist. There no longer are any Moravian towns in this country. The American Moravian Church now stands on the same footing as the other Protestant denominations of the land, and is pursuing the same policy of extension. In the last twenty years it has nearly doubled its membership, and flourished in other respects.

IV. The Constitution. — The Unitas Fratrum is distributed into three provinces, the German, British, and American, which are independent in all provincial affairs, but form one organic whole in regard to the fundamental principles of doctrine, discipline, and ritual, as also in carrying on the work of foreign missions. Hence we find a provincial and a general government. Each province has a Provincial Synod, which elects from time to time a board of bishops and other ministers, styled the "Provincial Elders' Conference," to administer the government in the interval between the synods. To this board is committed the power of appointing the ministers to their several parishes. It is responsible to the synod. The Provincial Board of the American Province consists of three members, has its seat at Bethlehem, Pensylvania, and is elected every six years. The American Provincial Synod, composed, of all ordained ministers and of lay delegates elected by the churches, meets triennially; and the province is divided into four districts, in each of which a District Synod is annually held. Every ten or twelve years a General Synod of the whole Unitas Fratrum is convened at Herrnhut, in Saxony. It consists of nine delegates from each province, elected by the Provincial Synod; of representatives of the foreign missions; and of such other members as are entitled to a seat by virtue of their office. This synod elects a board of twelve bishops and other ministers, styled the "Unity's Elders' Conference," which oversees the whole Church in so far as general principles come into question, and superintends the foreign missionary work. At the present time the same Conference acts as the Provincial Board of the German Province. It has its seat in the castle of Berthelsdorf, the former residence of count Zinzendorf.

V. Doctrines. — The Renewed Moravian Church does not, as was the case in the ancient Church of the Brethren, set forth its doctrines in a formal confession of faith, nor does it bind the consciences of its members to any which are not essential to salvation. Such essential doctrines, however, it publishes in its Catechism, its Easter-morning Litany, and its Synodical Results, or code of statutes, drawn up and published by each General Synod. From this latter work, as issued by the Synod of 1869, we quote the following extract:

"The points of doctrine which we deem most essential to salvation are:  "

1. The doctrine of the total depravity of human nature: that there is no health in man, and that the fall absolutely deprived him of the divine image.

2. The doctrine of the love of God the Father, who has 'chosen us in Christ before the foundation of the world,' and 'so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.'

3. The doctrine of the real godhead and the real manhood of Jesus Christ: that God, the Creator of all things, was manifested in the flesh, and has reconciled the world unto himself; and that 'he is before all things, and by him all things consist.'

4. The doctrine of the atonement and satisfaction of Jesus Christ for us: that he 'was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification;' and that in his merits alone we find forgiveness of sins and peace with God.

5. The doctrine of the Holy Ghost, and the operations of his grace: that it is he who works in us the knowledge of sin, faith in Jesus, and the witness that we are children of God.

6. The doctrine of the fruits of faith: that faith must manifest itself as a living and active principle, by a willing obedience to the commandments of God, prompted by love and gratitude to him who died for us.

"In conformity with these fundamental articles of faith, the great theme of our preaching is Jesus Christ, in whom we have the brace of the Lord the love of the Father, and the communion of the Holy Ghost. We regard it as the main calling of the Brethren's Church to proclaim the Lord's death, and to point to him, 'as made of God unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption. "

An authorized manual of doctrine is bishop Spangenberg's Exposition of Christian Doctrine as taught in the Church of the U.B. (Lond. 1784); a systematic work for theologians, although not authorized by the synod, is Evatngelische Glaubenslehre nach Schrift und Efaciahrung (Gotha, 1863), by Dr. Plitt, president of the German theological seminary. See also Zinzendorfs Theologie (Gotha, 1869-74, 3 volumes), by the same author.

VI. Ministry, Ritual, and Usages. — The ministry consists of bishops, presbyters, and deacons. The episcopal office is not provincial, but represents the whole Unitas Fratrum. Hence bishops have an official seat, not merely in the synods of the provinces in which they are stationed, but also in the General Synod; hence, too, they can be appointed only by this body, or by the Unity's Elders' Conference, although the American Province has secured the right of nomination. From all this it is evident that the Moravian episcopacy is not diocesan, and that bishops are not rulers of the Church ex officio, as was the case among the ancient Brethren. They are, however, almost invariably connected with the government by election to the Unity's Elders' Conference, or to the Provincial Boards. The president of the former is always a bishop; the presidents of the latter are, as a general thing, the same. The contrary is the exception. In the episcopate is vested exclusively the power of ordaining; it constitutes, moreover, a body of men whose duty it is to look to the welfare of the entire Unitas Fratrum, in all its provinces and missions, and especially to bear it on their hearts in unceasing prayer before God. At present there are eleven bishops in active service: four in America, two in England, and five in Germany. Of these, seven are members of the governing boards.

The ritual is liturgical in its character. A litany is used every Sunday morning; free prayer is allowed in connection with the litany, and at other times. There are prescribed forms for baptism, the Lord's Supper, confirmation, ordination, marriage, and the burial of the dead; special offices of worship for parochial, boarding, and Sunday schools; liturgical services for the various festivals of the ecclesiastical year, such as Advent, Christmas, Epiphany, etc., which are all observed; and a particular litany for Easter morning, prayed annually at sunrise, and, wherever practicable, amid the graves of them that sleep. Certain days commemorating important events in Moravian history are celebrated, and in those churches in which the division of the membership into "choirs" has been retained, which is the case not only in the exclusive settlements, each class observes an annual day of praise and covenanting, the festival closing with the Holy Communion. Love-feasts are held, in imitation of the ancient "agape," preparatory to the Lord's Supper, and on other occasions. At all liturgical services sacred music forms a prominent feature. Foot-washing (pedilavium) was formerly practiced on certain occasions within the limited circles of some of the " hoirs," but has been universally discontinued since the beginning of the present century. The statement in this Cyclopaedia,  volume 4, page 616, taken from Herzog's Real-Encyklopiadie, 4:630, that the Moravians still practice foot-washing, is therefore incorrect. At one time the lot was employed in the appointment of ministers, and in connection with marriages. Its use in the former case has been greatly restricted, and is left to the discretion of each provincial board. In the American Church it is scarcely ever resorted to, except when a minister receiving an appointment requests its use. Touching marriages by lot, they were abolished, as a rule, by the General Synod of 1818. Since that time they have been almost unknown in the American Province. This usage, which has been so generally misunderstood and ridiculed outside of the Church, was a legitimate result of its controlling influence in all the relations of its members, and constituted, moreover, a wonderful example of the childlike faith of the early Moravians. They gave themselves entirely into the hands of God. He was to lead them in all respects. In view of the loose ideas that prevail in our day with regard to the marriage contract, an intelligent mind cannot but admire such a spirit. That God did not put the confidence of the Brethren to shame is evident from the results of this practice. While it continued, there were fewer unhappy marriages among them than among the same number of people in any other denomination of Christians. This is a well-known fact, which can be established by statistics. Not a single divorce ever occurred. Without going into the details of this usage, we will merely add that any woman was at liberty to reject an offer of marriage even when sanctioned by the lot.

VII. Schools and Missions. — The Moravians have 35 flourishing boarding-schools: 17 in the German Province, 14 in the British, and 4 in the American. They are intended for young people not connected with the Church, and educate annually about 2500 pupils of both sexes. The schools in the American Province are the following: Moravian Seminary for Young Ladies, at Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, founded in 1785 (200 pupils); Nazareth Hall, for boys, at Nazareth, Pennsylvania, founded in 1785 (125 pupils); Linden Hall, at Litiz, Pennyslvania, founded in 1794 (75 pupils); Salem Female Academy, at Salem, N.C., founded in 1802 (200 pupils); Hope Academy, for girls, founded in 1866 (75 pupils). This province, moreover, has a flourishing theological seminary, with a classical department. at Bethlehem. It was founded in 1807; reorganized in 1858. The British theological seminary is located at Fulneck, Yorkshire, England; and the German seminary at Gnadenfeld, in Silesia. The German Province has a prosperous college at Nisky, in Prussia.  The work of foreign missions was begun in 1732, only ten years after the first house had been built at Herrnhut, and when that settlement counted but 600 inhabitants. Leonhard Dober and David Nitschmann were the pioneers, and established the first mission among the negro slaves of St. Thomas. Since that time the home Church has sent out 2171 missionaries, male and female. The following missions proved unsuccessful: Lapland (1734-35); among the Samoyedes, on the Arctic Ocean (1737-38); Ceylon (1738-41); Algiers (1740); Guinea, West Africa (1737-41, and 1767-70); Persia (1747-50); Egypt (1752-83); East Indies (1759-96); among the Calmucks- (1768-1823); Demerara, South America (1835-40). At the present time the work embraces the following fields, called "Mission Provinces:" Greenland (begun 1733); Labrador (1771); Indian Country of North America (1734); St. Thomas and St. John (1732); St. Croix (1732); Jamaica (1754); Antigua (1756); St. Kitt's (1775); Barbadoes (1765); Tabago (1790, renewed in 1827); Mosquito Coast (1848); Surinam (1735); South African Western Province (1736, renewed in 1792); South African Eastern Province (1728); Australia (1849); Thibet (1853). This extensive work is supported by the contributions of the members of the Church, by the interest of funded legacies, by the donations of missionary associations, and by such revenue as the missions themselves can raise through voluntary gifts and the profits accruing from mercantile concerns and trades. The annual cost of the foreign missions is about $250,000. On retiring from the field in consequence of sickness or old age, missionaries are pensioned. Their widows also receive a pension, and their children are educated at the expense of the Church. In other respects they are satisfied with a bare support. The converts are divided into four classes: New People, or applicants for religious instruction; Candidates for Baptism; Baptized Adults; Communicants. The principal missionary associations are the following: The Society of the United Brethren for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen, founded in 1787, at Bethlehem, Pennyslvania; The Wachovia Society of the United Brethren for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen, founded in 1823, at Salem, N.C.; The Brethren's Society for the Furtherance of the Gospel among the Heathen, founded in 1741. in England, supporting the mission in Labrador, and owning "The Harmony," a missionary ship annually sent out to supply the missionaries with the necessaries of life; The London Association in Aid of the Missions of the United Brethren, founded in 1817, and composed chiefly of members not connected with the Moravian Church; The Missionary  Society of Zeist, in Holland, founded in 1793; and The Missionary Union of North Sleswick, founded in 1843.

In addition to these foreign missions, the last General Council inaugurated a work in Bohemia (1870), in the midst of the ancient seats of the Brethren, which promises to be successful. It already numbers four churches.

Independently of the other provinces, the German Province carries on its Diaspora. This is a mission which receives its name from the Greek διασπορά in 1Pe 1:1, and which has for its object the evangelization of the European state churches, without depriving them of their members. Hence missionaries itinerate through Protestant Germany, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Poland, Livonia, Estonia, and some other parts of Russia, and organize "societies" for the purpose of prayer, of expounding the Scriptures, and of edification in general. The members of such societies do not leave the communion of the state churches. In the event of their disestablishment, however, which seems to be approaching, it is more than probable that the members of such "societies" will fully join the Moravian Church, whose membership will thus be increased by thousands. Indeed such a change is now taking place in Switzerland, where, since the adoption of the new ecclesiastical laws (1873), three independent Moravian churches have grown out of the Diaspora.

VIII. Statistics. — German Province: churches, 26, of which 15 are in Moravian towns; ministers, 113; members, 8067. British Province: churches, 38; ministers, 55; members, 5575; number in Sunday-schools, 3994. American Province: churches, 70; ministers, 80; menbers, 16,698; number in Sunday-schools, 8212. Foreign Missions: mission provinces, 16; stations, 114; out-stations, 8; preaching-places, 307; ordained missionaries from Europe and America, 161; female assistants from Europe and America, 172; total of laborers from Europe and America, 333; native ordained missionaries, 41; native assistants, 1575; normal schools, 7; day- schools, 217; scholars, 16,590; teachers (natives), 290; monitors, 623; Sunday-schools, 92; scholars, 13,604; teachers, 944; total number of converts, 79,021. Bohemian Mission: stations, 4; missionaries, 4; members, 259. Diaspora: central stations, 61; ordained missionaries, 33; unordained missionary assistants, 32; members, about 100,000. Totals in home provinces of the Unitas Fratrum: ministers, 248; members, 27,906.  Totals in missions: laborers, 1454; members, 69,473. Totals in Diaspora: laborers, 65; members of societies, 100,000. The Unitas Fratrum therefore has in all 1767 laborers engaged in the work of the Gospel, numbers 110,130 members, and has besides 100,000 souls in its Diaspora societies.

IX. Publications and Literatures. — Periodicals of the German Province: Herrnhut (weekly); Der Bruder Bote (every alternate month); Nachrichten aus der Brudergemeine (monthly); Journal de l'Unite des Freres (monthly); Berigten uit de Heiden-Wereld (monthly); Missionsblatt (monthly); Brudermissionsblatt fur Kinder (monthly). British Province: The Messenger (monthly); The Missionary Reporter (monthly); Periodical Accounts (quarterly). American Province: The Moravian (weekly); Der Bruderbotschqfter (weekly); The Little Missionary (monthly). South African Mission Province: De Bode (monthly); De Kinder-Vriend (monthly). Besides these periodicals, there is an annual published by the Unity's Elders' Conference, entitled The Text-book, containing two passages from the Bible — one from the Old, the other from the New Testament — each with a corresponding stanza from the Hymn-book, and arranged for every day in the year. This annual has appeared since 1731; it is published in German, English, French, Swedish, Esquimau, and Negro- English; and thousands of copies are circulated every year outside of the Moravian Church.

The denominational literature is very extensive. We mention only the most important works: Cranz, Accident and Modern History of the Brethren (Lond. 1780); Holmes, History of the United Brethren (Lond. 1825, 2 volumes); A concise History of the Unitas Fratrum (Lond. 1862); The Moravian Manual (Bethlehem, Pa., 2d ed.), giving a short but complete account of the Church; Bp. Croger, Geschichte der Erneuerten Briidderkirche (Gnadau, 1852-54, 3 volumes); Schrautenbach, Zinzendosf und clie Buiidergemeine (Gnadau, 1851); Burckhardt. Zinzendosf und die Briidergemeine (Gotha, 1865); Memorial Days of the Renewed Church of the Brethren (Lond. 1822); Results of the General Synod of 1869 (Lond. 1870); Plitt, Gemeinei Gottes in ihrem Geist u. ihren Formen (Gotha, 1859). The principal works relating to the foreign missions are: Holmes, Missions of the United Brethren (Lond. 1827); Cranz, Greenland (Lond. 1767, 2 volumes); The Moravians in Greenland (Edinb. 1839); Oldendorp, Mission der Briuder auf den Karaibischen Inseln (Barby. 1777); The Moravians in Jamaica (Lond. 1854); Loskiel, Hist. of Indian Missions (Lond. 1794); Heckewelder, Hist. of the Indian Mission (Phila. 1817);  Moratvitan Missions among the Indians (Lond. 1838); Schweinitz, Life and Times of David Zeisberger (Phila. 1870). Works not emanating from the Church are: Bost, Hist. of the Moravian Brethren (Lond. 1848: an abridged translation. of Hist. de l'Eglise des Freres de Boiheme et Moravie,, Paris, 1844, 2 volumes); Schaaf, Evangelische Brudergemeinde (Leipsic, 1825); Tholuck, Vermischte Schriften, 1:433; Muller, Selbstbekenntnisse merkwurdiger Munner, volume 3; Schroder, Zinzendorf und Herrnhut (Nordhausen, 1857); Bengel, Abriss d. Brudergemeinde (1751; reprinted in 1859; written against the Church); Litiz, Blicke in d. Vergangenheit u. Gegenwart d. B.K. (Leipsic, 1846); Nitzsch, Kirchengeschichtliche Bedeutung d. Brudergemeine (Berlin, 1853); Kurtz, Text-book of Church History (Phila. 1862). This last work contains a chapter on the Moravians, dictated by the personal animosity of' the author to their mission in Livonia, where he resides, and full of gross misstatements, as is shown in The Moravian Manual, pages 11-14. (E. de S.)

## The Spanish Bartole)[[@Headword:The Spanish Bartole)]]

             a Spanish lawyer and prelate, was born at Toledo, July 25, 1512. He studied under Nicolas Cleynants, Fernando Nufiea, and Azpilcueta, and taught canon law at Salamanca. In 1538 he became professor at Oviedo, later judge at Burgos, and counsellor at Grenada. In 1549 he was nominated archbishop of San Domingo; in 1560 bishop of Ciudad Rodrigo; in 1565 bishop of Segovia, and later of Cuenca. He was engaged in several ecclesiastical reforms and offices, and died at Madrid, September 27, 1577, leaving a number of historical and archaeological works, for which see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v. Biog. Universelle, s.v.

## Theandric Operation[[@Headword:Theandric Operation]]

             (θεανδρικὴ ἐνρέγεια), a theological term first used in the 7th century, and intended to express that unity of operation in the two natures and the two wills of our Lord Jesus Christ by which they act as the nature and will of one invisible Person, God and man. It was called a novel term by the Council of Lateran (A.D. 649), and discouraged as such in its 15th canon, which speaks of the “heretics” who had introduced it (τὴν ἐπ᾿ αὐτῆ θεανδρικῇ καινὴν ῥῆσιν), which makes it seem likely that it has been used by some of the Monothelite sect in justification of their principles. John Damascene (De Orthod. Fide, ch. 66) thus explains the term “The Theandric operation, then, signifies this, that when God became man both his human operation was divine, that is, deified, and not void of participation in his divine operation, and his divine operation was not void of participation in his human operation, but either is contemplated in connection with the other. And this manner is styled periphrasis when a person embraces any two things by one expression; for as we call the divided cauterizing and the inflamed incision of a heated knife the same thing, but call the incision one operation and the cauterizing another calling them operations of different natures, the cauterizing of fire and the incision of iron so, also, speaking of one Theandric operation of Christ, we understand of the two natures to be two-the divine that of his-divinity, and the human that of his humanity.”

## Theatines[[@Headword:Theatines]]

             an order of regular clergy 2 the Church of Rome, which was founded in the beginning of the 16th century for the purpose of defeating the efforts towards a reformation outside the Church by reorganizing the clergy, enforcing discipline in the convents, restoring an apostolical simplicity of life, and infusing a religious spirit into the Church by means of the public worship and the sermon. The order was founded by Cajetan of Thiene (thence called Order of the Cajetans.), bishop John Peter Caraffa of Theate, subsequently pope Paul IV who was usually called Chieti (hence Chietines and Paulines) and Boniface of Coile. It was confirmed by Clement VII in 1524 (June 24). Caraffa was its first superior, and his bishopric gave the order its name. The members renounced all worldly possessions, and refused either to labor or beg, depending, instead, on gifts which Providence should confer on them. Their number was never very considerable; but as they were chiefly of noble rank, the reputation of the order was great, and they acquired houses in many cities of Italy, Spain, Poland, and Bavaria. Mazaril conferred on it, in 1644, the only establishment it has been able to secure in France. It attempted missions in Tartary, Georgia, and Circassia, which have been unproductive of results. The garb of the order is the usual black robe of the regular clergy, with the addition of white stockings. See Caraccioli, De Vita Pauli IV; id. Cajetani Thienami, Bonifacii a Colle cum Paulo IV Ord. Clericorum ‘Regul. Fundave unt Vitce (Colossians Ubiorum, 1612); Mirsei Regulke et Constitutiones Clericorum in Cong. Viventium (Antverp. 1638).

Two congregations of Sisters are attached to the Order of Theatines, both of which were founded by the hermit-virgin Ursula Benincasa. She was aided by the Spanish priest Gregory of Navarre, and recommended by Philip Neri, founder of the Oratorians (q.v.). The rule given to the congregation founded by her in 1583 bound the nuns by the three simple vows (to-a common life of poverty, affection, and humility), permitted secular employments, etc., and enforced mortifications of the body. Their number was fixed at sixty-six, because the Virgin Mary was said to have attained the age of so many years. Ursula prophesied a world-wide extension of her order, but it was able to obtain only a single house in Palermo. It was attached to the Theatines by pope Gregory XV.  The second congregation was founded in 1610 at Naples. Its members were to be thirty-six in number in each convent, and they were governed by a more rigid rule than the former class. Complete separation from the world and its affairs was enforced, severe penances and mortifications imposed, and stringent vows exacted. A novitiate of two years was required before entering the order. This congregation secured but one additional house, also in Palermo. Clement IX united the sisterhood with the Theatines. Its garb consists of a white robe, black girdle, blue scapulary and mantle, and black veil for the head and neck (see Helyot, Ausführl. Gesch. aller geistl. u. weltl. Kloster u. Ritter-Orden [Leips. 1753-56], 4:103 sq.). —Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Theatre[[@Headword:Theatre]]

             (θέατρον). The Greek term, like the corresponding English one, denotes the place where dramatic performances are exhibited, and also the scene itself, or spectacle, which is witnessed there.

1. It occurs in the first or local sense in Act 19:29, where it is said that the multitude at Ephesus rushed to the theatre, on the occasion of the excitement stirred up against Paul and his associates by Demetrius, in order to consider what should be done in reference to the charges against them. It may be remarked also (although the word does not occur in the original text or in our English version) that it was in the theatre at Cassarea that Herod Agrippa I gave audience to the Tyrian deputies, and was himself struck with death, because he heard so gladly the impious acclamations of the people (Act 12:21-23). See the remarkable confirmatory account of this event in Josephus (Ant. 19:8, 2). Such a use of the theatre for public assemblies and the transaction of public business, though it was hardly known among the Romans, was a common practice among the Greeks. Thus Valer. Max. 2, 2, “Legati in theatrum, ut est consuetudo Graeci, introducti;” Justin, 22:2, “Veluti reipublicae statum formaturus in theatrum ad contionem vocari jussit;” Corn. Nep. Timol. 4, § 2, “Veniebat in theatrum, cum ibi concilium plebis haberetulr.”

2. The other sense of the term “theatre” occurs in 1Co 4:9, where the Common Version renders, “God hath set forth us the apostles last, as it were appointed to death; for we are made (rather, were made, θέατρον ἐγενήθημεν) a spectacle unto the world, and to angels, and to  men.” Instead of “spectacle” (so also Wycliffe and the Rhemish translators after the Vulgate), some might prefer the more energetic Saxon “gazing- stock,” as in Tyndale, Cranmer, and the Geneva version. But the latter would be now inappropriate, if it includes the idea of scorn or exultation, since the angels look down upon the sufferings of the martyrs with a very different interest. Whether “theatre” denotes more here than to be al object of earnest attention (θέα μα), or refers at the same time to the theatre as the place where criminals were sometimes brought forward for punishment, is not agreed among interpreters. In Heb 12:1, where the writer speaks of our having around us “so great a cloud of witnesses” (τοσοῦτον ἔχοντες περικείμενον ἡμῖν νέφος μαρτύρων), he has in mind, no doubt, the agonistic scene, in which Christians are viewed as running a race, and not the theatre or stage where the eyes of the spectators are fixed on them.

Among the Greeks and the states of Greek origin, the theatre — the proper appropriation of which was for the celebration of the public games — was also used as the place of assembly for every kind of public business; and served for town-hall, senate house, forum, etc., and harangues to the people were there delivered. Indeed, all important public business was transacted in these places-war was declared, peace proclaimed, and criminals were executed. Antiochus Epiphanes introduced public shows and games in Syria (2Ma 4:10-16); and in a later age theatres and amphitheatres were erected by the Herods in Jerusalem and other towns of Syria (Josephus, Ant. 15:8,1; 16:5,1; 19:7,5; War, 1, 21, 8), in which magnificent spectacles were exhibited, principally in honor of the Roman emperors. The remains of Ione of these near Caesarea are still clearly traceable (Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 237). For the history and construction of such buildings in that day, see Smith, Dict. of Class. Antiq. s.v. Wettstein well observes that the very situation of the theatre at Ephesus would not a little promote and increase the tumult in the case of Paul, since, as we find from the accounts of those who have surveyed the situation of the Temple of Diana, it was within view of the theatre. See Ephesus. The shell of this theatre remains unmistakably to be recognised on Mount Priar, though the marble seats have been removed. Its ruins are described by Fellows (Asia Minor, p. 274) as “a wreck of immense grandeur,” and it is said to be the largest of any that have come down to us from ancient days. See Lewin, St. Paul, 2, 328; Wood, Discoveries in Ephesus (Lond. 1877), ch. 4.

## Theatre And The Church[[@Headword:Theatre And The Church]]

             The writers of the early Church were very severe in their invectives against all frequenters of the theatre and public stage plays, and such frequenters were excluded from the privilege of baptism. For this sentiment respecting the theatre there are two reasons assigned:

1. The several sorts of heathen games and plays were instituted upon a religious account, in honor of the gods, and men thought they were doing a grateful thing to them while they were engaged in such exercises. Christians could not, therefore, be present at them as spectators without partaking, in some measure, in the idolatry of them.

2. They were the great nurseries of impurity, where incest and adultery were represented with abominable obscenity. Venus was represented in all her lewd behavior, Mars as an adulterer, and Jupiter no less a prince in his vices than in his kingdom. The theatres, by reason of their impurities, were places of unavoidable temptation, and were considered as the devil's own ground and property. Tertullian (De Spectac. c. 26) says the devil was once asked, when a woman was seized by him in a theatre, how he durst presume to possess a Christian, and he answered, confidently, “I had a right to, for I found her upon my own ground.” In the time of Tertullian, and when the author of the Constitutions drew up his collections, a Christian becoming a spectator of these plays lost his title to Christian communion. Later, when the theatres were purged from idolatry, but not from lewdness, the fathers contented themselves with declaiming against them with sharp invectives. —Bingham, Christ. Antiq. bk. 11:ch. 5, § 9; bk. 16:ch. 11:§ 12.

It is well known, nevertheless, that the dramatic representation of modern Europe grew up under the wing of the Church, and only slowly detached itself from this its earliest shelter. Of the dramatic element which was allowed to find place in its own services we have a curious illustration in the manner in which the offering of the magi was set forth in some churches on the festival of Epiphany (Interim, Denkwüdigkeiten, 5, 316). Three boys, clothed in silk, with golden crowns upon their heads, and each a golden vessel in his hand, represented the wise men of the East. Entering the choir, and advancing towards the altar, they chanted the following strophe:

“O quam diguis celebranda dies ista laudibus,

 In qua Christi genitura propalatur gentibus,

 Pax terrenis nunciatur, gloria ccelestibus;

 Novi partu signum fulget Orientis patria.

Currunt reges Orientis stella sibi perseviu,

 Currunt reges et adorant Deum ad praesepia;

 Tres adorant reges unum, triplex est oblatio.”

During the singing of these verses they gradually approached the altar; there the first lifted up the vessel which he held in his hand, exclaiming,

“Anrum primo,

And the second:

 thus secundo,

 And the third:

myrrham dante tertio.”

Hereupon, the first once more:

“A'urm regumi,

 The second:

 thus celestem,

 And the third:

mori nutat unctio.”

Then one of them pointed with his hand to the star hanging from the roof of the church, and sang in a loud voice, “Hoc signum magni Regis;” and all three proceeded to make their offerings, singing meanwhile the responsal, “Eamus, inquiramus eum, et offeramus ei munera, aurum, thus, et myrrham.” At the conclusion of this responsal, a younger boy lifted up his voice, which was meant to imitate the voice of an angel, from behind the altar, and sang, “Nuntium vobis fero de supernis; Natus est: Christus dominator orbis In Bethlehem Judese; sicenim propheta dixerat ante.” Thereupon the three who represented the kings withdrew into the sacristy; singing, “In Bethlehem natus est Rex coelorum,” etc.

See the Latin monographs on theatrical representations cited by Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 172. SEE MYSTERIES.

## Theberath, Charles S., D.D[[@Headword:Theberath, Charles S., D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in one of the Rhenish provinces of Prussia in 1807. He came to America in 1840, and settled in New York city, where he founded a Sunday-school in the fifteenth ward, from which sprang the Second German Presbyterian Church. He was the first pastor of this church, where he labored successfully several years. Receiving a call from the German Presbyterian Church of Paterson, N.J., he accepted the same, and remained four years. After this he took charge of a missionschool in Albany, N.Y., where he continued until his health failed, when he resigned and removed to Newark, N.J., where he died, October 8, 1882. (W.P.S.)

## Thebes[[@Headword:Thebes]]

             (THEBHE, or DIOSPOLIS MAGNA) was the Greek name of a city of Egypt, and its capital during the empire, called in the Bible No-Amon (נאֹ אָמוֹן; Sept. μερὶς Α᾿μμών; Nah 3:8) or No (נאֹ; Sept. Διόσ  πολις; Jer 46:25; Eze 30:14-16), famous in all ancient history.

I. Name. —The ancient Egyptian names of Thebes are, as usual, two. The civil name, perhaps the more ancient of the two, is Ap-t, Ap-tu (Brugsch, Geographische Inschriften, 1. 177, pl. 36:No. 781-784). Hence the Coptic tape, which shows that the fem. article was in this case transferred in pronunciation, and explains the origin of the classical forms, θήβη, θῆβαι, Thebe, Thebae (see Wilkinson, Modern Egypt and Thebes, 2, 136, 137). The sacred name has two forms, Pt-A men or perhaps Par-Amen (Brugsch, Geographische Inschriften, 1, 177, No. 780), the “house of Amen,” or Jupiter-Ammon, preserved in the Coptic pianoun; and Nru-Amen, the “city of Amen,” the sound of the first part of which has been discovered by M. Chabas, who reads No-Amun (Recherches sur le Nors Egypt. de Thebes, p. 5). The latter form of the sacred name is transcribed in the Hebrew No- Amon, and it is easy to understand the use of its first part Nu, “the city,” instead of the whole, at a time when Thebes was still the most important city of Egypt. This sacred name of Thebes, “the abode of Amon,” the Greeks reproduced in their Diospolis (Διὸς πόλις), especially with the addition the Great (ἡ μεγάλη), denoting that this was the chief seat of Jupiter-Ammon, and distinguishing it from Diospolis the Less (ἡ μικρά). Of the twenty names, or districts, into which Upper Egypt was divided, the fourth in order, ‘proceeding northward from Nubia, was designated in the hieroglyphics as Za'm-the Phathyrite of the Greeks — and Thebes appears as the Za'm-city,” the principal city or metropolis of the Za'm name. In later times the name Za'm was applied in common speech to a particular locality on the western side of Thebes.

II. Position. —The situation of Thebes with reference to the rest of Egypt well suited it to be the capital of the country. Though farther from the Mediterranean and Syria than Memphis, it was more secure from invasion; and if it was far from the northern trade, it commanded the chief line of commerce from the Red Sea. The actual site is, perhaps, the best of any ancient town of Upper Egypt. Here the valley, usually straitened by the mountains on one side, if not on both, opens out into a plain, which is comparatively spacious. On the west bank the mountains leave a broad band of cultivable land; on the east they recede in a semicircle. On the former side they rise to a fine peak about 1200 feet high, unlike the level cliff-like form of the opposite range, a form seldom varied on either bank  throughout the whole valley. The plain between is about two miles long, and has an extreme breadth of about four miles, no large space for a great capital except in Egypt. Through the center of this plain flows the river Nile, usually at this point about half a mile in width, but at the inundation overflowing the plain, especially upon the western bank, for a breadth of two or more miles.

The monuments do not arrest the attention of the traveler as he sails up the river as do the pyramids of Memphis. On the east the massive fort-like winged portal of El-Karnak and the colonnade of El-Uksur (Luxor), and on the west the hills honeycombed with sepulchral grottos, are the most remarkable objects to be seen, but, being far apart, they are singly seen from the river. If viewed from the western mountain, the many monuments of Thebes give an idea of the grandeur of this ancient city, the greatest in the world for magnificence.

III. History.

1. Classical. —The origin of the city is lost in antiquity. Niebuhr is of opinion that Thebes was much older than Memphis, and that “after the center of Egyptian life was transferred to Lower Egypt, Memphis acquired its greatness through the ruin of Thebes” (Lectures on Ancient History, lect. 7). Other authorities assign priority to Memphis. But both cities date from our earliest authentic knowledge of Egyptian history. The first allusion to Thebes in classical literature is the familiar passage of the Iliad (9, 381-385): “Egyptian Thebes, where are vast treasures laid up in the houses; where are a hundred gates, and from each two hundred men go forth with horses and chariots.” Homer-speaking with a poet's license, and not with the accuracy of a statistician--no doubt incorporated into his verse the glowing accounts of the Egyptian capital current in his time. Wilkinson thinks it conclusive against a literal understanding of Homer that no traces of an ancient city-wall can be found at Thebes, and accepts as probable the suggestion of Diodorus Siculus that the “gates” of Homer may have been the propylsea of the temples: “Non centum portas habuisse urbem, sed multa et ingentia templorum vestibula” (1, 45, 7). In the time of Diodorus, the city-wall, if any there was, had already disappeared, and the question of its existence -in Homer's time was in dispute. But, on the other hand, to regard the “gates” of Homer as temple-porches is to make these the barracks of the army, since from these gates the horsemen and chariots issue forth to war. The almost universal custom of walling the cities of  antiquity, and the poet's reference to the gates as pouring forth troops, point strongly to the supposition that the vast area of Thebes was surrounded with a wall having many gates.

Homer's allusion to the treasures of the city, and to the size of its: standing army, numbering 20,000 chariots, shows the early repute of Thebes for wealth and power. Its fame as a great capital had crossed the seawhen Greece was yet in its infancy as a nation. It has been questioned whether Herodotus visited Upper Egypt, but he says, “I went.to Heliopolis and to Thebes, expressly to try whether the priests of those places would agree in their accounts with the priests at Memphis” (2, 3). Afterwards he describes the features of the Nile valley, and the chief points and distances upon the river, as only an eye-witness would be'likely to record them. He informs us that “from Heliopolis to Thebes is nine days'sail up the river, the distance 4800 stadia ... and the distance from the sea inland to Thebes 6120 stadia” (2, 8, 9). In ch. 29 of the same book he states that he ascended the Nile as high as Elephantine. Herodotus, however, gives no particular account of the city, which in his time had lost much of its ancient grandeur. He alludes to the Temple of Jupiter there, with its ram-headed image, and to the fact that goats, never sheep, were offered in sacrifice. In the 1st century before Christ, Diodorus ivisited Thebes, and he devotes several sections of his geniral work to its history and appearance. Though he saw the city when it had sunk to quite secondary importance, he preserves the tradition of its early grandeur-its circuit of 140 stadia, the size of its public edifices, the magnificence of its temples, the number -of its monuments, the dimensions of its private houses, some of them'four or five stories high-all giving it an air of grandeur and beauty surpassing not only all other cities of Egypt, but of the world. Diodorus deplores the spoiling of its buildings and monuments by Cambyses (1, 45, 46). Strabo, who visited Egypt a little later-at about the beginning of the Christian sera-thus describes (17, 816) the city under the name Diospolis: “Vestiges of its magnitude still exist which extend eighty stadia in length. There are a great number of temples, many of which Cambvses mutilated. The spot is at present occupied by villages. One part of it, in which is'the city, lies in Arabia; another is in the country on the other side of the river, where is the Memnonium.” Strabo here makes the Nile the dividing line between Libya and Arabia. The temples of El-Karnak and El-Uksur (Luxor) are on the eastern side of the river, where was probably the main part of the city. Strabo gives the following description of the twin colossi still standing upon the western  plain: “Here are two colossal figures near each other, each consisting of a single stone. One is entire; the upper parts of the other, from the chair, are fallen down the effect, it is said, of an earthquake. It is believed that once a day a noise, as of a slight blow, issues from the part of the statue which remains in the seat, and on its base. When I was at those places, with Elius Gallus, and numerous friends and soldiers about him, I heard a noise at the first hour of the day, but whether proceeding from the base or from the colossus, or produced on purpose by some of those standing around the base, I cannot confidently assert. For, from the uncertainty of the cause, I am inclined to believe anything rather than that stones disposed in that manner could send forth sound” (17, 46). Simple, honest, sceptical Strabo! Eighteen centuries later some travellers have interrogated these same stones as to the ancient mystery of sound; and not at sunrise, but in the glaring noon, the statue has emitted a sharp, clear sound like the ringing of a disk of brass under a sudden concussion. This was produced by a ragged urchin, who, for a few piastres, clambered up the knees of the “vocal Memnon,” and, there effectually concealing himself from observation, struck with a hammer a sonorous stone in the lap of the statue. Wilkinson conjectures that the priests had a secret chamber in the body of the statue, from which they could strike it unobserved at the instant of sunrise, thus producing in the credulous multitude the notion of a supernatural phenomenon. . It is difficult to conceive, however, that such a'trick, performed in open day, could have escaped detection, and -we are therefore left to share the mingled wonder and scepticism of Strabo (see Thompson, Photographic Views of Egypt, Past and Present, p. 156).

Pliny speaks of Thebes in Egypt as known to fame as “a hanging city,” i.e. built upon arches, so that an army could be led forth from beneath the city while the inhabitants above were wholly unconscious of it. He'mentions also that the river flows through the middle of the city. But he questions the story of the arches, because, “if this had really been the case, there is no doubt that Homer would have mentioned it, seeing that he has celebrated the hundred gates of Thebes.” Do not the two stories possibly explain each other? May there not have been near the river-line arched buildings used as barracks, from whose gateways issued forth 20,000 chariots of war?

2. Monumental. —The oldest royal names found at Thebes are those of kings of the Nantef line, who are known to have been there buried, and who are variously assigned to the 9th and the 11th dynasty, but undoubtedly reigned not long before the 12th. The 11th dynasty, which  probably.ruled about half a cbntury, began about 2000 years B.C.; and the 12th was, like it, of Theban kings, according to Manetho, the Egyptian historian. The rise of the city to importance may therefore be dated with the beginning of the first Theban dynasty. With the 12th dynasty it became the capital of Egypt, and continued so for the 200 years of the rule of that line. Of this powerful dynasty the chief monument there is only part of the ancient sanctuary of the great temple of Amen-ra, now called that of El- Karnak. The 12th dynasty was succeeded by the 13th, which appears after a time to have lost the rule of all Egypt by the establishment of a foreign Shepherd dynasty, the 15th to the 17th. Theban kings of the 12th and 13th dynasties continued, however, to govern a limited kingdom, tributary to the Shepherds, until an insurrection arose which led to the conquest of the foreigners and the capture of their capital Zoan by Aahmes, the head of the 18th dynasty and founder of the Egyptian empire, which Was ruled by this and the 19th and 20th dynasties, all of Theban kings, for about 400 years from B.C. cir. 1492. During this period Thebes was the capital of the kingdom, and of an empire of which the northern limit was Mesopotamia, and. the southern a territory upon the Upper Nile; and then, especially by the kings of the 18th and 19th dynasties, those great monuments which make Thebes the most wonderful site in Egypt were founded or excavated. The kings who have left the finest works are Thothmes III and Amenoph III of the 18th dynasty, Sethos I and Rameses II of the 19th, and. Rameses III of the 20th (19th); but throughout the period of the empire the capital was constantly beautified. During the 20th dynasty the high-priests of Amen-ra gained the sovereign power, perhaps corresponding to Mlanetho's 21st dynasty, which he calls of Tanites, and which must in this case be considered as. of Thebans.

They continued to add to the monuments of the capital, though, like the later kings of the empire, their constructions were not of remarkable size. The 22nd dynasty, headed by Sheshenk I, the Shishak of the, Bible, seems still to have treated Thebes as the capital, although they embellished their native city, Bubastis, in the Delta. Under them and the kings of the 23rd, who were evidently of the same line, some additions were made to its temples, but no great independent structures seem to have been raised. The most interesting of these additions is Shishak's list of the countries, cities, and tribes conquered or ruled by him, including the names of those captured from Rehoboam, sculptured in the great temple of ElKarnak. Under the 23rd dynasty a period of dissension began, and lasted for some years until the Ethiopian conquest, and establishment of an Ethiopian dynasty, the 25th,  about B.C. 714 (see De Rougd's interesting paper, Inscr. Hist. du Roi Pianchi-Meriamoun, in the Rev. Arch. N. S. 8:94 sq.). At this time the importance of Thebes must have greatly fallen, but it is probable that the Ethiopians made it their Egyptian capital, for their sculptures found there show that they were careful to add their records to those of the long series of sovereigns who reigned at Thebes. It is at the time of the 25th dynasty. to which we may reasonably assign a duration of fifty years, that Thebes is first mentioned in Scripture, and from this period to that of the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar it is spoken of as one of the chief cities of Egypt, or as No, “the city.” Under the Ethiopians it was no more than a provincial capital; immediately after their rule it was taken twice at least by the Assyrians. Asshur-bani-pal, son and successor of Esar-haddon (Asshur- akh-idanna), who came to the throne about B.C. 667-666, in a first expedition defeated the troops of Tirhakah, and captured the city of Ni'a; a second time he invaded the country, which had revolted, and again captured Ni'a. The exact time of these events has not been fixed, but it is evident that they occurred either at the close of the rule of the Ethiopian dynasty, or early in that of the Saite 26th, when Egypt was governed by the Dodecarchy. Tirhakah and Niku, evidently Necho I, the father of Psammetichus I, are mentioned almost as late as the time of the second expedition. Psammetichus I came to the throne B.C. 664, and therefore it is probable that these events took place not long before, and about the time of, or a little after, his accession. These dates are especially important, as it is probable that the prophet Nahum refers to the first capture when warning Nineveh by the fate of her great rival. But this reference may be to a still earlier capture by the Assyrians, for Esar-haddon conquered Egypt and Ethiopia, though it is not distinctly stated that he captured Thebes (see Rawlinson, Illustrations of Egyptian History, etc. from the Cuneiform. Inscriptions, in the Transactions of the R. S. Lit., 2nd ser. 7:137 sq.). The Saite kings of the 26th dynasty continued to embellish Thebes, which does not seem to have suffered in its monuments from the Assyrians; but when their rule came to an end with the Persian conquest by Cambyses, it evidently endured a far more severe blow. Later Egyptian kings still added to its edifices, and the earlier Greek sovereigns followed their example. The revolt against Ptolemy X Lathyrus, in which Thebes stood a siege of three years, was the final blow to its prosperity.

In subsequent times its population dwelt in small villages, and Thebes no longer existed as a city, and this has been the case ever since; no one of these villages, or those that have succeeded them — for the same sites do not appear in all cases to have been occupied having risen to the importance of a city. At the present time there are two villages on the eastern bank, El-Karnak and El-Uksur (Luxor); the former, which is inconsiderable, near the oldest part of ancient Thebes; the latter, which: is large and the most important place on the site, so as to deserve to be called a small town, lying some distance to the south on the river's bank. Opposite El-Karnak is the ruined village of El-Kurneh, of which the population mainly-inhabit sepulchral grottos; and opposite El-Uksur is the village of El-Ba'irat, which, indeed, is almost beyond the circuit of the monuments of Thebes.

IV. Description. —The plan of the city, as indicated by the principal monuments, was nearly quadrangular, measuring two miles from north to south, and four from east to west. Its four great landmarks still are El- Karnaku and El-Uksur upon the eastern or Arabian side, and El-Kurneh and Medinet-Habf upon the western or Libyan side. There are indications that each of these temples may have been connected with those facing it upon two sides by grand dromoi, lined with sphinxes and other colossal figures. Upon the western bank there was almost a continuous line of temples and public edifices distance of two miles, “rom El-Kurneh to Medinet-Habft, and Wilkinson conjectures that from a point near the latter, perhaps in the line of the colossi, the “Royal Street” ran down to the river, which was crossed by a ferry terminating at El-Uksur on the eastern Side.

As Memphis is remarkable for its vast -necropolis, Thebes surpasses the other cities of Egypt in its temples. The primeval kings of Egypt who ruled at the northern capital were tomb-builders, those who preferred the southern capital were rather temple-builders; and as the works of the former give us the best insight into the characteristics of the national mind, those of the latter tell us the history of the country under its most powerful kings. Thebes is the most thoroughly historical site in Egypt. The temples  are not only covered with the sculptured representations and histories of the chief campaigns of the conquering kings and the similar records of their presents to the shrines, and many other details of historical interest, but they have the advantage of showing, in the case of the most important temple or rather collection of temples, what was added under each dynasty, almost each reign, from the 16th century B.C. to the Roman dominion; and thus they indicate the wealth, the power, and the state of art during the chief part of the period for which Thebes was either the capital or an important city of Egypt. The following is the plan of an Egyptian temple (q.v.) of the age of the empire: An avenue of sphinxes, with, at intervals, pairs of colossal statues of a king, usually seated, led up to its entrance.

The gate was flanked by lofty and broad wings, extending along the whole front of the temple, the long horizontal-lines of which were relieved by tapering obelisks. The first hall was usually hypanthia unless perhaps it had a wooden roof and was surrounded by colonnades. The second, but some-, times the third, was filled with columns in avenues, the central avenue being loftier than the rest, and supporting a raised portion of the roof. Beyond were the naos and various chambers, all smaller than the court or courts and the hall. This plan was not greatly varied in the Theban temples of which the remains are sufficient for us to form an opinion. The great temple of El Karnak, dedicated to Amen-ra, the chief god of Thebes, was founded at least as early as the time of the12th dynasty, but is mainly of the age of the 18th and 19th. The first winged portal, which is more than 360 feet wide, forms the front of a court 329 feet wide, and 275 long. Outside the eastern portion of the south wall of this. court is sculptured the famous list of the dominions and conquests of Sheshenk I, the Shishak of Scripture, which has already been mentioned. SEE SHISHAK.

The great hall of columns is immediately beyond the court, and is of the same width, but 170 feet long it was supported by 134 columns, the loftiest of which, forming the central avenue, are nearly seventy feet high, and about twelve in diameter; the rest more than forty feet high, and about nine in diameter. This forest of columns produces a singularly grand effect. The external sculptures commemorate the wars of Sethos I and his son Rameses II, mainly in Syria. Beyond the great hall are many ruined chambers, and two great obelisks standing in their places amid a heap of ruins. More than a mile to the south-west of the temple-of El Karnak is that of El-Uksur (Luxor), a smaller but still gigantic edifice of the same character and age, on the bank of the Nile, and having within and partly around it the houses of the modern village. On the western bank are three temples of  importance, a small one of Sethos I, the beautiful Rameseum ,of Rameses II, commonly called the Memnonium, and the stately temple of Rameses II, the Rameseum of Medinet-Habt, extending in this order towards the south. Between the Rameseum of Rameses II and that of Rameses III was a temple raised by Amenoph III, of which scarcely any remains are now standing, except the two great colossi, the Vocal Memnon and its fellow, monoliths about forty-seven feet high, exclusive of the pedestals, which have a height of about twelve feet. They represented Amenoph, and were part of the dromos which led to his temple. Besides these temples of Western Thebes, the desert tract beneath the mountain bordering the cultivable land and the lower elevations of the mountain, in addition to almost countless mummy-pits, are covered with built tombs, and honey- combed with sepulchral grottos, which, in their beautiful paintings, tell us the lives of the former occupants, or represent the mystical subjects of the soul's existence after death. The latter are almost exclusively the decorations of the Tombs of the Kings, which are excavated in two remote valleys behind the mountain. These tombs are generally very deep galleries, and are remarkable for the extreme delicacy of their paintings, which; like most of the historical records of Thebes, have suffered more at the hands of civilized barbarians in this century than from the effects of time. For fuller descriptions, see the numerous histories and books of travel on Egypt. The ruins have been copiously depicted photographically. SEE EGYPT.

V. Biblical Notices. —The most remarkable of the notices of Thebes in the Bible is that in Nahum, where the prophet warns Nineveh by her rival's overthrow. “Art thou better than No-Amon, that was situate among the rivers, [that had] the waters round about it, whose rampart [was] the sea, [and] her wall [was] from the sea?” Notwithstanding her natural as well as political strength, Thebes had been sacked and the people carried captive (3, 8-10). The description of the city applies remarkably to Thebes, which alone of all the cities of Egypt was built on both sides of the river, here twice called, as now by the modern inhabitants, the sea. The prophecy that it should be rent asunder” (Eze 30:16) probably primarily refers to its breaking-up or capture; but the traveler can scarcely doubt a second and more literal sense when he looks upon its vast torn and heaped-up ruins.  The other notices are in Eze 14:15, and in Jer 46:25. See No.

## Thebes, The Seven Heroes Of[[@Headword:Thebes, The Seven Heroes Of]]

             in Grecian mythology, were a body of chieftains who engaged in the first Theban war. Jocaste, the mother of AEdipus, was inadvertently guilty of incest with her son, and bore him the twin-brothers Eteocles and Polynices, though some authorities name Eurygania as their mother. After the discovery of his incest AEdipus was banished, and fled leaving his curse upon his children. Eteocles and Polynices agreed to reign alternately, a year at a time, and the former ascended the throne by virtue of seniority; but when the year expired he refused to make way for his brother, who thereupon fled to Adrastus, king of Argos, bearing with him the necklace and mantle of Harmpnia, both of which were covered with jewels and were exceedingly precious, having been made by Vulcan, but which were to bring misfortune to the person into whose possession they might come. Polynices reached Argos at night, and met Tydeus, who had just arrived from Etolia, and the two became involved in a quarrel, which Adrastus settled. An ancient oracle having commanded that the daughters of Adrastus should wed a lion and a boar, they were given to the visitors because they bore corresponding devices-Polynices a lion's, and Tydeus a boar's head. Adrea became the wife of the former, and Deipyle of the latter. Adrastus promised to recover the lost thrones for his sons-in-law, and directed his first efforts towards Thebes in behalf of Polynices the war of the Seven against Thebes (see uEschylus).

The leading heroes of the Argives having been summoned, Amphiaraus, Capaneus, Hippomedon, and Parthenopeeus joined the expedition, thus completing the list of seven. Amphiaraus, a favorite of Jupiter and Apollo, a seer, foresaw the failure of the attempt, and endeavored to avoid participating in it by concealing himself, but was discovered; and compelled by his sense of honor to unite with his comrades. In the forest of Nemea the heroes suffered much from thirst; but, meeting with Hypsipyle of Lemnos, the nurse of young Opheltes, son of Lycurgus, they induced her to direct them to a spring, which she did to the harm of Opheltes, however, whom a serpent destroyed in her absence. Funeral games were held in honor of the dead, but the gods had decreed the ruin of the expedition. Tydeus was sent in advance to negotiate, but without other result than that fifty men surprised him while returning, whom, with the single exception of Maon, he slew with his own hand. The heroes then took possession of all approaches to  the city, and established themselves before the several gates. The seer Tiresias warned the Thebans that the city must fall, unless some one should voluntarily sacrifice himself for its deliverance. Menoeceus accordingly threw himself headlong from the wall, and the war began. Capaneus had already mounted the wall when Jupiter's lightning smote him to the ground, and with him fortune fled. Eteocles and Polvnices slew each other in single combat. Five of the seven heroes fell. Amphiaraus fled, and was received by Jupiter into the earth, while Adrastus escaped on his divine steed Arion, the offspring of Neptune. The victorious Thebans forbade the burial of their enemies on pain of death; and Creon caused Antigone, who had performed the last rites of love on the remains of her brother Polynices, to be buried alive. The humane intercession of Theseus, king of Athens, ultimately induced the Thebans to withdraw their cruel prohibition. Adrastus subsequently took up the sword again, and led the sons of the heroes, the so-called Epigoni, in a victorious campaign against Thebes.

## Thebez[[@Headword:Thebez]]

             (Heb. Tebets', תֵּבֵוֹ, conspicuous; Sept θὴβης [v.r. θαίβαις] and θαμασί; Vulg. Thebes), a place mentioned in the Bible only as the scene of tihe death of the usurper Abimelech (Jdg 9:50). After suffocating a thousand of the Shechemites in the hold of Baal-berith by the smoke of green wood, he went off with his band to Thebez, whither, no doubt, the rumor of his inhumanity had preceded him. The town was soon taken, all but one tower, into which the people of the place crowded, and which was strong enough to hold out. To this he forced his way, and was about to repeat the barbarous stratagem, which had succeeded so well at Shechem, when a fragment of millstone descended and put an end to his turbulent career. The story was well known in Israel, and gave the point to a familiar maxim in the camp (2Sa 11:21). The geographical position of Thebez is not stated; but the narrative leaves the impression that it was not far distant from Shechem. Eusebius defines its position with his usual minuteness. He says, “It is in the borders of Neapolis… at the thirteenth mile on the road to Scythopolis” (Onooast. s.v. “Thebes” ). Just about the distance indicated, on the line of the old Roman highway, is the modern village of Tubas, in which it is not difficult to recognize the Thebez of Scripture. It was known to Hap-Parchi in the 13th century (Zunz, Benjaminz, 2, 426), and is mentioned occasionally by later travelers (Schwarz, Palest. p. 152). It stands on a hillside at the northern end of a  plain surrounded by rocky mountains. The hill is skirted by fine olive groves, and the whole environs bear the marks of industry and prosperity. It is defective, however, in water; so that the inhabitants are dependent on the rain-water they keep in cisterns, and when this supply fails, they must bring it from a stream, Fari'a, an hour distant (Robinson, Bibl. Res. 3, 305). Some large hewn stones in the walls of the modern houses, and a number of deep wells and cisterns in and around the village, are the only traces of antiquity now remaining (Van de Velde, Travels, 2, 335; Porter, Handbook, p. 348).

## Thebez (2)[[@Headword:Thebez (2)]]

             The modern Tabus is described in the Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey (2:229, 247).

## Thebutes, or Thebuthis[[@Headword:Thebutes, or Thebuthis]]

             All that is known of this person is the statement that Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. 4:22) quotes from Hegesippus to the effect that Thebutes made a beginning secretly to corrupt the Church of Jerusalem, because Simon the son of Cleophas was appointed to be bishop of the Christians of that city instead of himself.

## Theca[[@Headword:Theca]]

             (θήκη, a case), or BURSE (bursa, a “purse” ), a case-cover containing the corporals, and presented to the priest at mass. It was of square form, made usually of rich stuff, and lined like a bag with fine linen or silk; on the upper side was a sacred image or cross. One of the 15th century, of canvas, remains at Hessett, painted with the Veronica (q.v.) and the Holy Lamb.

## Thecla[[@Headword:Thecla]]

             the name of several saints of the Romish Church.

1. The daughter of people living at Iconium, who is occasionally mentioned by Epiphanius, Ambrose, Augustine, and other Church fathers, and of whom tradition relates that she was converted through the preaching of Paul in the house of Onesiphorus, and that she thereupon renounced all worldly possessions and separated from her betrothed, a wealthy man named Thamyris. No arguments or appeals could change her course. Both she and Paul were imprisoned; and she was condemned to death by fire, while the apostle was banished. A cloud, however, extinguished the fire, and Thecla, uninjured, accompanied Paul to Antioch. To escape the persistency of a second wooer of noble rank named Alexander, she took refuge with a noble widow whose name was Tryphaena. Again she was  condemned to die, this time by the teeth of wild beasts, and again she escaped uninjured, the animals crouching at her feet or being killed by thunder-bolts. She now assumed male clothing and followed Paul to Myra, where she received direction from him to teach the heathen the truths of Christianity. She thereupon returned to her native city, and afterwards went to Seleucia, where she succeeded in converting many people and in healing large numbers of the sick. A shining cloud accompanied her as she went about. When she died, many miracles were wrought at her grave and by her relics. Her day is variously given-May 18 or 19, or Sept. 23 or 24. A treatise entitled Περίοδοι Pauli et Thelae, probably the work of an Asiatic presbyter, was in circulation as early as the 3rd century. It mentioned her missionary tours in the company of Paul, and her miracles; recommended the celibate state, and asserted its holiness; inculcated the duty of praying for the dead, and belief in purgatory; and was branded as Apocryphal by Tertullian, Jerome, and pope Gelasius I. See Acta S.S. 23. Sept. (Antw. 1757), 6:546-568; Baronins, Annal. Eccl. (Colossians Agrip. 1609), 1, 398-402; Unschuld. Nachr. v, alten u. neuen theolog. Sachen (Leips. 1702), p. 136 sq. SEE THECLA AND PAUL (Acts of).

2. A reputed native of Sicily of noble rank. She was instructed in Christianity by her mother, Isidora, aided many persecuted Christians, and gave burial to the bodies of many martyrs, which she had purchased. For this she was brought to trial, but escaped the threatening danger. Afterwards she instructed many heathen people, built a number of churches, and endowed with a rich income a bishopric which she founded. Jan. 10 is consecrated to her memory.

3. An alleged martyr, the associate of Mariana, Martha, Mary, and Enneis. She is reported to have lived near Asa, in Persia. A priest named Paul endeavored to persuade these virgins to renounce the Christian faith, and when they refused he caused them to be terribly scourged and then beheaded. Soon afterwards be became himself the victim of a violent death, as they had predicted. The memory of these martyrs is honored on June 9. See Asführl. Heil. —Lexikon (Cologne and Frankf. 1719), p. 2132 sq. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Thecla And Paul[[@Headword:Thecla And Paul]]

             Acts of. The name Thecla, which nowhere occurs in Scripture, occupies an important position in the Apocryphal writings of the New Test., because it  is closely connected with that of the apostle Paul. Under the title Acta Pauli et Thecle (first edited by Grabe, in his Spicilegium SS. PP. [Oxon. 1698; 2nd ed. 1700]; then by Jones, A New and Full Method of Settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament [Lend. 1726]; and finally by Tischendorf, in his Acta Apostt. Apocrypha [Lips. 1851], and Wright, Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles [Syriac and English, Lond. 1871, 2 vols.]), we have an Apocryphal work extant which has furnished rich material for the so-called “Thecla Legend.”

I. The Contents of it are as follows: “When Paul had fled from Antioch and went up to Iconiumn, he was accompanied by Jeiumas and Hernmouenes two men full of hypocrisy, who pretended unto Paul as though they loved him, but they loved him not. On the way Paul made the oracles of the Lord sweet unto them, teaching them the great things of Christ. Onesiphorus, having heard that Paul was coming to Iconium, went out to meet him, that he might bring him into his house. Now he had not seen Paul in the flesh, but Titus had told of him. He therefore went along the road to Lystra. looking for Paul among them that passed by. And when he saw Paul, he beheld a man small in stature, bald-headed, of a good complexion, with eyebrows meeting, and a countenance full of grace. For sometimes he appeared like a man, and sometimes he had, as it were, the face of an angel. And when Paul saw Oniesiphorns, he smiled upon him. But Oniesiphorus said, ‘Hail, servant of the blessed God.' And Paul answered, ‘Grace be with thee, and with thy house.' But Demas and Hermogenes were full of wrath and hypocrisy.

“When Paul had come into the house of Ouesiphorus, there was great joy, and they bowed their knees and brake bread. And Paul preached unto them the word, saying,

“‘Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God. Blessed are they that bear rule over themselves, for God shall speak with them.

“‘Blessed are they that have kept chaste their flesh, for they shall become the temple of God.

“‘Blessed are they that have kept themselves apart from this world, for they shall be called righteous.

“‘Blessed are they that have wives as though they had none, for they shall have God as their portion.  “‘Blessed are they which retain the fear of God, for they shall become as the angels of God.

“‘Blessed are they that have kept the baptism, for they shall have rest with the Father and the Son.

“‘Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy, and shall not behold the bitter day of judgment.

“‘Blessed are the bodies of the virgins, for they shall be well pleasing unto God, and they shall not lose the reward of their chastity.

“‘Blessed are they that tremble at the words of God, for they shall receive consolation.

“‘Blessed are they that are partakers of the wisdom of Jesus Christ, for they shall be called the sons of the Most High God.

“Blessed are they who, for the love of Christ, are departed from conformity to this world, for they shall judge the angels, and shall be blessed at the right hand of the Father, and they shall have rest for ever and ever.'

“While Paul was thus speaking, there was a certain virgin, called Thecla, the daughter of Theacleis, betrothed to a man whose name was Thamuyris; and she sat at a window which was close by, listening attentively to Paul's discourse concerning virginity and prayer; and she gave earliest heed to the ‘things which were spoken, rejoicing with all her heart. And when she saw many women going in to hear Paul, she, also, had an eager desire that she might be deemed worthy to stand in his presence and hear the word of Christ.

“For three days and three night4thecla listened to the apostle, till her mother sent for Thamyris to see whether he could induce her to come home. His endeavors were in vain, for Thecla only listened to the things, which were spoken by Paul. Then Thamyris started up, and went forth into the street of the city, watching those that went in and came out of the house of Onesiphorus. And he saw two men striving bitterly one with the other, and he said, ‘Tell me, I pray you, who is this that leadeth astray the souls of young men, and  deceiveth virgins, so that they do not marry, but remain as they are? I promise to give you money, for I am one of the chief men of this city.' The men, who were Demas and Hermogenes, said unto him, ‘Who indeed he is we know nor, but this we know, that he deprives young men of wives, and maidens of husbands, saying unto them that in nmo other way can they have a resurrection than by not polluting the flesh, and by keeping it chaste.' At the supper which Thamyris gave them in his house, they advised him to bring the apostle before the governor, charging him with persuading the multitudes to embrace this new doctrine of the Christians. The governor, they said, will destroy him, and thou wilt have Thecla to thy wife; and we will teach thee that the resurrection which this man speaks of has taken place already, for we rose again in our children, and we rose again when we came to the knowledge of the true God.

“The next morning Paul was brought before the governor by Thamiyris, who acted in accordance with the words of his advisers. The governor said to Paul, ‘Who art thou, and what dost thou teach? for they bring no small accusation against thee.' But Paul, lifting up his voice, said, ‘Forasmuch as I am this day examined concerning what I teach, listen, O governor! The living God, the God of retributions, he who is a jealous God, a God who is in need of nothing (ἀπροσδεής), a God who taketh thought for the salvation of men, hath sent me to reclaim them from uncleanness and corruption, from all pleasure, and from death, so that they may not sin. Wherefore, also, God sent his own Son, whom I preach unto you, teaching men that they should rest their hope on him, who alone hath had compassion upon a world that was led astray, that men may no longer be under condemnation, but that they may have faith, and the fear of God, and the knowledge of holiness, and the love of the truth. If I therefore teach that which has been revealed to me by God, wherein do I go astray?' When the governor had heard this, he ordered Paul to be bound and he put in ward, saying, ‘When I shall be at leisure, I will hear him more attentively.'

“Thecla, having bribed the keeper of the door, was admitted by night to the imprisoned apostle, and sitting at his feet, heard the wonderful works of God. When she was found there, she was  brought before the governor together with Paul; the latter was scourged and cast out of the city, but Thecla was ordered to be burned. Soon a pile was erected, and after she had made the sign of the cross she went up thereon, and the wood was kindled. When the fire was blazing, a heavy rain and hail came down from heaven, and thus Thecla was saved.

“Now Paul was fasting with Onesiphorois and his wife and children, in a new tomb, on the way from Iconium to Japhoue. After several days, when the children were hungered, Paul took off his cloak and gave it to one of the children, saying, ‘Go, my child, and buy bread.' On the way the boy met Thecla, who was looking for Paul. When she was brought to him, he thanked God for her safe deliverance. Thecla said to Paul, ‘I will cut my hair, and will follow thee whithersoever thou goest.' But he answered, ‘This is a shameless age, and thou art very fair. I fear lest another temptation came upon thee worse than the first, and that thou withstand it not.' Thecla said, Only make me a partaker of the seal that is in Christ, and temptation shall not touch me.' But Paul answered, ‘O Thecla, wait with patience and thou shalt possess the water.'

And Paul sent away Onesiphorus and all his house unto Iconium, and went to Antioch with Thecla. As they were entering into thine city; a certain ruler of the Syrians, Alexander by name, seeing Thecla, clave unto her in love, and would have given gifts and presents unto Paul. But he said, ‘I know not the woman of whom thou speakest, nor is she mine.' At this Alexander embraced her in the street of the city. But as Thecla would not suffer this, she took hold of Alexander and tore his cloak and pulled off his crown. Ashamed of what had happened, Alexander had her brought before the governor, who condemned her to t he wild beasts, allowing her, however, at her own request that she might remain pure until she should fight with the wild beasts-to stay with a certain woman named Tryphsena.

“When the games were exhibited, they bound Thecla to a fierce lioness, but the beast licked her feet.' And the people marveled greatly. And the title of her accusation was ‘Sacrilegious.' And the women cried out, ‘An impious sentence has been passed in this city.' After the show, Tryphienia again received Thecla, for her  daughter Falconilla was dead, and had said to her mother, in a dream, ‘Mother, take this stranger, Thecla, in my stead, and she will pray for me, that I may be transferred to the place of the just.' And Thecla prayed, saying, ‘O Lord God, who hast made the heaven and the earth, Son of the Most High, Lord Jesus Christ, grant unto this woman according to her desire, that her daughter Falconilla may live forever.'

“The next day Alexander came again to fetch Thecla. But Trypusena cried aloud, so that Alexander fled away. And straightway the governor sent an order that Thecla should be brought. And Tryphsena, holding her by the hand, it, said, ‘My daughter Falconilla, indeed, I took to the tomb: and thee, Thecla, I am taking to the wild beasts.' And Thecla wept very-bitterly and said, ‘O Lord God, in whom I have believed, to whom I have fled for refuge, thou who didst deliver me from the fire, do thou grant a recompense to Tryphsena, who hath had compassion on thy servant, and hath kept me pure.' When Thecla had been taken out of the hands of Tryphena, they stripped her of her garments, and a girdle was given to her, and she was thrown into the theatre. And lions, and bears, and a savage lioness were let loose against her. But instead of killing Thecla, they tore one another. While she was praying, many more wild beasts were sent in. And when she had ended her prayer, she turned and saw a trench filled with water, and she said, ‘Now it is time for me to wash myself.' And she cast herself in, saying, ‘In the name of Jesus Christ, I baptize myself on the last day.' And the seals saw the glare of the fire of lightning, and floated about dead. And as she stood naked, there was a fiery cloud round about her, so that neither was she seen naked; nor could the wild beasts do her hurt. And when other beasts were cast into the theatre, the women wept again. And some of them threw down sweet-smelling herbs, so that there was an abundance of perfumes. And all the wild beasts, even as though they had been restrained by sleep, touched her not. When fierce bulls were let loose, Tryphsena fainted, and the multitude cried, ‘Queen Tryphsena is dead.' Alexander now asked the governor to release Thecla, saying, ‘If Ceasar hear of these things, he will destroy the city, because his kinswoman queen Tryphaenua had died beside the theatre.' And the governor called for Thecla out of the midst of the  wild beasts, and said unto her, ‘Who art thou? and what hast thou about thee, that none of the wild beasts toucheth thee?' And she said, ‘I, indeed, am a servant of the living God; and as to what there is about me, I have believed in the Son of God, in whom God is well pleased. Therefore hath not one of the beasts touched me. For he alone is the way of salvation, and the ground of immortal life. He is at refuge to the tempest-tossed, a solace to the afflicted, a shelter to them that are in despair; and, once for all, whosoever shall not believe in him shall not live eternally. When she was released, she stayed with Tryphsena eight days. And she instructed her in the word of God, so that most, even of the maid-servants, believed. But Thecla desired to see Paul. When she was told that he was staying at Myra of Lycia, she went there, being dressed in man's attire. And when she saw him, she said, ‘I have received the baptism, O Paul! For he that wrought together with thee for the gospel hath been effectual also with me for the baptism.' When Thecla told him that she was going to Iconium, Paul said to her, ‘Go and teach the word of God.'

“In Iconium she went into the house of Onesiphorus where Christ made the light first to shine upon her.' After having tried in vain to convert her mother — Thamyris having died in the meantime she went to Seleucia, where she enlightened many by the word of God, and where she died in peace.”

This is the legend of Thecla. How great or how little the substratum of truth in it, we cannot decide. The fact is that churches were built in honor of the “beata virgo martyr Thecla;” in prose and rhyme the deeds of our heroine were celebrated; and Sept. 24 is commemorated in her honor.

II. Date of Compilation. —We have a long line of Greek and Latin fathers by whom Thecla is mentioned in such a manner as to lead to the supposition that whatever is said of her is the same as we find it in the Acta Pauli et Theelce. As one writer has followed the other, our examination will be confined to the earliest testimony to that of Tertullian. In his treatise De. Baptismo, ch. 17 we read: “But if any defend those things which have been rashly ascribed to Paul, under the example of Thecla, so as to give license to women to teach and baptize, let them know that the presbyter in Asia, who compiled the account, as it were, under the title of Paul, accumulating of his own store, being convicted of what he had done, and  confessing that he had done it out of love to Paul, was removed from his place. For how could it seem probable that he who would not give any firm permission to a woman to learn should grant to a female power to teach and baptize?” It has been taken for granted that-the meaning is that a presbyter of Asia, somewhere towards the end of the 1st century, compiled a history of Paul and Thecla and, instead of publishing it as a true narrative, either in his own name or with any name at all, but in good faith, published it falsely, and therefore wickedly, under the name of Paul, as though he were himself the writer; that he was convicted of his forgery, and deposed from the priesthood. This account has been marvelously dressed up, and some of its advocates have ventured to say that a Montanist writer of the name of Leucius was the real author of these Acts (Tillemont, Memoires, 2, 446). Jerome (Cataloguus Script. Eccl. c. 7), commenting upon the passage of Tertullian, says that the presbyter who wrote the history of Paul and Thecla was deposed for what he had done by John (apud Johannem) the apostle. That Jerome relied upon Tertullian is evident from his statement; but his conduct in fathering the story of the deposition by John upon Tertullian is inexcusable, because no such statement was made by Tertullian. On the other hand, we must bear in mind that, according to tradition, alleged or real events which occurred in Asia Minor and touched upon the life of the Church have been brought in connection with John. Thus he is said to have confuted Cerinthus, Ebion, Marcion, and even Basilides. Even miracles which were first narrated by disciples of the apostles, or by bishops of Asia Minor were afterwards referred to him (comp. Patr. —Apost. Opp. ed. Gebhardt, Harnack, Zahn, 1 [ed. 1], 194). Our passage is a proof of this. Tertullian speaks of an Asiatic presbyter, Jerome adds apud Johannem, and his copyists write, instead of “apud Johannem,” a Johanne.

Now, putting aside Jerome's commentary and the other patristic testimonies, which will be found collected at great length in Baronius, Tillemont, and Schlau, we see from the external evidence as contained in Tertullian's passage that the Acts of Paul and Thecla must have existed in his time. To this external evidence of antiquity we have the internal, furnished by the Acts themselves. ‘This will determine nothing as to who was their author, but will be valuable in helping us to assign an approximate date. An indication of the early origin of a Christian document is the absence of quotations from the New Test. True, this is only a negative evidence; but when found in connection with sayings attributed to  Christ or the apostles which are not found in the canonical Scriptures, it tends to establish antiquity. Now there is not a single direct citation from the New Test.; and when Paul preaches upon the Beatitudes words are boldly put into his mouth which are not in Scripture.

This was becoming enough in a contemporary of the apostle, or in a writer of the 2nd century who had received them through a not far distant tradition; but it would have been unbecoming in a writer of the 3rd century, and, speaking in general terms, it was what writers of the 3rd century seldom did. Thus we could quote Clement of Rome, Iguatius of Antioch, Justin Martyr, Polycarp, besides referring to the art. SEE SAYINGS, TRADITIONAL, OF CHRIST, that such has been the case; and it is therefore not a matter for surprise, but it is exactly what we might be prepared to expect, if the Acts of Thecla are, in the main, a document of the 2nd century, that the writer should represent Paul not only as saying “Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy,” but “Blessed are they which have kept the baptism, for they shall have rest with the Father and the Son.”

A further indication of the comparatively early date of this composition is its teaching the salvability of departed heathens. All early Christendom believed in the efficacy of prayers for those who had fallen asleep in the faith of Christ. But it was only the first two centuries which taught that prayer was of avail for such as had died without baptism and without the knowledge of Christ on earth. Thus we have a parallel case to the prayer of Thecla for Falconilla in the Passio Perpetuae et Felicitatis, where we read that Perpetua, through her prayers, saved her brother Dinocrates, who had died without baptism, “from the dark place;” and from the place of sufferings he comes to the place full of light. Augustine, commenting upon this (De Origine Animae, 1, 10; 3, 9), says that Dinocrates must have been baptized, and that he was suffering in consequence of some childish fault committed after baptism. But Augustine's statement that the boy was baptized is arbitrary, because best suited to his own theory. But is it in the least likely that Dinocrates had been baptized, when Perpetua herself was unbaptized, and only received baptism shortly before her martyrdom? Now in the 2nd century it was not an uncommon thing to pray for non-Christians; but after the 2nd century, not only do we lose all trace of prayer for non-Christians who had departed this life, but we find the contrary opinion firmly maintained. So entirely was this the case that, as we have seen, Augustine, “in order to get rid of the plain inference to be drawn from St. Perpetua's prayer for her brother, was driven to invent the ingenious but scarcely amiable explanation that a little child who had died at the early age of  seven years was suffering purgatorial torments for some infantile fault committed after his baptism.”

Another indication of an early date is the fact that the name Χριστιανοί, which occurs twice in the Acts, is only used by the two companions of Paul, who call the attention of Thamyris to this fact as a point for accusation. This would place the compilation of the Acts at a time when the name “Christian” was sufficient to condemn any one, i.e. at about the time of Trajan, in the year 115. We may feel a reasonable confidence, then, that, whether the legend of Thecla be true or false, it was composed at least before A.D. 200, perhaps somewhere between 165 and 195, and most probably within a few years of the middle of that period.

III. Object of the Author. —Whoever may have been the author of the Acts, the question has been asked, What was his object? It has been said that he intended to defend and maintain the Montanist theory, and the most important evidence in favor of the Montanist authorship of the Acts was taken from the concluding words, “she illuminated many by the word of God;” by which is meant-illumination being taken as a synonym for baptism-she also baptized those whom she converted. Now, leaving aside the statement of Jerome that “Thecla baptized a lion,” a statement which he himself calls afiabula, and which he did not find in Tertullian, whom he follows, and who would have undoubtedly stigmatized it as nonsense, for such it is; and, without investigating how he came to make such a statement, or whether it was originally meant that Thecla baptized a person of the name of Leo (which means, in Latin, “lion”), we know that Thecla baptized none except herself. The only point in the argument now are the words πολλοὺς ἐφώτισεν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ θεοῦ, “she illuminated many by the word of God,” which, as Basil of Seleucia (whether he is the author of the Acts or merely their editor) says, mean that “Thecla baptized those whom she converted to Christ.” Now it is true that φωτίζειν has been used by Gregory of Nazianzum, Gregory of Nyssa, Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. 3, 23, 8), and Methodius (Conv. Decem Virg.) in the sense of “baptize,” and φωτισμός for “baptism,” and by Clemens Alexanfinus, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Justin Martyr (Apol. 1, 61; comp. 65); but this is not the only meaning, for, as Justin himself says, καλεῖται τοῦτο τὸ λουτρὸν φωτισμὸς ὡς φωτιζομένων τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν ταῦτα μανθανόντων thus deriving the new signification of the word from the old; and Dionysius Areopagita, Clemens Alexandrinus, Chrysostom, and Cyril of Alexandria use the word φωτι σμός, for “illumination,” “instruction,” which  signification is required here by the addition τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ θεοῦ. We have here the same usus loquendi that we find in Eph 3:9; Heb 6:4; Heb 10:32; and so also in the Sept., where it is used for הוֹרָה. For examples, comp. Stephanus, Thes. Graec. Ling. s.v. φωτίζειν. We are not told that she instructed in public, which is the main point; and if she had preached at all, it probably was no sermon in the strict sense of the word, but a missionary discourse. This inference we make from the Acts themselves, according to which she lived among heathen; there was not as yet a congregation, consequently also no office. That women taught in the apostolic age was nothing uncommon, for of Aquila and Priscilla we are told (Act 18:26) that they took Apollo καὶ ἀκριβέστερον αὐτῷ ἐξέθεντο τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ; and in Rom 16:3 sq. Paul calls them τοὺς συνεργούς μου ἐν Χριστῷ.

After all, we cannot perceive any Montanistic tendency in the author of the Acts, for his Thecla does not remind us of the Montanistic prophetesses, who even performed ecclesiastical functions. That Thecla baptized others we are not told; and when Basil of Seleucia states this of her, he does it because of his interpretation of (φωτίζειν, and indicates that in the beginning of Christianity in Asia Minor such things had happened. We need only refer to the letter of Firmilian, bishop of Caesarea, addressed to Cyprian against pope Stephen (the 75th of Cyprian's Letters), and to the Apostolic Constitutions (3, 9). The latter expressly forbid women to baptize and teach, it being ἐπισφαλές, μᾶλλον δὲ παράνομον καὶ ἀσεβές, as well as against the Scriptures. We call very well perceive how, in the face of such tendencies, which in the 3rd century could have been only of a very rare occurrence, a book must have been welcomed out of which the authority of an apostle could be quoted in favor of female prerogatives in the Church. Being disposed to generalize a single case, the difference in the time and persons was overlooked, and this special case was applied erroneously to different cases. For what we know of Thecla's baptism is, that she asked the apostle for that rite, but he exhorted her to be patient and wait. At Antioch, when in the arena, and believing that she will surely die without having received the baptism, she throws herself into the trench. After her deliverance she remains eight days with Tryphaena, and instructs her in the word of God. We are not told that she baptized some, but that most of the maid-servants believed, and that there was great joy in the house. Then she comes to Paul at Myra, saying, ἔλαβον τὸ λουτρόν, Παῦλε· ὁ γὰρ σοὶ συνεργήσας εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κάμοὶ  συνήργησεν εἰς τὸ λούσασθαι (ch. 40). Paul does not utter his disapprobation, but keeps quiet. But when she is about to leave, he does not say to her that she should teach and baptize, but go and teach.” The faculty which Jesus gives to his disciples (Mat 28:19-20) is entirely different from the one which Paul gives to Thecla.

Thecla's case is exceptional on account of her twofold, martyrdom; being left by Paul and the adherents to his teaching, and being in periculo mortis, she baptizes herself, using the Christian formula. According to the whole narrative, Paul cannot make any objections because God has made himself known in delivering her, and the action of a martyr cannot be prescriptive as to others. Besides, the author brings before us a time in which ecclesiastical affairs had not yet taken a definite form, and there is not the least evidence that the object of the author of the Acts was to support Montanistic doctrines, and to establish the same by the authority of the apostle Paul. The only object which the author could have had in view was to describe the apostolic time, in which he succeeded only in part. It is a time when the Church commences to develop herself. But, using his own judgment in this respect, it becomes fatal, since the author connects the person of an apostle with deeds and doctrines which in this connection must be detrimental to the order of the Church. Such a writing could only be a great hindrance to the leaders of the Church; and in order to render it of no effect, it was severely criticized, and its author called to account and deposed. Yet the possibility of a historical substratum in the Acts is not precluded, although it is difficult to say where history ends and legend commences.

IV. Sources of the Acts. —We have already stated that the Acts contain not a single direct citation from the New Test., yet the student cannot fail to discover many, instances in which the New Test. has been used.

That the author of the Acts was acquainted with the I second epistle to Timothy is unquestionable, because there are many striking parallels between that epistle and the A.cts, which need not be mentioned.

V. Literature. —Espencei er Opera Omnia (Parisis, 1619), p. 998 sq; t Baronius, Martyrologium Romanum (Venetiis, 1593), ad 23 Sept. p. 431- 434; -id. Annales Ecclesiastici ad Aluma 47 (Lucae, 1738), 1, 338 sq.; Panutinus, lotoe i1 Ed. Librorumo7 II Basilii Seleucic in Isauuria  LEpi.scopi de Vita ac Miraculis D. Theclce (Antv. 1608), p. 222-238; Hournejus, Hist. Eccl. (Brunsvicii, 1649), 1, 40-42; Vetustius Occidentalis Ecclesiae Martyrologium, etc. (ed. Franc. M. Florentinus [Lucae, 1668]), notar ad 12 et 23 Sept.; Conbetis, Bibliothecae Graecorum Patrumos Auctarium, Novissitnum (Par. 1672), pt. 1; Not. ad Nicetae Paphl. Orat. in Theclam, p. 506-509; Tillemont, Memoires pour servir a l'Histoire Ecclesiastique, etc. (ibid. 1694), 2, 65-70, 528-530; Ittig, De Jeresiarchis (Lips. 1690); Appendix Dissertationum de Hewesiarchis (ibid. 1696); De Pseudepigraphis, 1, 128, 129; De Bibliothecis et Catenis Patrum (ibid. 1707), p. 700-705; Grabe, Spicilegium SS. Patrum (Oxonice, ed. 2, 1700; ed. 1, 1698), 1, 87-94, resp. 128, 330-335; Des heiligen Clementis Historie von deunen Reisen und Leben des Apostels Petri, miuit einoem Vorberichte S. Anolds (Berlin, 1702); Acta Sanctorum. (Antv. 1717), mens. Jun. 7:552, 553 (auctore Joh. Bapt. Sollerio); — Hiieronymi Catalogun Scriptorum Ecclesias ficorum, cum notis Erasmi Roterdatni, Mariani Victorii, H. Gravii, A. Miraei, et Jo. Alb. Fabricii-Erulestus Salomo Cyprianus recensuit et annotatiomnibus illustravit (Francof. et Lips. 1722); Dom. Georgius, in an annotation to the Martyrology of Alo of Vienne, in his edition of the same (Romans 1745 fol.), p. 493; Lardner, The Credibility of the Gospel History (2nd ed. Lond. 1748), II, 2, 697-703; Acta Sanctorum (Amntv. 1757), ad 23 Sept. 6:546 sq. (auctore Jo. Stittingo); Fabricius, Bibliotheca Graeca (Hamb. 1807), ed. Harles. 10:331; Thilo, Acta S. Thomae Apostoli (Lips. 1823), prol. p. 59, 60; Schwegler, Der Montanismus (Tub. 1841), p. 262-266; Tischendorf, Act Apostolorum Apocrypha (Lips. 1851), prol. p. 21-26; Kostlin, Die pseudonyume Literatur der Iltesten Kirche, in the Theol. Jahrbücher (Tub. 1851), p. 175, 177; Ewald, Uebersicht der 1851-52 erschienenen Schrifte zür bibl. Wissenschaft, in the Jahrbücher zür bibl. Wissenschaft, 1852, p. 127; Ritschl, Die Entstehusng der altkatholischen Kirche (2nd ed. Bonn, 1857), p. 292-294; Neudecker, art. “Thekla” in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 15,'704,705; Gutschmid, Die Konigsnamen der appocryph. Apostelgeschichte (Rhein. Mus. 1864), new series, 19:176-179, 396, 397; Reuss, Gesch. d. heil. Schriften (Brunswick, 1864), § 267, p. 264, note; Hilgenfeld, Novum Testamentum extra (Canonem Receptum (Lips. 1866), 4:69; Renan. SaintPaul (Par. 1869), 1,40; Miller, Erklarung des BarnabasBriefes (Leips. 1869), p. 4; Wright, Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles (Lond. 1871, 2 vols.); Hausrath, Neutestament. Zeifgeschichte (1872), 2, 547; Lipsius, Ueber den Ursprung und altesten Gebrauch des Christennamens (Jena, 1873), p. 8; Mossman, A History of the Catholic  Church. of Jesus Christfromn the Death of St. John to the Middle of the Second Century (Lond. 1873), p. 351-400; Der Kaiholik, Nov. 1875, p. 461; but more especially Schlau, Die Acten des Paulus und der Thecla und die iltere Thecla-Legende (Leips. 1877); and the review by Lipsius in Schtirer, Theol. Literaturzeitung (ibid. 1877), p.543. (B. P.)

## Thecoe[[@Headword:Thecoe]]

             (θεκωέ), the Greek form (1Ma 9:33) of the Heb. name (2Ch 20:20) TEKOA SEE TEKOA (q.v.).

## Theft[[@Headword:Theft]]

             (גְּנֵבָה, κλέμμα or κλοπή) is treated in the Mosaic code in its widest bearings (Exo 22:1 sq;), especially when accompanied by burglary or the abruption of animals (Josephus, Ant. 16:1, 1; Philo, Opp. 2, 336). If the stolen property had already been sold or rendered useless, the thief was required to make fivefold restitution in cases of horned cattle (comp. 2Sa 12:6; Philo, Opp. 2, 337), or fourfold in case of sheep or goats; but only twofold in case the living animal was restored. But the statute likewise included the stealing of inanimate articles, as silver and gold (Josephus, Ant. 4:8,27). The prominence given to the former kind of theft is explainable on the ground of the pastoral character of the Hebrews (comp. Justin. 2:2; Walther, Gesch. d. rom. Rechts, p. 807; Sachs. Criminal Codex, art. 226; Marezoll, Criminal-Codex, p. 388). Any other kind of property might easily be found and recovered, and hence its theft was punished by its simple restoration, with a fifth part of the value added for loss of use (5:22 sq.; Lev 6:3 sq.). Rabbinical legislation on this point may be seen in the Mishna (Baba Metsiuh, 2). From Pro 6:30, Michaelis infers a sevenfold restitution in Solomon's time, but the passage probably speaks only in round numbers. On the ancient Greek laws, see Potter, Antiq. 1, 364 sq.; and on that of the twelve tables, Adam, Romans Antiq. 1, 426; Abegg, Strasfrechtswiss. p. 449; or generally Gellitus, 11:18; on that of the modern Arabs, see Wellsted, Travels, 1, 287; on the Talmudic, see Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 253. The Rabbinical interpretations of the law are given in the Mishna, Baba Kamma, 7 sq. If the burglar suffered a fatal wound in the act by night, the act was regarded as a justifiable homicide (Exo 22:2). So likewise in Solon's laws (Demosth. Timocr. p. 736) and among the ancient Romans (Heinecc. Antiq. Jur. Romans IV, 1, 3, 499), as well as Germans (Hanke, Gesch. d. deutsch.  peinl. Rechts, p. 99). Kidnapping (plagium) of a free Israelite was a capital crime (Exo 21:16; Deu 24:7), punishable with strangulation (Sanhedr. 11:1); and was an act to which a long line of defenseless sea-coast like Palestine was peculiarly liable from piracy. A similar penalty prevailed among the ancient Greeks (Xenoph. Memor. 1, 2, 62; Demosth. Philipp. p. 53) and Romans after Constantine (see Marezoll, Criminalrecht, p. 370; Reim, Criminalr. d. Romans p. 390); comp. Philo, Opp. 2, 338. See generally Michaelis, Mos. Recht, 6:66 sq., 83 sq. SEE STEAL.

## Theft, Christian Treatment Of[[@Headword:Theft, Christian Treatment Of]]

             In the early Church theft ‘was reckoned among the great crimes which brought men under public penance. Among St. Basil's canons there is one that particularly specifies the time of penance. The thief, if he discover himself, shall do one year's penance; if he be discovered by others, two: half the time as a prostrator, the other half a costander. —Bingham, Christ. Antiq. bk. 16:ch. 12:§ 4.

## Theile, Carl Gottfried Wilhelm[[@Headword:Theile, Carl Gottfried Wilhelm]]

             doctor and professor of theology, was born at Grosscorbetha, near Merseburg, Feb. 25, 1799, and died at Leipsic, Oct. 8, 1853. He wrote, De Trium Evangeliorum Necessitudine (Lips. 1823): —Notitia Novi Commentarii in Novum Testamentum (ibid. 1829): —Tabulae Rerum Dogmaticarum Compendiarim (ibid. 1830): —Christus und die Vernunft (ibid. 1830): — Commentarius in Epistolam Jacobi (ibid. 1839): —Zür Biographie Jesu (ibid. 1837): —Thesaurus Literatursae Theologicae Academicae, sive Recensus Dissertationum, etc. (ibid. 1840): —Pro Confessionis Religione adversus Confessionum Theologiam (ibid. 1850). Besides the above, he edited, together with R. Stier, Polyglotten-Bibel zum Handgebrauch (Bielefeld, 1854, and often, 6 vols.); he also edited Van der Hooght's Hebrew Bible (Leips. 1849, and. often), together with Explicatio Epicriseon Masorethicarum; Conspectus Lectionum, etc. This is one of the best editions of the Hebrew Bible. He also published, Novum Testamentum, Grece et Germanice (ibid. 1852, and often); and Novumn Testamentum Graeca, ex recognitione Knapii emendatius edidit argumentorum que notationes locos parallelos annotationem criticam et indices adjecit (7th ed. ibid. 1858; 11th ed. ibid. 1875, by Oscar von Gebhardt). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 419; Winer, Handbuch der theolog.  Literatur, 1, 85, 237, 302, 552; 2, 809; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2, 1320 sq.; Schurer, Theolog. Literaturzeitung, 1876, p. 1sq. (B. P.)

## Theiner, Augustin[[@Headword:Theiner, Augustin]]

             a Roman Catholic divine, was born April 11,1804, at Breslau, in. Silesia. He first studied theology, afterwards philosophy and jurisprudence, and at Halle, in 1829, was made doctor utriusquejuris. For several years he collected material at the libraries of Vienna, Paris, and London for canonical disquisitions. Shortly before his promotion he published, together with his brother Johann Anton (q.v.), Die Einführung der erzwungenen Ehelosigkeit bei den christlichen Geistlichen und ihre Folgen (Altenburg, 1828, 2 vols.); but he soon perceived his errors, and went to Rome, where he entered the Congregation of St. Philip Neri, and received holy orders. He remained in Rome, and in 1855 Pius IX appointed him prefect of the Vatican archives. In 1870 he retired from his office, and died Aug. 10, 1874. Of his many writings we mention, Commentatio de Romanorum Pontificum Epistol-turm Decretalium Antiquis Collectionibus et de Gregorii IX P. M. Decretalium Codice (Lips. 1829): —Recherches in plusieurs Collections Inedites de Decretales du Moyendge (Paris, 1833): —Geschichte der geistlichen Bildungsanzstalten (1835): Cardinal Frankenberg und sein Kanzpf fiir die Kirche (Freiburg, 1850): —Zustande der Kathol. Kirche in Schlesien von 1740 bis 1758 (Ratisbon, 1852, 2 vols.): —Geschichte des Pontificats Clemens XIV (Paris, 1853, 2 vols.): — Vetera Monumenta Historica Hungariam Sacram Illustrantia (Rome, 1859, 1860, 2 vols.): — Vett. Monum. Polonice et Lithuaniae Gentiumque Finitinarum Historiam Illustrantia (ibid. 1860-63, 3 ols.): —Vett. Monum. Slavorum Meridionaliunm Histot. Illustr. (1863): —Codex Dominii Temporalis Sanctae Sedis (1861 sq., 3 vols.). He also published a new edition of the Annals of Baronius, and worked assiduously upon the continuation of this gigantic work. See Winer, Handbuch der theolog. Literatur, 1, 603, 828; 2, 5, 800; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2, 1323 sq.; Theolog. Universal-Lex. s.v.; Regensburger Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Literarischer Handweiser fir das kathol. Deutschland, 1864, p. 148 sq.; 1874, p. 303 sq. (B.P.)

## Theiner, Johann Anton[[@Headword:Theiner, Johann Anton]]

             brother of Augustin, was born at Breslau. Dec. 15,1799. He studied theology, was made chaplain in 1823 in Zobten on the Bober, and in 1824  was appointed professor of exegesis and canon law at Breslau. The lively interest which he took in the reformatory movements of his Church obliged him to give up his lectures, and he entered upon ministerial duties at different places. In 1845 he sided with the German Catholic movement, from which he soon withdrew, in 1848, and lived excommunicated by his Church until 1855, when he was made custos of the university library at Breslau, where he died, May 15, 1860. He wrote, Descriptio Codicis qui Vetsionem Pentateuchi Arabicam continet (Berlin, 1822): —Die wolf kleinen Propheten (Leips. 1828): —Dasfunfte Buch Mosis (ibid. 1831): — De Pseudoisidoriana Canonunl Collectione (Breslau, 1837 ): —Die reformatorischen Bestrebungen der kathol. Kirche (Altenburg, 1845): — Das Seligkeitsdogma in der katthol. Kirche (ibid. 1847): —Enthüllungen über Lehren u. Leben der kathol. Geistlichkeit. See Winer, Handbuch der theolog. Literatur, 1, 174, 603; 2, 22, 800; Theologisches Universal-Lex. s.v.; Reyensburger Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2, 1322; Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 419. (B. P.)

## Theism[[@Headword:Theism]]

             The etymological opposite of theism can only be atheism, since the word designates a conception of the universe according to which a Deity rules over nature and men, and the atheistic view denies the existence of the Deity and divine powers. Various specific contrasts are, however, contained under this general meaning of the term, as monotheism and polytheism, or deism and pantheism.

The dispute between monotheism and polytheism is no longer open. Philosophy and theology have long been agreed that the Deity can be but one, and that the idea of a multiplicity of gods involves a contradictio in adjeco. There can be but one supreme, perfect, absolute Being, and such a Being is required even if the superior orders generally of supernatural beings be included under the idea of the Deity. This doctrine has, moreover, the support of human experience, since history shows that in every instance where a thorough development of polytheism has been reached, it eventuates in monotheism to the extent of subordinating ,the many gods to one who is supreme, or of regarding them as simple modes of conceiving of his nature, powers, or manifestations. It may be added that the converse idea, on which the origin of polytheism is found in pantheistic identifications of the Deity with nature and its forces, affords the most satisfactory explanation possible of the beginnings and growth of this error.  The monotheistic conception once received, however, opens the way to discussions respecting the nature of the Deity and of his relations to the universe, and compels recognition of the issue between deism and pantheism. For the conceptions which underlie the terms, we refer to the articles SEE PANTHEISM and SEE DEISM, and in this place note merely that the term deism designates that conception of the world on which God is not only different, but also distinct, from the universe, and which therefore denies the immanence of God in the world under any form, and constitutes the direct contradiction to pantheism. It is evident that this deism harmonizes with Christianity as little as does pantheism itself. It is to be noted, however, that the Scriptures return no direct and positive answer to the question, ‘How is the relation of God to the universe to be conceived?' and speculation is accordingly compelled to attempt the solution of the problem after its own fashion. Theology has attempted the solution-with what degree of success it does not belong to this article to determine, since theism is not a theological, but a philosophical, term.

The modern literature of philosophy apprehends the idea of theism in a more limited meaning than that indicated above, and understands by the term that tendency and those systems which attempt to mediate between pantheism and deism, and seek to solve the theological problem in question by the method of free philosophical inquiry. Such endeavors grew directly out of the development of the modern philosophy of Germany, beginning with Kant and passing through Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, Herbart, etc., until deism and pantheism came to be direct contradictories within the domain of philosophy itself. A removal of the difficulty was evidently demanded by the state of philosophy; by the considerations that pantheism inevitably leads to atheism or anthropotheism by including the world of nature and mankind in the essence of the Deity, and that it contradicts the indestructible and. undeniable facts of human consciousness; while deism renders an infinite and absolute Being impossible by its denial of any substantial bond which connects God and the world, and its consequent assertion of the limitation of the Deity.

The object of theistic speculation, it may be assumed, was correctly stated by the younger Fichte in his essay Ueber den Unterschied zwischen ethischem und naturalistischem Theismus, in the Zeitschr. fur Philosophie u. philosopische Kritik (Halle, 1856), p. 229, in these words: “Theism denotes for us the altogether general idea that the absolute world-principle, whatever differences of opinion respecting the, limits within which it may  be objectively apprehended may obtain, can yet in no case be conceived of as blind and unconscious power under the category either of a universal substance or of an abstract impersonal reason, and must be apprehended as a being having existence in and for itself; to whose fundamental attribute human thought can find no other analogy and form of expression than that of absolute self-consciousness. Connected with this conception of the Absolute Spirit, and necessarily leading up to it, is the equally general idea that the universal fact of the interconnection of the world indicates a beginning in accident and blind chance no more than it affords room for the thought of an absolute necessity which could not be otherwise. The only appropriate thought, in view of the conditions of the world, is the intermediate idea of adaptation to an end, which, on the one hand, implies the possibility of a differently conditioned world order, but, on the other, asserts that the existing order is most perfect, and projected in harmony with the ideas of the good and the beautiful. This result of an empirical observation of the world, which may infinitely enlarge itself by the study of particulars in all the departments of nature, and may advance to a steadily in-creasing degree of certainty, compels metaphysical thought to ascend to the idea of an absolute original reason which determines the end; to whose attributes, as demonstrated in the universe, human language is once more unable to find other designations than perfect thought and a will which requires the good.” It will be observed that the leading idea in this definition is the existence of God in and for himself, or of his absolute self- conscious being. The prevalence of this idea determined the general current of speculation to disagree with the Hegelian doctrine of the Absolute, according to which God is impersonal and unconscious reason, and attains to consciousness of himself only in man. The distinction between ethical and-naturalistic theism is of secondary importance, but, nevertheless, deserves notice to the extent of observing that it grew out of Schelling's advance towards theistic views, in which he attained to the recognition of God as an independent Being, and as the “Lord of Being;” but as he persisted in retaining the theoceniric position of his early teachings, and “derived” the finite world out of the absolute essence of God, he really conceived of God simply as a cosmical principle, as the younger Fichte observes. Other philosophers followed in his track, e.g. the Roman Catholic Baader (q.v.); but the representatives of the theistic tendency belonged rather to the school of Hegel than that of Schelling, as a rule, though they “passed beyond” the master and differed widely among themselves, as they adhered more or less closely to his views. The principal  names in this class are J. H. Fichte (Bedingungen eines spekulativen Theismus [Elberfeld, 1835]) and K. P. Fischer (Encykl. d. philos. Wissenschaften [Frainkf. —on-Main, 1848; vol. 3 1855]).

The present status of philosophical theism is significantly illustrated in the works of Chr. H. Weisse. This writer regards the dialectics of Hegel as the “completed form of philosophical inquiry,” but rejects the pantheism to which its application brought Hegel. He holds that the teleological proof is necessary to lead to the theistic idea of God and counteract the pantheistic tendency of the ontological and cosmological arguments. The world was created for God, and finds its end in him. In his absolute essence God is absolute personality, but necessarily a trinity of persons; and in this trinity the second person, or Son, prior to the creation and independently of it, represents the eternal reason and possibility of the creation of the world. but with the creation is “infused into it,” “enters into it,” “gives himself to it.” This second person of the trinity is, however to be regarded as the absolute Primus of the world, and not be identified with the latter, etc.. To avoid the contradiction of an absolute dualism in the Deity, it becomes necessary to postulate a third person in the trinity, who proceeds from the Father and the Son, and is coequal with them. In harmony with this view, the creation is not to be regarded as “the effect of a sufficient reason, but as the result of the self-renunciation of the second Divine Personality.” This self-renunciation, though represented as the free act of God, comes to pass, however, because only in creation can God become the “God who exists as God,” the “really Supreme Being,” since “it is only thus that he can be the all embracing, supermundane, self-conscious Divine Spirit in whom all newly originating beings are preformed, and all existing ones are combined into a higher unity of expression or idea.” At the point of his renunciation, the idea of God is seen to coincide with that which is usually termed matte?; the activity of the Deity becoming the matter of the creation. See Weisse, Philosoph. Dogmatik oder Philosophie d. Christenthums (Leips. 1855).

A review of the progress of theistic speculation reveals the fact that the demands of pantheism (monism) have been fully met in the principal endeavors to establish the theistic conception of the world on a philosophical basis. The world is represented as having, emanated from the being-the nature, essentiality, substance-of the Deity, as the realizing, renunciation, viewing; completing, of himself; his self-consciousness and subjectivity, however, being regarded as existing independently of the  world. But no similar justice has been done to the claims of deism; for the leading and fundamental demand of the deistic conception of the world is the idea of God as the Absolute Spirit who is eternally complete in himself through his absolute power and goodness, as contrasted with the world, which is bound by conditions and constantly engaged in the process of becoming and developing. This idea is contradicted by every view, which makes the world to be in any way a part of the essence of God himself, since such a view transfers the becoming and developing condition of the world into the nature of God. The absolute is necessarily complete and perfect.

Literature. —Schelling, Philosophied. Mythologie; id. Philosophie d. Offenbarung; Fischer, Die Idee d. Gottheit (Stuttg. 1839), and the Encyklop. mentioned above; Wirth, Die Spekul. Idee Gottes, etc. (Stuttg. 1845); Chalybasus,System d. Wissenschffelehre (Kiel, 1846); Schwarz, Weiterbildung d. Theismus, in Zeitschr. f. Philosophie (Halle, 1847), vol.18; id. Gött, Natur u. Mensch (Hanov. 1857); Von Schaden, Geqensat d. theist. u. pantheist. Standpunkts (Erlangen, 1848); Mayer, Theisnus u. Pantheismus (Freiburg, 1849); Schenach, Metaphysik (Innspruck, 1856); Eckart, Theistische Begründdurn d. Aesthetik (Jena, 1857); Hoffnann, Theismus u. Pantheismus (Wurzburg, 1861); Ulrici, Gött u. die Natur (Leips. 1861); Bowne, Studies in Theism (N.Y. 1879). —Herzog, Real- Encyklop. s.v.

## Thelasar[[@Headword:Thelasar]]

             (2Ki 19:12). SEE TAL-ASSAR.

## Thelersas[[@Headword:Thelersas]]

             (θελερσάς v.r. θελσάς), a Greek form (1Es 5:36) of the name Hebraized (Ezr 2:59) TELHARSA SEE TELHARSA (q.v.).

## Theman, or Theeman[[@Headword:Theman, or Theeman]]

             (θαιμάν), the Greek form (Bar 3:22-23) of the Heb. name TEMIAN SEE TEMIAN (q.v.).

## Themistians[[@Headword:Themistians]]

             an early school of theorists which took its name from a deacon, Themistius. An answer given him by the patriarch Timothy led him to  conclude that if the body of Christ was corruptible (subject, that is, to the decay arising from the wear and tear of life), then he must also have been so far subject to the defects of human nature that his very knowledge of the present and the future was imperfect, and there were, therefore, some things of which he was ignorant. The patriarch himself repudiated this conclusion, but a school of theorists grew up under the leadership of Themistius, and became known as AGNOETE SEE AGNOETE (q.v.).

## Thenius, Otto[[@Headword:Thenius, Otto]]

             doctor of theology and philosophy, was born in 1801 at Dresden, where he also died, Aug. 13, 1876. Although Thenius occupied the pulpit for more than twenty years, yet his main renown is as an exegete, and as such he will always hold an honorable position among scholars. He published, Erklarung der Bücher Samuels (Leips. 1842; 2nd ed. 1864),: —Erklarung der Biicher der Kinige (ibid. 1849; 2nd ed. 1873), with an Appendix, which was also published separately, Das vorexilische Jerusalem und dessen Tempel Erklarung der Klagelieder Jeremiad (ibid. 1855): —De Loco Joh 13:21-28 Dissertatiuncula (Dresdae, 1837): Quis Psalms 51 Auctor fuisse videatur (ibid. 1839): — Die Grdber der Kinige von Juda, in Illgen's Zeitschrift fur die historische Theologie, 1844: — Ueber die Stufenpsalmen, in Studieln ind Kritiken, 1854, vol. 2. Thenius's works will always be consulted for textual criticism. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 419; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2, 1323; Theologisches Universal-Lex. s.v. (B. P.)

## Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury[[@Headword:Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury]]

             was born in Normandy, the year of his birth not being known. He was the third archbishop supplied to the Church of England by the celebrated abbey of Bee. He was appointed prior in 1127, and ten years afterwards was elected abbot. In 1138 he was invited to England by king Stephen and his queen, Matilda. He was consecrated archbishop of Canterbury in 1139. It reflects credit upon the character of Theobald that in that rude and boisterous age, his residence became the centre of all the learning and ability of the kingdom. "For two generations several of the most distinguished men in the country could refer to the happy hours they had passed at Tleobald's court." He appears to have been banished by the king at one time, but lie returned to England, and matters were again set right. The last time Theobald appeared in public was at the consecration of Richard Peche, bishop of Lichfield. He was to infirm to officiate, but witnessed the consecration. He died April 18, 1161. See Hook, Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, 2:322 sq.

## Theocanus[[@Headword:Theocanus]]

             (θεωκανός v.r. θοκανός and θωκα νος), a corrupt Greek form (1Es 9:14) for the Heb. name (Ezr 10:15) TIKVAH SEE TIKVAH (q.v.).

## Theocatagnostae[[@Headword:Theocatagnostae]]

             a name used by John of Damascus apparently as a general term for heretics who held unorthodox opinions about God, and therefore “thought evil” (κατάγνωσις) respecting him.

## Theocracy[[@Headword:Theocracy]]

             (θεοκρατία, rule of God), a form of government such as prevailed among the ancient Jews, in which Jehovah, the God of the universe, was directly recognized as their supreme civil ruler, and his laws were taken as the statute-book of the kingdom. This principle is repeatedly laid down in the  Mosaic code, and was continually acted upon thereafter. SEE KING. Moses was but the appointee and agent of Jehovah in giving the law and in delivering the people from Egypt; and throughout the Exode the constant presence of God in the pillar and the cloud, as well as upon the mercy seat, was on every occasion looked to for guidance and control. So, likewise, Joshua and the Judges were special “legates of the skies” to perform their dictatorial factions. Even under the monarchy, God reserved the chief direction of affairs for himself. The kings were each specifically anointed in his name, and prophets were from time to time commissioned to inform them of his will, who did not hesitate to rebuke and even veto their actions if contrary to the divine will. The whole later history of the chosen people is but a rehearsal of this conflict and intercourse between the Great Head of the kingdom and the refractory functionaries. Under the New Economy, this idea passed over, in its spiritual import, to the Messiah as the heir of David's perpetual dynasty, and thus Christ becomes the ruler of his Church and the hearts of its members. See Spencer, De Theocratia Judaica (Tüb. 1732); Witsius, De Theocratia Israel. (Lugd. 1695); Blechschmidt, De Theocratiac Populo Sancto Instituta; Deyling, De Israeli Jehova Domino; Goodwin, De Theocratia Israelitarum (Ultraj. 1690); Hulse, De Jehova Deo Rege ac Duce Militani in Prisco Israele; Dannhauer, Politica Biblica; Conring, De Politia Iebsrceorum (Helmst. 1648); Michaelis, De Antiquitatibus AEconomnic Patriarchalis; Schickard, Jus Regium Hebraeorum, culm animadversionibus et notis Carpzovii (Lips. 1674, 1701); Abarbanel, De Statu et Jure Regio, etc., in Ugolino, Thesaurus, vol. 24. SEE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.

## Theodemir[[@Headword:Theodemir]]

             a Goth who was abbot of Psalmodi, in the diocese of Nismes, at the beginning of the 9th century. He was reputed to be very learned, so that even bishop Claudius of Turin (q.v.; comp. Illgen, Zeitschr. fliu die hist. Theologie, 1843, 2, 39 sq.) dedicated many of his commentaries to him. Theodemir wrote a letter to Claudius, in which he mentioned the approval, which the writings of the latter received, especially from the Frankish bishops; but he subsequently discovered expressions in the commentaries, particularly those on Corinthians, which he regarded as being questionable and erroneous, the principal objection being raised against the treatment of the subject of image and relic worship. Claudius thereupon wrote an Apologeticum (see Claud. Taur. Episc. Ined. Operum Specinensa, etc., exhibuit A. Rudelbach [Havn. 1824]; Peyron, Tull. Ciceronis Orationum  Fragmenta Inedita [Stuttg. 1824], p. 13), to which Theodemir replied. The dispute was ended by the death of Theodemir about A.D. 825 (see Gieseler, Lehrb. der Kirchengesch. Vol. 2; Neander, Church Hist. 3, 433). —Herzog, Real Encyklop. s.v.

## Theodicy[[@Headword:Theodicy]]

             (vindication of the divine government, from θεός, God, and δίκη, justice). This word dates back, in the sense in which it is now currently employed, no farther than the celebrated essay by Leibnitz, whose first edition appeared at Amsterdam in 1710. It designates the attempt to justify God with reference to the imperfections, the evil, and especially the sin, which exist in the world, or, in other words, any attempt to show that God appears in the creation and government of the world as the highest wisdom and goodness, despite sin, evil, and apparent imperfections.

Leibnitz preceded such evidence with a Discours de la Conformite de la Foi avec la Raison, because a theodicy must evidently proceed on the assumption that reason and revelation do not contradict each other, and that the former has the ability to recognize the facts presented by the latter, whether in nature or in history. As the aim of theodicy is to refute by reason the objections of superficial reasoners against the wisdom and goodness of God, the work necessarily demands agreement between faith and reason. It is consequently the primary object of Leibnitz to show that such agreement exists, or that it must be presumed to exist so soon as a correct view of the idea and nature of reason is entertained. Reason is the “rightful combination” of truths, which we recognize, either directly or by means of revelation and there can be no conflict between it and the truth, which God reveals. There are two classes of truths, and, so to speak, two forms of reason. In a narrow meaning of the word, reason has to do only with such truths as it derives from itself or recognizes without assistance from without; and in this character it contrasts with experience, and also with faith in so far as the latter is based on authority and forms a sort of empirical certainty. Its truths are “eternal and necessary truths,” in no wise dependent on sense-perception, and, a priori, such as reason alone can apprehend and formulate, because they are founded on logical, metaphysical, or geometrical necessity. Another class of truths presents to view definite facts, e.g. the laws of nature (verites defait), such as come immediately within the province of experience and faith. This class of truths likewise involves necessity, and is so far set forth within the domain  of reason also; but this necessity is physical, instead of logical or metaphysical. The contrary to such truths is not logically impossible and unthinkable, but cannot be because its existence would be an imperfection, a fault. This physical necessity is thus shown to be at the bottom a moral necessity, founded in the attributes of God as the highest wisdom and goodness; and as moral necessity it appertains also to the doctrines of the faith, being ascertainable by reason, and forming ground on which to comprehend and accept such doctrines.

With respect to the creation of the world, Leibnitz teaches that it was the free act of God, performed that he “might most effectually, and in a manner most worthy of his wisdom and goodness, reveal and impart his perfection.” He could create only a relative perfection, however; the creation of absolutely perfect beings, i.e. gods, was not possible, and the world and its inhabitants were accordingly created relatively imperfect. This condition of things may be denominated metaphysical evil, whose existence was directly conditioned in the will of God by which was determined the creation of limited and imperfect beings. Physical evil, or suffering, and moral evil, or sin, on the other hand, are not directly willed by God, but only indirectly, as serving to promote the good and secure the attainment of a higher perfection of the “whole,” though themselves evil as respects the individual. The ground of metaphysical evil was, therefore, the good which God willed to secure in the creation of limited beings, while that of physical and moral evil is “the better” which could only thus be secured.

To the objection that God might have created a world in which physical and moral should have no place, or that he might have altogether refrained from the work of creating, Leibnitz replies that physical evil may serve to help the world to achieve a higher degree of good; and that moral evil, which is possible because God has endowed man with powers of volition, is likewise so wonderfully controlled as to increase the beauty of his universe as a whole. To the further objection that God thus becomes the author of sin, he replies that sin has no positive cause in so far as it is actualized in consequence of the imperfections of the creature, but only a causa deficiens, which, moreover, does not work sin directly and of its own motion, but only par accident by reason of the existence of a ‘higher good than sense can recognize or desire. The final objection, that as God foreknew all that is future, and consequently inaugurated a causal connection, which must inevitably lead to whatever may come to pass,  including sin; the latter is unavoidable and its punishment unjust, is met by Leibnitz by formulating a distinction between predestination and necessity. No volitional act need be performed by man unless he will. Foreordination is not compulsion; and the intervention of foreordained events serves only to influence the will with motives, and not at all to constrain the will with force.

The review of Leibnitz's work shows that it is far from satisfying the demands of the problem with which it deals. The reason for its failure lies in the philosophical views which that author laid at the basis of his scheme, his ideas of the monads, of God as the primitive monad, of the relations between reason and the will, of freedom and necessity, respecting which see the art. Leibnitz. Nor is this the place to attempt a new and independent solution of the problem of theodicy, which necessarily must involve the development of an entire system of philosophy. Suffice it to say that the general method of Leibnitz must ever be regulative to those inquirers who approach this problem from the standpoint of Christian theism, and that the main attempt must be to separate more clearly between the conceptions of physical and moral evil and connect the former more intimately with morality and the moral consummation of the world-to show more clearly the profound reasons for the necessity by which the possibility of sin is included in the concept of human freedom, and the existence of the latter is involved in the idea of the Food and, finally, to tone down certain theological exaggerations of the power of evil, and present freedom and morality in their gradual development out of the natural life and human naturalness, as well as in decided negative contrast with nature.

Most of the philosophers of more recent times who have treated this subject have approximated more or less closely to Leibnitz, and have endeavored by criticism or modification, either avowedly or silently, to correct the faults of his essay. We can only name a series of the older writers, e.g. Balguy, Divine Benevolence Vindicated (2nd ed. Lond. 1803, 12mo); Werdermann, Versuch zur Theodicae, etc. (Dessau and Leips. 178493); Benedict, Theodicea (Annaburg, 1822); Blasche, Das Basen, etc. (Leips. 1827); Wagner, Theodicea (Bamberg, 1810); Erichson, Verhutn. der Theod. zur spekulitiv. Kosmologie (Greifswald, 1836); Sigwart, Problem des Basen, etc. (Tüb. 1840); Von Schaden, Theodicea (Carlsruhe, 1842); Maret, Theodicea (Paris, 1857); Young, Evil and God, a Mystery (2nd ed. Lond. 1861). —Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Theodora (1)[[@Headword:Theodora (1)]]

             the wife of the emperor Justinian was the daughter of Acacius, who had charge of the wild beasts of the Prasini at Constantinople. The decease of her father and remarriage of her mother obliged her to earn her living as an actress, and she also became a notorious courtesan. She accompanied Ecebolus as his mistress to Pentapolis when that wealthy Tyrian was appointed praefect of that government, but was soon deserted by him and obliged to return in poverty to Constantinople. She then altered her mode of living and sought to earn a virtuous name; and while living in retirement she won the favor of the imperial prince Justinian, and so excited his passion that on the death of the empress he persuaded the reigning emperor, Justin, to suspend a law which stood in the way of his marriage with Theodora (see Cod. Just. lib. 5, tit. 4; “De Nuptiis,” 1, 23). They were married in A.D. 525; and on Justinian's accession, in 527, Theodora was publicly proclaimed empress and coregent of the empire. Her influence over him became unbounded, and continued even after her decease.

Theodora participated actively in the Monophvsite controversy, lending her influence secretly to the propagation of that error, and endeavoring to win her consort from the orthodox view. Colloquies instituted between bishops of the two conflicting parties in 531 accomplished no substantial result; but the empress succeeded, in 535, in promoting the Monophysite bishop Anthims to the patriarchate of Constantinople, and afterwards, through the assistance of Belisarius, the famous general, in advancing Vigilius to the same position. She was twice visited with the ban of the Church, but was not thereby intimidated to such a degree as to prevent her intervention in the controversy of the Three Chapters. She died, however, before the dispute wags determined, at the early age of forty years. Historians describe her as having been proud and tyrannical; but no charge is raised against her chastity after her marriage with the emperor. She bore the latter one child, a daughter, who died early.

Literature. — Procopius, Hist. Arcnat; id. Aquee. c. 9, 10; id. De Aedif: 1, 11; Nicephorus Callistus, 16:37; Mansi, Collatio Cathol. cum Severian. a. 531, 8:817 sq.; id. Joannis Episc. Asice, in Assemani, Bibl. Orient. 2, 89; Acta Syn. Const. a. 536, in Mansi, 8:873 sq.; Evagrius, ch. 4; Liberal. Breviar. p. 21 sq.; Anastasius, Vitae Pontif.; Vigilii Epist. ad Justin. et ad Mennam, in Malasi, 9:35,38; Wernsdorf, De Silverio et Vigilio; Gregor. Nazian. Epist. 9:36; Theophanes, Chronicles p. 350; Vict. Tununens.  Chronicles; Ludewig, Vita Justiniani Imp. et Theodorce (Hal. 1731, 4to); Invernizzi, De Rebus Gestis Justisniani (Romn. 1783); Gibbon, Decline and Fall, ch. 40; Walch, Ketzergesch. pt. 6:7; Gieseler,; Monophys. Wett. Variceide Cristi. etc. (Gött. 1835-38); and the Church histories. Also Smith, Dict. of Biog. and Mythol. s.v., and Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

Theodora (2)

wife of the emperor Theophilus, who succeeded his father, Michael II, on the throne in A.D. 829. She obtained the regency of the empire on the death of her husband, in 842, and hastened to restore the worship of images, which had until then been savagely repressed. She banished John Grammaticus, the patriarch of Constantinople, and gave his place to Methodius, who was in sympathy with her plans, and then called a synod which decreed the restoration of image worship throughout the empire. To commemorate this event she ordained an annual “festival of orthodoxy.” Not content with having thus ended a dispute which had agitated the empire during 150 years, she inaugurated a persecution of the Paulicians (q.v.), and thereby occasioned a succession of wars in which entire provinces were devastated and depopulated by the allied Paulicians and Saracens (see Cedrenus, p. 541 sq.; Zonaras, Chronicles 16:1; Petr. Siculi Hist. Manich. p. 70 sq.; Photius, Contra Manich. 9:23; Constantin. Porphrog. Continuator, 4:16, 23-26).

A more creditable work was the conversion of the Bulgarians, which was accomplished by the Thessalonian monks Cyril and Methodius in 862. The empress, however, was not permitted to see this success. Her son Michael III compelled her to resign the regency, and incarcerated her in a convent, where she died of grief in A.D. 855 (see Dalleus, De Imaginibus [Lugd. 1642.]; Spanheim, Hist. Imaginumu Restituta ibid. 1686 ]; id. Opp. vol. 2; Schlosser, Gesch. der bIderstirm. Kaiser, etc. [1812]; Marx, Bilderstrait deir byzant. Kaiser [1839]; Walch, Ketzergesch. pt. 10:11; Schröckh, Christl. Kirschengesch. vol. 20; Gieseler, Kirchengesch. [4th ed.], 2, 1, 9). —Herzog, Real-Encyklop S v.

## Theodore (Theodorus), St[[@Headword:Theodore (Theodorus), St]]

             of the 4th century, was a Syrian or Armenian, or of Amasea as some more definitely state. Gregory of Nyssa relates that Theodore joined the Roman army (thence called tiro) when Maximin and Galerius were persecuting the Christians, but was himself denounced. His youthful appearance won for  him three days respite, at the end of which he was to die unless he should recant. While engaged in earnest prayer, a Christian disguised as a soldier, named Didymus, approached and exhorted him to flee, which he did. Didymus was thereupon seized as a Christian and condemned to decapitation. Theodore returned and steadfastly endured horrible tortures until he died by fire. His body was rescued by Christians, and is reported to have been brought to Brindisi in the 12th century, while his head is said to be still preserved at Gaeta. Gregory pronounced a eulogy in his memory. The Greek Church dedicates to him Feb. 17, the Latin, Nov. 9. See Greg. Nyssce Opp. (Par. 1615), 2, 1002 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Theodore I[[@Headword:Theodore I]]

             pope, was a Greek by birth, and reigned from 642 to 649. He excommunicated Paul, the patriarch of Constantinople, in 646, for holding Monothelite views, and recognized in his stead the banished patriarch Pyrrhus, who had recanted his Monothelite errors while at Rome. Pyrrhus, however, returned to his heretical opinions, and Theodore thereupon pronounced the ban against him. Shortly before his death, in 649, this pope  convened a synod at Rome which rejected the Typos promulgated by the emperor Constans II; and he also sent a vicar, in the person of the bishop of Dore, to Palestine in order to dismiss all bishops who should be found to hold the Monothelite heresy, and thus stamp out the sect's adherents. He wrote Epistola Synodica ad Paulun Patr. Const., and Exemplar Proposit. Constantinople Transmisse adv. Pyrrhum.

## Theodore II[[@Headword:Theodore II]]

             pope, a native Roman, reigned only twenty days in 897.

## Theodore Lector (The Reader)[[@Headword:Theodore Lector (The Reader)]]

             a Church historian in the East, was reader in the Constantinopolitan Church in or about the year 525. He furnished an abstract of the history from the twentieth year of Constantine to the accession of Julian, taken from the works of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, which is known under the name Historia Tripartita, and is still extant in manuscript form. Valesius published so much of its contents as was found to vary from Theodore's sources. A second and more important work begins an independent record at the point where the history of Socrates ends, and carries it forward to the year 439. Neither of these works can be regarded as a completed whole, and between them is an untouched space of seventy years. The latter history, which was contained in two books, has been lost; but extended fragments have been preserved in John of Damascus, Nilus, and especially Nicephorus Gallistus, and published by Robert Stephens and Valesius. These remains show that the histories of Theodore contained mulch important matter. in relation to politics and the progress of the Church. Comp. the literary notices in Cave, Fabricius. Hamberger, and Staudlin-Hemsen, Gesch. u. Lit. d. Kirchengesch. p. 76. Editions: Stephanus, Ε᾿κ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας θεοδώρου ἀναγνώστου ἐκλογαί, cum Eusebio (Par. 1544); Reading, Excerpta ex Eccl. Hist. Theod. Lect. et Fragmenta alia H. Valesio Interpr. cum Theod. Historia (Cantabr. 1720). —Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Theodore of Mopsuestia[[@Headword:Theodore of Mopsuestia]]

             bishop, and leader in the so-called theological school of Antioch, was born at Antioch about the year 350. He studied philosophy and rhetoric, the latter in company with John Chrysostom at the school of the famous  Libanius. Stimulated by Chrysostom to a fervor of Christian enthusiasm, he renounced his proposed secular career in order to devote himself to Christian studies and monastic asceticism; and though affection for a lady named Hermione interrupted his course, he was recalled to it by the zealous efforts of his friend, and, through the influence of his teacher, Diodorus of Tarsus, who introduced him to the study of sacred literature, was confirmed in it for life. Two of Chrysostom's letters to Theodore in relation to this subject are yet extant. He became a presbyter at Antioch and rapidly acquired reputation, but soon removed to Tarsus, and thence to Mopsuestia, in Cilicia Secunda, as bishop. In 394 he attended a council at Constantinople, and subsequently other synods. When Chrysostom was overtaken by his adverse fortunes, Theodore sought to aid his cause, but without success. Theodore himself enjoyed a notable reputation throughout the Church, especially in the Eastern branch. Even Cyril of Alexandria deemed him worthy of praise and esteem. He was accused, indeed, of favoring the heresy of Pelagius, but died in peace in 428 or 429, before the Christological quarrel began between the schools of Antioch and Alexandria, in which his character for orthodoxy was so seriously impaired. After his death, the Nestorians appealed to his writings in support of their opinions, and at the Fifth (Ecumenical Council Theodore and his writings were condemned. His memory was revered among the Nestorians, and his works were held in repute in the churches of Syria.

The theological importance of this father grows chiefly out of his relation to the Christological controversies of his time, and, in a lower degree, out of his exegetical labors. He was an uncommonly prolific writer, and expended much effort on the exposition of the Scriptures; but of his exegetical works only a commentary on the minor prophets in Greek has been preserved intact to the present time. Other expositions of minor books, e.g. the Pauline epistles, which had been published in Latin by Hilary of Poitiers, have lately been recognized as the property of Theodore. Fragments of still other exegetical labors by this father are scattered through the compilations of Wegner, Mai, and Fritzsche (see below). Theodore's method was that of sober, historical exposition, although his results are not always satisfactory; and to this he added independent criticism of the canon. He distinguished the books of the Bible into prophetical, historical, and didactic writings, the latter class including the books of Solomon, Job, etc., whose inspiration he denied.  In Christology Theodore was opposed to Augustinianism and thus naturally approximated to Pelagianism, though his position was intermediate. Adam was created mortal. The human will, in its earthly environment, would necessarily be drawn into sin. Adam's sin was riot transmitted, and Christ's work had for its object the enabling of a created and imperfect nature to realize the true end of its being rather than the restoration of a ruined nature. All intelligent beings were included in this purpose, and it would consequently appear that Theodore taught the impossibility of eternal punishment.

The works of this author which are still extant are, A Commentary on the Minor Prophets (Wegner [Berol. 1834]; Mai, Script. Vet. Nov. Coll. [Romans 1832], vol. vi), and Fragments, in Mai, Nov. Patr. Bibl. 1854, vol. 7. The Greek fragments are more completely given in Fritzsche, Theod. Mops. in N. Test. Comm. (Turici, 1847). Pitra, in Spicil. Solesm. (Par. 1854), vol. 1, has Latin versions of Theodore's commentaries on Philippians, Colossians, and Thessalonians. See also Mercator, Opp. ed. Baluz., on the councils growing out of the controversy of the Three Chapters. etc.

Literature. —Dupin, Nouv. Bibl. vol. 3; Cave, Script. Eccl. Hist. Lit. p. 217; Tillemont, Memoires, vol. 12; Fabricius, Bibl. Graeca, 9:153 sq. (ed. Harl. 10:346); Norisii Diss. de Synodo Quinta, in his Hist. Pelag. Pat. 1673, and per contra Garner in his Liberaltus; the Church histories; Fritzsche, De Theod. Mops. Vita et Script. (1836); Klener, Symbol. Lit. ad Theod. Mops. Pertin. (Gött. 1836). Also, with reference to exegetical questions, Sieffert, Theod. Mops. Vet. Test. sobrie Interpr. Vind. (Regiom. 1827.); Kuhn, Theod. Mop. u. Jun. Africanus als Exegeten (Freib. 1880); and the histories of interpretation. With reference to doctrines, the literature of the Pelagian controversy, and especially Dorner, Entwicklungsgesch. vol. 2. —Smith, Dict. of Biog. and Mythol. s.v.; and Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury[[@Headword:Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury]]

             succeeded Deusdedit, who died in the year 664. When the elected Anglo- Saxon presbyter Wigheard died in Rome, where he had gone to receive ordination, pope Vitalian declared that he intended to-send a worthy substitute. The Roman abbot Hadrian, a native of Africa, refused to be elected, and called attention to Theodore of Tarsuis as a man well qualified in every respect for that position. In March, 668, he left Rome for his new post, and was accompanied by Hadrian, who was to act as his adviser, but who, in fact, was to see that nothing of the Roman ritual was replaced by the Greek. Theodore acted in the spirit of Rome; he founded monasteries and schools, and died Sept. 19, 690 in London. His corpse was the first buried in St. Peter's at York. He left a penitential book and a collection of canons (reprinted in the collection of Latin penitential books of the Anglo- Saxons by Kunstmamu [Mayence, 1844]). See the Introduction to Kunstmann's collection; Baxmann, Politik der Perspste, 1, 180, 184; Theologisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v. (B. P.)

## Theodore, surnamed Graptus[[@Headword:Theodore, surnamed Graptus]]

             a monk of St. Saba who is somewhat prominent among the monkish martyrs of iconolatry. He was born at Jerusalem, attained to the rank of presbyter, and was sent by the patriarch Thomas of Jerusalem to Constantinople about 818 to labor in defense of the images. In the execution of this purpose he remonstrated so vehemently to the emperor's face that Leo the Armenian caused him to be scourged and transported to the coast of Pontus. Three years later he was pardoned but again imprisoned and banished, this time by Michael the Stammerer. The next emperor, Theophilus, caused him to be scourged and carried to the island  of Aphusia. Having returned after several years and renewed his passionate advocacy of image-worship, he was threatened and tortured, and finally banished as incorrigible to Apamea. But few writings are ascribed to him; among them are a disputation of the patriarch Nicephorus, given in Combefis, Orig. Constantinople p. 159: —a letter by John of Cyzicum narrating the sufferings endured under Theophills, also in Combefis: —a manuscript, De Fide Orthodoxa contsra Iconomachos, from which a fragment is given in Combefis, p. 221. See Vita Theod. Gr. in Combefis, p. 191, Latin by Surius, Dec. 26; and comp. the notices in Cave, and Walch, Gesch. d. Ketzereien, 10:677, 717. —Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Theodoret[[@Headword:Theodoret]]

             (θεοδώρητος ; also THEODORITUS) was one of the most eminent ecclesiastics of the 5th century. He was born of reputable, wealthy, and pious people at Antioch in 386 (Garnier) or 393 (Tillemont, Memoires, 20:869). His mother was especially devout, and susceptible to the influence of a number of hermit monks, one of whom had relieved her of an apparently incurable affection of the eyes, and another of whom announced to her, after thirteen years of sterile wedlock, that she should give birth to a son. In obedience to their directions, Theodoret was dedicated to the service of God. At the age of seven years he entered the monastery presided over by St. Euprepius, near Antioch; and there he remained for twenty years engaged in theological study. The works of Diodormus of Tarsus, Chrysostom, and Theodore of Mopsuestia formed his mind, and it appears that the latter was the chief of his actual teachers. In time he was appointed lector in Antioch, and afterwards deacon; and in the latter office he acquired such reputation that he was, against his will (Ep. 81), consecrated to the bishopric, 420 or 423.

The diocese entrusted to his care had for its seat the impoverished town of Cyrus, or Cyrrhus, the capital of the Syrian district of Cyrrhestia, two days journey to the westward of Antioch, and it included eight hundred parishes. His life as bishop was exemplary, and characterized by charity, public spirit, thorough unselfishness, successful guidance of his clergy, and great zeal for the faith. Though great numbers of Arians, Macedonians, and especially Marcionites were found in his diocese, he succeeded by 449 in regaining them all to the Church. He reports the baptism of no less than ten thousand Marcionites alone. These labors he prosecuted often at imminent risk to his life, and always without invoking the aid of the temporal power.  The quiet tenor of Theodoret's life was interrupted by the Nestorian controversy, whose progress and results embittered his later career. Garnier states (in Life of Theodoret, 5, 350) that Nestorius had been Theodoret's fellow-pupil in the monastery of St. Euprepius, and charges the latter with holding, in fact, the views which caused the ruin of the former representative of the Antiochian school. It appears, however, that Theodoret was concerned rather to resist the intolerance of Cyril of Alexandria and combat his errors, opposite to those of Nestorius, than to advocate the views of the latter. With his school, he opposed the unification of the two natures in Christ, and taught that the Logos had assumed, but had not become, flesh. He denied that God had been crucified, and thereby implied that God had not been born, and that the term θεοτκόος could not, in any proper sense, be applied to Mary. It was, of course, impossible that while holding such views he should become an avowed antagonist of Nestorius.

In 430 Theodoret addressed a letter to the monks of Syria and surrounding countries in which he charges Cyril with having promulgated Apollinarism, Arianism, and other similar errors in the twelve Capitula. In 431, at the Synod of Ephesus, he urged delay in the transaction of business until the Eastern bishops could arrive; and when that advice was disregarded, he united with those bishops in a synod which condemned the proceedings of the council and deposed Cyril. He also headed, with John of Antioch, the delegation which the Orientals sent to the emperor with their confession of faith, whose rejection closed the series of incidents connected with the Ephesian synod. After his return from that mission, Theodoret wrote five books on the incarnation (Πενταλόγιον Ε᾿νανθρωπώσεως), with the intent of setting forth his views and exposing the heretical tendency of Cyril's tenets and the unjust conduct of his party in the proceedings at Ephesus. Of this work only a few fragments remain, which are derived from the Latin version of Marius Mercator, a bigoted adherent of Cyrillian views. He also wrote a work in defense of the memory of his master, Theodore of Mopsuestia, against the charge of having originated Nestorianism (see Hardouin, Act. Cone. 3, 106 sq.). He was however, induced to yield to the pressure brought to bear by John of Antioch on the opponents of the policy of the emperor, and to acknowledge the orthodoxy of Cyril. He also submitted, under protest; to the deposition bf Nestorius. But when the Nestorians were treated with extreme severity in 435, he renounced the idea of peace, and once more stood forth the decided opponent of Cyril.  With the accession of Dioscurus as the successor of Cyvril, Theodoret's position became more unfavorable. He opposed Eutychianism, as Cyril's doctrine now came to be called, with inflexible energy; and the new patriarch, in 448, procured an order which forbade him, as a mischief- maker, to pass beyond his diocese.

Theodoret defended himself in several letters addressed to prominent personages (Ep. 79-82), and wrote repeatedly also to Dioscurus; but the latter responded with publicly anathematizing the troublesome bishop, and finally with causing him to be deposed, in 449, by a decree of the “Robber Synod” of Ephesus. Theodoret now invoked the assistance of the see of Rome, which was readily granted by Leo I; and he also applied to other Occidental bishops (Ep. 119). In the meantime he had been sent to the monastery of Apamea, where he was subjected to rigorous treatment until the emperor Theodosius died, in 450, and Pulcheria, with her husband, Marcian, ascended the throne. The imperial policy now changed, and the deposed bishops were set at liberty. Theodoret appeared before the ecumenical synod of Chalcedon in 451 as the accuser of Dioscurus and as a petitioner for the restoration of his bishopric. In this synod he found himself charged with being a Nestorian, and was prevented from making any explanation of his views until he consented to pronounce an anathema on Nestorius. He was thereupon unanimously restored (Hardouin, Cone. 2, 496). This action has been very generally condemned by students of history as the one blot upon an otherwise spotless career; but there are not wanting apologists to defend even this (see Smith, Dict. of Biog. and Mythol s.v. “Theodoret”). It would undoubtedly have been more creditable to him to have resisted the clamor of his enemies at that time. He left the synod with a crusty “farewell,” and returned to his bishopric, where he died in 457. The Eutychians anathematized his memory at their synods of 499 and 512, and his name was involved in the controversy of the Three Chapters. SEE CHAPTERS, THE THREE.

Theodoret was the author of many works in exegesis, history, polemics, and dogmatics, the exegetical being of chief consequence. He was generally free from the disposition to allegorize, and had a taste for simple and literal exposition. His method is partly expository, partly apologetic and controversial. On the historical books of the Old Test. he rather discusses difficult passages than presents a continuous commentary. He treated the first eight books, and also Kings and Chronicles, on the plan of simply stating and meeting the difficulties they present to the thoughtful  mind, without entering into a consecutive commentary of the several books; but upon other books he wrote expositions in the usual form. His commentaries on Psalms, Canticles, and Isaiah exist no longer save in fragmentary extracts. He wrote also on the remaining prophets, the Apocryphal book Baruch, and the Pauline epistles; and Schröckh preferred Theodoret's commentary on the latter to all others, though it is very defective as regards the statement of the doctrinal contents of the several books. The apologetical work ῾Ελληνικῶν θεραπευτική Παθημάτων, etc., was intended to exhibit the confirmations of Christian truth contained in Grecian philosophy, and affords evidence of the author's varied learning, as do also his ten discourses on Providence. His dogmatico-polemical works are, a censure of Cyril's twelve heads of anathematizaration : — Franistes, seu Polymorphus, containing three treatises in defense of the Antiochian Christology, and directed against Eutyches, in 447, one year before the condemnation of that heretic at Constantinople: —a compendium of heretical fables, whose statements are evidently inexact and very superficial; this work contains so harsh a judgment of Nestorius as to lead Garnier to deny its authenticity: twenty-seven books against Eutychianism, an abstract of which is supplied by Photius (Bibl. Cod. 46). The historical works are two in number. A History of the Church, in five books, extending from 325 to 429, which serves to complement Socrates and Sozomen: —and a very much inferior Φιλόθεος ῾Ιστορία, or Religiosa Historia, which contains the lives of thirty celebrated hermits, and is rather the work of a credulous ascetic than of a learned theologian.

There are only two complete editions of Theodoret's works, the first by the Jesuits Sirmond and Garnier (Paris, 1642-84), in five volumes. The last volume was added after Garnier's death by Hardouin. The other edition, by Schulze and Nosselt (Halle, 1769-74, 5 vols. in 10 pts. 5vo), is based on the former, and contains all that is good, while it corrects much that is faulty in its predecessor. For an account of editions of separate works, see Hoffmann, Lex. Bibl. Script. Graec.

See Garnier, Dissertationes, in vol. 5 of Schulze's ed.; Tillenont, Mensoires, vol. 14; Cave, Hist. Lit. s.v. “423,” p. 405 fol. ed. Basil.; Fabricius, Bibl. Graeca, 7:429; 8:277; Schulze, De Vita et Scriptis Theod. Dissert. prefixed to vol. 1 of his edition; Neander, Gesch. d. christl. Rel. u. Kirche, vol. 2 passim; Schröckh, Christl. Kirchengesch. 18:365 sq.; Oudin, Comment. de Scriptor. Eccl. Smith, Dict. of Biog. and Mythol. s.v.; Herzog, Real Encyklop. s.v.

## Theodorus[[@Headword:Theodorus]]

             SEE THEODORE; SEE THEODULUS.

## Theodosians[[@Headword:Theodosians]]

             a sect of dissenters from the Russo-Greek Church, who separated some years since from the Pomoryans, partly because they neglected to purify by prayer the articles which they purchased from unbelievers. They are noted for their honesty and strict observance of the Sabbath. An early Protestant sect bearing this name was formed in Russia in 1552 by Theodosius, one of three monks who came from the interior of Muscovy to Vitebsk, a town in Lithuania. These monks condemned idolatrous rites, and cast out the images from houses and churches, breaking them in pieces, and exhorting the people, by their addresses and writings, to worship God alone, through our Lord Jesus Christ. The inhabitants renounced idolatry, and built a church, which was served by Protestant ministers from Lithuania and Poland.

Theodosius I

Roman emperor, whose services to the State and the Church earned for him the title of “the Great,” was descended from an ancient family, and born about A.D. 346 at Cauca or at Italica, in Spain. His father was Comes Theodosius, the soldier who restored Britain to the empire. He was trained in the camp of his father, and entered on a military career, approving his talents in a campaign in Moesia in 374, where he defeated the Sarmatians; but he renounced his brilliant prospects when the emperor Gratian caused the elder Theodosius to be beheaded at Carthage in 376, and retired to his estates, where he engaged in agricultural pursuits. The incursions of the Goths soon rendered his services necessary in the field. Gratian called him to fill the place of his colleague Valens, who had fallen at Hadrianople, and he was proclaimed Augustus Jan. 19, 379. He received the government of the East. His conduct of the war was distinguished by the prudence with which he handled the dispirited troops, so that victory was gained without the fighting of pitched battles. On his return he passed through a severe sickness, and, in the belief that his end was near, received baptism at the hands of Ascolius, the orthodox bishop of Thessalonica. His baptism was followed, Feb. 28, 380, by an edict which imposed the Nicene Creed on his  subjects as the faith of the land. Other laws, having regard to the improvement of morals and the welfare of the State, followed on his restoration to health. The Goths were subdued in successive campaigns, and admitted into the empire as allies.

At the time of the accession of Theodosius, Constantinople was the principal seat of Arianism. Demophilus, the Arian prelate, preferred to resign his dignities rather than subscribe the Nicene Creed, and Gregory of Nazianzum was invited to become his successor. He declined the place, but induced the emperor to deprive the Arians of the possession of all churches and other property, and to expel them from the metropolis. The Eunomians experienced similar treatment. The Manichaean heresy was made punishable with death after the Second AEcumenical Council had, in 381, confirmed the Nicene Creed and condemned all heretics. Theodosius also exempted bishops from obedience to the civil tribunals; and to his reign belongs the infamy of first establishing inquisitors of the faith. Measures were also taken to prevent the sacrifice of bloody offerings and the practice of augury among the adherents of heathenism, which induced such votaries to Satire from the cities to more distant and unimportant places. This gave rise-to the terms pagan and paganism in popular usage when speaking of the polytheistic religions.

In the year 385 the princess Pulcheria died, and soon afterwards the empress Flacilla, panegyrics being pronounced in their honor by Gregory of Nyssa; and in the following year Theodosius married Galla, the sister (f Valentinian II, emperor of the West. The latter with his mother, was expelled from Italy in 387 by Maximus, the usurper who ruled in Spain, Gaul, and Britain; and Theodosius, after he had heard that Maximus favored the pagans, marched against and defeated him. He entered Rome on June 13, 389. In 391 occurred the famous incident inwhich Ambrose, the archbishop of Milan, forbade the emperor to enter his church, and required of him the acknowledgment of his guilt in having delivered over to death 7000 (chiefly innocent) inhabitants of Thessalonica, in retaliation for the murder of his governor, Boteric. The emperor laid aside the insignia of his rank, and entreated pardon for his great sin before the congregation in the Church of Milan; and he issued an edict by which an interval of thirty days was fixed between every severe sentence and its execution.

The affairs of the Western Empire were at length settled, and Valentinian re-established on the throne, so that Theodosius was at liberty to return to  his own capital. On the way, he delivered Macedonia from the robbers who lurked in its forests and swamps, and entered Constantinople in November, 391. Valentinian, however, was slain on May'15, 392, probably at the instigation of Arbogastes, a soldier of Frankish race, whose influence with the army made him more powerful than his lord. Eugenius, a learned rhetorician and skilful courtier, the mere instrument of Arbogastes, became emperor. Theodosius met the usurper in the plains of Aquileia, and achieved a victory which destroyed both Eugenius and Arbogastes, and secured the submission of the West. Four months later Theodosius died, Jan. 17, 395, of dropsy. His body was brought to Constantinople, and buried in the mausoleum of Constantine the Great.

See Zosimus, Hist. lib. 4 passim; Claudian, L. Seren. 50 sq.; De IV Cons. Hororii, etc.; Pacatus, Panegyr. Theod. Aug.; Themistius, Oratt. 5, 6, 16, 18; Sozomen, Hist. Eccl. lib. 5, 7; Socrates, lib. 5; Theodoret, Hist. Eccl. lib. 5; Ammianus Marcellinus, lib. 22:29; Jerome, ad an. 379, and De Viris Illustr. 133, 103; Ambrose, Epp. 17, 21, 27, 28, 51, 67, etc.; id. De Obitu Theod. passim; Idathius, Chronicles p. 10 sq., and Fast. p. 110; Orosius, lib. 7; Cod. Theod. passim; Augustine, De Civitate Dei, lib. 5; Rufinus, Hist. Eccl.'II, vi; Prosper, Chronicles; Cedrenus, p. 552 sq.; Greg. Naz. Carm. p. 21; id. Orat. 25; Theophanes, p. 105 sq.; Libanius, Orat.pro Templis, ed. Reiske; Symmachus, Epist. 10:17 sq.: Greg. Nyss. Opp. tom. 3, ed. Paris; Evagrius, Hist. ccl. 1, 20; Eunap. AEdes, c. 4, p. 60 sq.; Paulin, Vita Ambros. c. 24; Philostorgius, II, 11; Ambrose, De Valent. Obitu Cons. p. 1173. Also Flechier, Hist. de Thiodose le Grand (Paris, 1680, 8vo; Tillemont, Hist. des Empereurs, vol. 5; Gibbon, ch. 4 and 5; Baumgarten, Allgem. Wfelgesch. (Halle, 1754) vol. 14; Muller [P. E., Comment. Hist. de Theodos. (Gött. 1797 sq.); Rödiger, De Statu Paganorum sub Imp. Christianis; Suffken, De Theod. M. etc. (Lugd. 1828); Pauly, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Ullmann, Gregory Naziam (Darmst. 18- 25); Olivier, De Theod. M. Constitutionibus (Lugd. Bat. 1835); Schröckh, Christl. Kirchengesch. vol. 7; Gieseler, Kirchengesch. vol. 1; Smith, Dict. of Biog. and Mythol. s.v.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Theodotians[[@Headword:Theodotians]]

             a name given to the MONARCHIANS SEE MONARCHIANS (q.v.), from their founder, Theodotus (q.v.).

## Theodotion[[@Headword:Theodotion]]

             is the name of one of the Greek translators of the Old Test. after the time of the Septuagint (q.v.). According to Epiphanius (De Pond. et Mens. c. 17, 19), he was a native of Sinope, in Pontus, and for a time sided with the Marcionites, but left them afterwards and became a Jew. Irenaeus, however, calls him Ephesitus, i.e. a native of Ephesus; while Jerome and Eusebius call him an Ebionite, or semi-Christian. Bleak thinks it most probable that Theodotion was a Judaizing heretic, a semi-Christian and Ebionite, according to Jerome's prevailing description of him. His reasons for thinking it probable that he professed to belong to the Christian Church are these two at. “We find no trace of the Jews ever making use of his translation, and still less of its having been held in esteem by them: much more was this the case in the Christian Church, which accepted his translation of Daniel for ecclesiastical use. b. He has translated a clause in Isa 25:8, Κατεπόθη ὁθάνατος εἰς νῖκος, precisely as in 1Co 15:54, but thoroughly deviating from the Sept... This concurrence is probably not purely accidental, but is to be explained by Theodotion having appropriated to himself the Pauline translation of the passage; and this, again, makes it extremely probable that he was a Christian at the time of making the translation.”

As to the time when this translation was made, ace cording to Epiphanius it was published under the emperor Commodus (A.D. 180-182), which, as Keil remarks, “is not impossible, and can perfectly well be reconciled with the mention of him by Ireensus; yet it is by no means certain. In any case, his translation is not so ancient as that of Aquila, but more ancient than that of Symmachus” (q.v.).

As to the character of the translation, if we receive the testimony of those who had the version in their hands, it approached the Sept. very nearly in sense and phraseology. The mode of translation adopted by Theodotion holds an intermediate place between the scrupulous literality of Aquila and the free interpretation of Symmachus. The translator appears, indeed, to have made the Alexandrian version the basis of his own, and to have abided by it as long as it represents the Hebrew faithfully; departing from it and freely translating for himself only where it inadequately expresses the sense of the original. His object was rather to supply the defects of that version than to give a new and independent one; hence the additions found only in the former reappear in his work. From the remaining fragments, it may be  inferred that his knowledge of Hebrew was not great. He has retained Hebrew words not very difficult or obscure, expressing them in Greek letters from ignorance of their meaning: “Praetor alia minus docti interpretis signa quse erudito lectori exploranda remittimus, persaepe illa verba Hebraica, quorum interpretatio non'ita difficilis erat ut vertendi molestiam declinaret, Graecis literis expressit” (Monfaucon, Prceliminaria, VII, 3, 129, ed. Bahrdt). Thus, Isa 3:24, “פתיגיל=φθιλίλ; Isa 19:15, אגמון=ἀγμών; Isa 43:20, תני=θεννίν; Joe 2:17, האולם=οὐλαμ; Job 8:11, אחו=ἀχύ. But Jahn (Einleitung, 1, 178 sq.) conjectures that they were used among the Ebionites, and therefore retained by him — a supposition as improbable as that of Owen, that they were left so for particular reasons, such as the honor of the Jewish nation (Inquiry into the Present State of the Sept. Version, p. 108).

Among Christians the version of Theodotion was held in higher estimation than that of Aquila and Symmachus; and Origen, in his Hexapla, supplied the omissions of the Sept. chiefly from it. At a later period his version of the book of Daniel was universally adopted in the Greek Bible among Christians, instead of the Alexandrian version. According to Bleek, this change occurred some time between the age of Origen and that of Jerome. The latter says, in his Praef. 3 Daniel. “Dauielem juxta LXX interpretes Domini Salvatoris ecclesiae non legunt, utentes Theodotionis editione, et cur hoc acciderit nescio. Sive enim quia sermo Chaldaicus est, et quibusdam proprietatibus a nostro eloquio discrepat, noluertunt Septuaginta interpretes easdem lingume lineas in translatione servare; sive sub nomine eorum a nescio quo non satis Chaldaicam linguam sciente editus est liber, sive aliud quid causse exstiterit ignorans; hoc unum affirmare possum, quod multum a veritate discordet, et recto judicio repudiatus sit.” Delitzsch (De Habacuci Prophetce Vita atque Etate Conzmentatio Historico-isagogica [Grimae, 1844], p. 28) says, “Quapropter ego (donec proferantur argumenta contrarii) versionem Daliielis Theodotionianam ab ecclesia non prius adoptatam esse censeo, quam ab origene tanquam castigata Alexandrinse editio in Hexapla recepta et ab Eusebio et Pamphilio, cum ex his textum septuagintaviralem ederent, septuagintavirali substituta est.” Credner thinks that the Christians were so long under the pressure of contradictions, assaults, and mockeries, from Jews and heathens combined, that finally (though, to be sure, not in general before the end of the 3rd century) they gave up their Greek translation of the Sept., and set that of Theodotion in its place. From a passage by Jerome on Jer 29:17, “Theodotion  interpretatus est sudrinas; secunda pessima; Symmachus novissimas,” it has been conjectured that there also existed a second edition of Theodotion's version; but Hody (De Bibliorum Textibus, p. 584) thinks that the text of Jerome here is corrupt, and that after sudrinas we should insert Aquilae prina editio.

Besides the literature given in Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 420 sq., see also Davidson, Biblical Criticism, 1, 217 sq.; Keil, Introduction to the Old Test. 2, 232 sq.; Geiger, Nachgelassene Schriften (Berlin, 1877), 4:87; Kaulen, Einleitung in die heil. Schrift (Freiburg, 1876), p. 78; Delitzsch, op. cif., p. 28 sq.; Ginsburg, Commentary on Ecclesiastes (Lond. 1861), p. 497 sq. SEE GREEK VERSIONS. (B.P.)

## Theodotus[[@Headword:Theodotus]]

             (θεόδοτος, God-given = Johanan ), one of the, three messengers sent by Nicanor to Judas Maccabseus to negotiate peace (2Ma 14:19). B.C. cir. 162.

## Theodotus the Fuller[[@Headword:Theodotus the Fuller]]

             (ὁ σκυτεύς) was a leather dresser who went from Byzantium to Rome about the end of the 2nd century, and there taught Ebionitish doctrines; but the Romish bishop Victor is said to have excommunicated him from the Church. Theodotus maintained that Jesus, although born of the Virgin according to the will of the Father, was a mere man, and that at his baptism the higher Christ descended upon him. But this higher Christ Theodotus conceived as the Son of him who was at once the supreme God and Creator of the world, and not (with Cerinthus and other Gnostics) as the son of a deity superior to the God of the Jews. Epiphanius (Haeres. 54) associates him with the Aloji. He must not be confounded with another heretical Theodotus (ὁ τραπεζίτης or ἀργυραμοιβός) ivho was connected with a party of the Gnostics, the Melchisedekites. See Neander, Hist. of Christ. Church, 1, 580; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philosophy, 1, 308.

## Theodromi[[@Headword:Theodromi]]

             (θεόδρομοι), a term applied to couriers in the early Church. It was their duty to give private notice to every member where and when the Church assemblage was to be held (Baronius, Anal. 58, n. 108). See Bingham, Christ. Antiq. bk. 8 ch. 7:§ 15.

## Theoduilus (or Theodorus)[[@Headword:Theoduilus (or Theodorus)]]

             the name of three bishops who at different times presided over the see of Valais in Switzerland.

1. THEODORUTS was the first bishop of the Church of Valais. He was present at the Synod of Aquileia in 381, which condemned the Arian bishops Palladius and Secundianus, as directed by the command of the emperor Gratian; and his zeal for orthodoxy was such that he refused to recognize Palladius as a Christian and priest. He was especially meritorious  in enhancing the welfare and glory of his own Church, where he is said to have established orthodoxy on an assured basis, and to have discovered the relics of the Thebaic martyrs, in whose honor he subsequently built a church near where the Church of St. Maurice now stands. The influx of pilgrims to this church caused him to devise an appropriate cult, and thereby to give occasion for the organization of a monastery. Theodorus also forwarded relics to Vitricius of Rouen and Martin of Tours, for which thanks are rendered by the former in his De Laudibus Sanctorum; and he furnished Isaac, bishop of Geneva, with information respecting the discovery of the famous relics which became the basis of the legend written by Eucherius. Theodorus I thus appears to have been the actual apostle of the country, as he was its first consecrated bishop, and also the founder of the Church of Valais and of the cult which became its boast. His name appears in the oldest liturgical manuscripts of the country, the very ancient Missale Aledenum, an ancient Martyrology preserved in tie Castle of Valeria in Sion, and in the Martyrol. Gallic. . His name occurs also among those of the ten bishops who wrote to pope Siricius from Milan in 390.. After this he disappears, and is accordingly supposed to have died about 391. See the ancient Acta Conc.; S. Eucheri Passio Agaunesium Martyr.; ancient martyrologies; Vita Theodul. Episc. in the Bollandists, ad Aug. 16, 3, 278-280. —Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

2. THEODULUS or THEODORUS II, bishop of Valais, is mentioned in the spurious articles of endowment by king Sigismund to the Convent of St. Maurice, and was evidently confounded by the author of that document with Theodorus I, as he is made to urge the erection of a new convent and an appropriate endowment, on the ground that the bones of the Thebaic martyrs were yet unburied; all this so late as A.D. 515. Despite the doubts raised by this anachronism, he must be supposed to have existed, as his name occurs in the ancient and trustworthy list of Agaunensian bishops, and in all subsequent lists as well. He is also mentioned by an anonymous contemporary, in the life of abbot Ambrose of St. Maurice, as having raised collections in behalf of the new church edifice, and as having assisted in the collection of relics for its endowment. A new bishop, Constantius, appears in the Synod of Epaon in A.D. 517; the death of Theodorus was accordingly prior to that date. See Bolland, ad Aug. 27.

3. THEODORUS III, preferably called THEODULUS, the most famous, but also the most imperfectly authenticated, bishop of Valais of this name, is reputed to have lived in the time of Charlemagne. The only source for  the assumption that he lived is the legend of St. Theodulus, by Ruodpert, which runs as follows: Theodulus, of the noble family of Grammont, in Burgundy, was invited by Charlemagne to a general council which was to devise means for restoring his peace of mind. All the bishops responded to the monarch's tears with the promise of twenty, and even more, prayers and sacrifices, but Theodulus promised only a single one. His prayer was continued day and night and followed with the mass, so that God sent an angel who revealed to Theodulus the emperor's crime, and assured him that it was forgiven. Thus attested, the emperor could not doubt the bishop's assurance, and rewarded the latter with the praefecture of his country, that he might be able to control the rude inhabitants, while exempting the clergy from the civil authorities. A later addendum to this legend relates that Theodululs had revealed to him by an angel that the pope intended to spend a night in the embraces of a concubine. While thinking upon this revelation, the devil drew near in female form. Theodulus seized him, leaped on his shoulders, and compelled him to serve as a medium of transportation to Rome, where he was able to prevent the papal sin. The Bollandists add to the above a miracle, through which Theodulus filled all obtainable vessels with the juice of a single grape which he had blessed at a time when the vintage had failed. This miracle elevated him to the rank of patron saint of the country, in which character he is still commemorated with great rejoicings on Aug. 16. No martyrologies or similar documents mention this Theodulus. Rudpert is clearly a mythical personage. The bishop under consideration is imaginary, and probably developed out of the fact that donations to the Church of Valais were made in honorem S. Marice or S. Theodori (Theoduli), and the other fact that Charlemagne had a court bishop named Theodore, who dedicated the Church of Zurich. See Gelpke, Kirchengesch. d. Schweiz, 1, 91 sq., 120 sq.; 2, 95 sq.; Briguet, Vallesia Christiana (1744), p. 48 sq., 95 sq.; Rivaz. De la Legion Thebenne (1779), p. 37, etc.; Comment. Previous Gulielmi Cuperi, etc. —Herzog, Real Encyklop. s.v.

## Theodulph[[@Headword:Theodulph]]

             termed Aurelianensis, probably a Goth, was one of the men whom Charlemagne invited to France for the advancement of learning. He was in Gaul as early as 781, and in his classical tendency resembled Alcuin, whose commendation he received. He was, in fact, one of the foremost representatives of the peculiar renaissance poetry called into being by Charlemagne's forcible promotion of culture. His poems are not without value to an understanding of the social condition is of his time. As a theological writer he is less important, his works being limited to tracts — De Odine Baptismi, De Spiritu Sanctmo-fragments of sermons, and Capitula addressed to the presbyters of his parish. The Capitula reveal his care for his clergy, and especially his concern for the establishing, by the clergy, of popular schools throughout the diocese. Charlemagne gave him- the abbey of. Eleury and the bishopric of Orleans, and employed him in affairs of state. In 794 Theodulph was present at the Council of Frankfort. After the death of Charlemagne, he appears to have at first connected himself with the party of Louis the Pious, but afterwards to have desired a more powerful ruler. The complaint laid against him at Aix-la'-Chapelle accused him of conspiring with Bernard of Italy, and he was imprisoned in the monastery of Angers. He was pardoned by Louis, but was soon afterwards snatched away by death, in 821.

Literature. —Hist. Lit. de la France, 4,: 459; Tiraboschi, Soria della Lett. Ital. III, 2, 196; Bahr, Gesch. d. rom. Lit. in Carol. Zeitalter (Carlsruhe, 1840), § 34, 35, 139; Guizot, Cours d'Histoire Moderne, 2, 334, Brussels ed, 2, 334; id. Hist. de la Civilisation en France, 2, 197204. Theodulph's poems were collected by Sirmond (Paris, 1646, 8vo). Also in Bibl. Patr. Max. (Lugd. 1677), 14:28; and in Migne, Patrol. 105. See Herzog, Real- Encyklop. s.v.

## Theognostus[[@Headword:Theognostus]]

             A person of this name is said by Philip of Sida (see Dodwell, Dissert. in Iren. [Oxon. 1689], p. 488 sq.) to have presided over the catechetical school of Alexandria in the second half of the 3rd century. Photius calls him an Alexandrian and an exegete; and he was unquestionably an Origenist, in the strict sense. Photius also expressly states that Theognostus shared the errors of Origen with respect to the Trinity, and termed the Son  Icri aycc (comp. Dionys. Alexand., and see Athanasius, De Blasph. in Spirit. Sanctum; also Origen, De Princ. 1, 3, 7, 63). Theognostus wrote seven books of Hypotheses, which, according to Photius, constitute a doctrinal work constructed in the order of loci-(1) of God the Father as the exclusive originator of the world (against an assumed eternity of matter); (2) of the Son; (3) of the Holy Spirit; (4) of angels and demons; (5 and 6) of the incarnation; (7) of the world-order. The brief extracts from this work which were preserved by Athanasius in De Decret. Nic. Synod. § 25, and a fragment from that father's work On the Blasphemy of the Holy Ghost (Athan. Ephesians 4 ad Serap. § 11) may be found in Ronth, Relig. Sacr. 3, 221 sq. See Galland, Bibl. Vet. Patr. 3; Guericke, De Schola Alexand. (Halle, 1824), 1, 78; 2, 325 sq.

## Theogony[[@Headword:Theogony]]

             (θεογονία), the name given in ancient Greece to a class of poems recounting the genealogy of the gods. Musaeus is said to have written the earliest Theogony; but his work, as well as the theogonies of Orpheus (q.v.) and others, have perished; that of Hesiod being the only one that has come down to us. This has been translated by Thomas Cook (Lond. 1728, 2 vols. 4to).

## Theologal[[@Headword:Theologal]]

             The third Lateran Council, held in 1179, ordered that teachers should be appointed to the various churches and-monasteries who should instruct the clergy, and be rewarded for their labors with suitable benefices. The fourth Lateran Council repeated this ordinance, and provided in Canon 10 that only capable men should be appointed in cathedrals and convent churches, who should, in their capacity of masters, assist the bishops in preaching, hearing confessions, imposing ecclesiastical penalties, and otherwise promoting the welfare of Christians. Canon 11 provided, in addition, that, where the means of a church permitted, a good teacher of grammar should be appointed; while metropolitan churches should appoint a theologian, whose business it should be to instruct the clergy and other religionists in the knowledge of Holy Scripture and all other matters which are important to the care of soils. This teacher should be allowed the income from a prebend so long as he continued to perform the functions of his office, but should not rank as a canon; and it was to such instructors that the name of theologal was given. The Council of Basle ordered the more general  employment of theologals. See Fortgesete Samml. v. alten u. neuen theol. Sachen ( Leips. 1721), p. 968; Mansi, Sacr. Cone. Nova et Ampliss. Collectio (Venet 1778), 22:998 sq. —Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Theologia Germanica[[@Headword:Theologia Germanica]]

             (the German title is Büchlein von der deutschen Theologie) is the title of the famous theological work, by an unknown author, which was discovered by Luther and published for the first time by him in 1516. The title implies merely that it is a German theological work, and is not to be understood as asserting the spirit of exclusiveness to which Poiret objected, in any degree.

The contents of the book are entirely in harmony with the writings of Tauler, Suso, and other mystics connected with the Friends of God of the 14th century. Its object is to teach self-renunciation, the laying-aside of our own and the accomplishing of the Divine will. It declares that only our self- will separates man from God, the perfect one; it was self-will that changed angels into devils, and it is this alone which feeds the flames of hell. Haughty and opinionated minds, it asserts, aim at perfection in other ways than that of humility and obedience. In this their conduct resembles that of the devil, and they can accordingly end only in ruin. Communion with God is to be had only when the soul passes through repentance and is purified from sin and selfishness, thus attaining to enlightenment. Love and the practice of virtue are also requisite to true enlightenment, as is, in addition, a cheerful endurance of trials and temptations. Thus enlightened, a soul attains to union with God and enters into unending perfection.

The book has been attributed to various authors, e.g. Eblendus, Tauler, etc., but without authority. Luther's preface declares that it was written by a priest and custos in the “Deutschherrn” house at Frankfort-onthe-Main. A manuscript copy, discovered by Dr. Reuss of Wtirzburg, calls it simply Der Frankfurter. Hamberger, in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v., thinks that the priest Heinrich of Rodelheim has been shown beyond controversy to be its author. The question of authorship is a difficult one, because the writer, who was associated with the Friends of God, intentionally followed the custom of those mystics in writing anonymously.

The fact that Luther first gave publicity to the work caused it to be regarded in time as the special property of Protestants. The Romish Church at first paid no attention to it, though it gave occasion to the Bavarian  bishop Pirstinger to write a Tewtsche Theologey from his point of view. In March, 1621, however, the German Theology was placed on the Index. A recent Romish theologian, Gunther, has charged it with pantheistic tendencies; but this is evidently malicious, since it strains the language of a book which does not pretend to a strictly scientific character further than the case will warrant. Luther's edition of 1516 was incomplete; but the second edition comprehended the whole work, and was accompanied with a preface from his pen. Numerous editions followed in rapid succession, Luther himself adding five to those already mentioned. The most desirable edition is perhaps that of Johann Arndt, who supplements Luther's preface with an excellent one by himself (1631). The manuscript discovered by Dr. Reuss was edited by Dr. Pfeiffer, of Vienna (2nd ed. 1855). This version is more complete than Luther's, particularly in the first third and near the end of the work. Repeated translations have been made into Low-German, Flemish, English, Latin, and French; the best known English version being that of Miss Susanna Winkworth, with preface by Rev. C. Kingsley, and introduction by Prof. Stowe (Andover, 1856).Lisco, Heilslehre des Theologia Germanica, etc. (Stuttgart, 1857), and Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Theologian[[@Headword:Theologian]]

             one who treats of theology, or the science of things divine. The most ancient Greeks used the latter term in the sense of narratio de deo, and those who wrote the history of the gods, their works and exploits, were called θεολόγοι. Moses is called by Philo θεολογεῖν when he gives the history of the creation. Among the Romans, from the time of Numa Pompilius to that of the emperors the knowledge and worship of the gods were made subservient to the interests of the State. Thus, according to Augustine (De Civ. Dei, 6:1), there were three kinds of theology — the poetical, or that of the poets; the physical, or that of the philosophers; and the political, or that of the legislators. The Greek Christians originally designated any deep philosophical apprehension of the truths of religion by the term Gnosis (knowledge), which was opposed to Pistis (faith). First, during the 3rd and 4th centuries, the word theology came into use especially in connection with such of the fathers as defended the doctrine of the deity of the Logos. In this sense the evangelist John and Gregory of Nazianzum were termed theologians. During the same period, the word theology was applied to the doctrine of the Trinity. In the century following, Theodoret widened its application by applying it to the whole  circle of theoretical instruction in: religion. Finally, in the 12th century, Abelard, in his Theologia Christiana, gave the word that comprehensive signification it still bears, as expressive not only of a theoretical, but also of a practical, exposition of religious truth. In general, therefore, theology is the knowledge of God carried to the highest degree of perfection in respect to correctness, clearness, and evidence of which it is susceptible in this world.

Theology is divided into two great branches —

(1) Natural, or that which relates to such disclosures of himself as God has made in the outward world; and

(2) Revealed, or such as he has made through his spoken and written word. Eminent writers in the latter department of theology, as Schleiermacher, Hagenbach, Pelt, Godet, and others, present different methods of arranging the different subjects embraced in this study. SEE THEOLOGY. The arrangement adopted by Dr. J. M'Clintock is given in the article METHODOLOGY SEE METHODOLOGY (q.v.). The different branches are discussed under their several heads. SEE APOLOGETICS; SEE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY; SEE ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY; SEE ETHICS; SEE POLEMICS, etc.

## Theological Seminaries[[@Headword:Theological Seminaries]]

             SEE SEMINARIES, THEOLOGICAL.

## Theologus[[@Headword:Theologus]]

             is the title of a clerical instructor of the clergy associated in chapters, etc., who was appointed, by the authority of several councils, to teach the Holy Scriptures; the Theologal (q.v.).

## Theology[[@Headword:Theology]]

             (from θεός, God, and λόγος, discourse). is not to be interpreted simply as its etymology requires, as the doctrine of God, nor yet historically, as the doctrine of the Trinity, but is to be understood with reference to a definite range of life which it is to bring into the consciousness and apprehend both theoretically and practically. Theology is not, consequently, the doctrine of the Christian religion, nor of the self-consciousness of God in man, as speculative theology is wont to speak, nor yet of the feeling of the Absolute. It is primarily the shaping of a life in man; in the language of Steenstrup, the Danish divine, it is an internal habit, which lies deeper than the intellect. This has been conceded since the time of Schleiermacher with reference to both religion and theology. Rudelbach describes it as a science  of divine things mediated by the Spirit of God. Vilmar teaches that true theology is esoteric in form, because truly scientific; but also practical, because it involves piety and the entire contents of religion. It sustains to the practical life; however, only the relation of idea to practice. The heart of the Christian life is, moreover, not religion, but the kingdom of God, or God's organic revelation to the world-the Church (see Storr, Schleiermacher, Baumgarten-Crusius, and many Romish theologians; also Kling, in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 12:600-606). Theology thus becomes the science of the unfolded, objective self-manifestation of the Divine Spirit in the phenomenal kingdom of God a practical science which develops progressively and side by side with that kingdom. But it is nonetheless a positive science also through its relation to the kingdom. Schleiermacher (Kurze Darstell. etc.) describes Christian theology as the comprehension of all that scientific knowledge and those scientific methods without whose possession and use a harmonious direction of the Christian Church, i.e. a Christian Church government is not possible. This definition is, however, too external; for in the material of theology all truth finds its goal, and that fact should be expressed in its definition. Both the object and the scientific character of theology will be retained if the latter be defined as the scientific self-consciousness of the Church with reference to its development through the Holy Spirit, or, more briefly, its self- consciousness with respect to its self-edification.

From this definition theology branches out into particular departments. The self-consciousness has for its first task the apprehension of the Church in actuality by determining its historical origin, development, and present state. Historical theology is the history of the kingdom of God consciously apprehended. It subdivides into the three special branches of Sacred History, Ecclesiastical History, and Ecclesiastical Statistics.

The determination of sources and portrayal of the outworking and development of the leading principles by which events are governed are of primary importance in historical study. The first source here is wholly unique, being the might of the Divine Spirit. The source for the beginnings of the Christian Church is, at the same time, a regulative guide and vivifying principle to the Church. By the side of other sources it affords knowledge respecting the time of the origin of the Old Covenant, and its development until it became the New, and it possesses unquestionable authority as the earliest witness to the operative power of the Divine Spirit  in the world, and consequently as its mediating principle, or as the Bible, the only sacred book.

The first part of historical theology is consequently a knowledge respecting the Bible (Biblical theology, in the wider meaning). It is all-important to determine what books belong to the Bible, and this is the business of the Canon. The whole Bible is to be authenticated both in its parts and its text; to accomplish this is the work of historical and textual criticism. Introduction to the books of the Old and New Tests. (Isagogics), or, more exactly, the History of the Canon and of Biblical Literature, presents the collective material to view, and is followed by philological and theological exposition. The scientific conception of this expository work is Hermeneutics, or the art of interpretation. The history of the Word of God, the Divine Revelation, and the presentation of its contents which have attained to their development are given in Sacred History (and Archaeology) and in Biblical Dogmatics and Ethics-usually termed, in Germany, Biblical Theology of the Old and New Tests.; the latter being the final and gradually developing phase of the Divine Revelation, whose central point is the establishing of the kingdom of divine grace through Jesus Christ. This science is theologico-historical, and therefore deals largely with details, e.g. the particular doctrinal contents of separate Old- Test. books, etc.

Personal convictions are of great importance in this connection. Without being rooted in the Divine Revelation, no apprehension of its meaning is possible. The contents of the Revelation as appropriated both by the individual and the Church must accordingly be received into the scientific consciousness, which indicates the task of scientific theology. The latter, however, does not derive its contents directly from the Bible, but through numerous intermediate agencies, to contemplate which is the work of Ecclesiastical History, and, in so far as they belong to the present age of the Church, of Ecclesiastical Statistics.

Ecclesiastical History portrays the history of the kingdom of God in time from the founding of the Christian Church on the day of Pentecost to the present day, having the end of prophecy continually in view as its goal. It directs its attention more prominently either to the outward development of that kingdom in the Church and the life as renewed and inspired by Christianity (Church History), or to the consciousness of that development and its contents the History of Doctrines and the connected History of  Christian Ethics, Literature, and Art. The study of Sources, Geography, Chronology, etc., likewise involves much that is peculiar, and requires the separate theological treatment of those branches, in consequence of which originate Patristics, Ecclesiastical Archaeology, History of Liturgies, etc.

The present not only forms the limit of development at which the kingdom of God has arrived, but also the ground on which we stand. The description of this ground is the work of Ecclesiastical Statistics. It includes both external and internal conditions, both of the faith and the life, and gives rise, on the one hand, to Statistics of Churches in different countries and of different denominations and sects, and, on the other, to Historical Symbolics.

Inquiry into, the faith and morals of different denominations leads from Statistics over to Systematic Theology. The nature of the latter is determined by the nature of the Christian consciousness as based on a new life in the individual and the race. The development of that consciousness into scientific knowledge requires, first, an assured recognition of the principles which underlie the kingdom of God as manifested in Christianity; next, an unfolding of the contents of such principles in systematic form; and, finally, a recognition of the relation of this knowledge to the universe of human knowledge. In this way is obtained a science of the principles and the particular phenomena of Christianity as they are given in its history (the science of Christian principles or fundamentals), a science of their doctrinal and ethical contents generally, and also in the particular confessions (thetical theology), and a philosophy of Christianity (parallel to the philosophy of law in a different field of ethics).

As Systematic Theology does not proceed from the Christian convictions of the individual, but from those of the entire Church or of one of its subordinate parts, it provides room for Ecclesiastical Tradition. The starting-point is the idea of the kingdom of God which rests on the Word of God as objectively presented to us in the Canon, as approved in the heart in the character of Christ, and as given in Tradition in the forms of faith, custom, constitution, and methods. The consummation is in the Dogma, in which God's kingdom is the object of the scientific consciousness of the general Church, or, under historical limitations, assumes a definite form in the particular denomination (Denominational Principles or Systematic Symbolics). At this point the doctrinal consciousness discovers its variation from the systems of other  denominations and of morbid apparitions within the Church to which it belongs. The latter observation gives rise to Polemics, or, better, the Discussion of ethical and doctrinal excrescences in the Church (analogous to pathology in medicine).

The ground has thus been prepared for the founding and establishing of Thetical Theology, the confessional Dogmatics and Ethics as traditionally determined on the basis of the underlying faith. Here the dogma, in its character of scriptural truth subjectively apprehended and handed down in the Church by authoritative tradition, attains to its complete development; and here the various doctrines are combined into a system through the labors of critical, religiously ethical, and systematic scholars. The true relation is accurately indicated by the oxymoron in the phrase “the science of the faith.” Unquestionable certainty is given in the faith, but the mind transmutes this successively and partially into knowledge.

This dogmatico-ethical process begets a system of knowledge respecting God and divine things. This constitutes Speculative Theology, the last result of a philosophy of Christianity which was conceived in mysticism, unfolded in theosophy, sifted by criticism, and formed by speculation, and now presents Christianity with the science of it as the center and goal of all culture and as the crown of the scientific labors of the entire human race. Christianity is here presented as a religion, and as the highest manifestation of religion, and also as the complete realization of the kingdom of God on earth through a progressive development, which reaches down to the final consummation; and in this light Christianity is presented as the central feature in the philosophy of human history.

The duty of the Church to insure its own edification through the power of the Holy Spirit comes into prominence here, as it does in the historical department. That edification is Ecclesiastical Praxis, and the scientific understanding of its foundations and methods constitutes Practical Theology, the third principal branch of theological science. The starting- point of this science is the energy of the Christian life, which is to be perfected. Practical theology is the science of human operations within the kingdom of God and as enabled by the Holy Spirit, to the end that that kingdom may be fully developed. Only through God can we arrive at God, in knowledge as in feeling or in practice.

The setting forth of these fundamentals, and of the methods by which the organism of God's kingdom, particularly in the Church, is to be erected on  them, is the work of the science of Ecclesiastical Foundations, otherwise the science of the principles of Practical Theology, which finds its completion in the science of Church organization. We next discover a separate department of Church law, which constitutes the second part of Practical Theology, and subdivides into Church law and Church government (in a restricted sense, Church polity; in an unrestricted, the care of souls). The process of self-edification under the Holy Spirit's influence, moreover, gives rise to a recognition of the means through which this is achieved, and thereby originated a third technical part. covering the theories of art methods in the different Christian churches, which are known, with reference to the shaping of the external forms of worship so that they may represent the worship of the inner man, as Liturgics; with reference to the proclamation of the Word of God, as Homiletics or Keryktics; with reference to the training of the young, as Christian Pedagogics and Catechetics; with reference to the conversion of heathen and other false religionists, as Halieutics and Theory of Missions, and with reference to the organization of scientific instruction for the Church, as Ecclesiastical Paedeutics, which has to do with the Christian organization of institutions of learning, as the placing of theological faculties in universities, the founding of theological seminaries, etc. Theological literature cannot, of course, be brought within any rule, but may be classified in conformity with its manner of entering upon the arena of the Christian and the Church life. —Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. SEE THEOLOGIAN.

See Pelt, Theol. Encyklop. (Hamb. and Gotha, 1843), with whose theory the above article is substantially agreed. SEE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF THEOLOGY, with the literature there referred to.

## Theology And Science[[@Headword:Theology And Science]]

             SEE SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

## Theology, Biblical[[@Headword:Theology, Biblical]]

             SEE BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.

## Theology, Dogmatical[[@Headword:Theology, Dogmatical]]

             SEE DOGMATICAL THEOLOGY.

## Theology, Exegetical[[@Headword:Theology, Exegetical]]

             SEE EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

## Theology, Natural[[@Headword:Theology, Natural]]

             SEE NATURAL THEOLOGY.

## Theology, New England[[@Headword:Theology, New England]]

             including “New Divinity,” “Edwardean Divinity,” “Hopkinsianism,” etc.

I. Origin and Development. —The original theology of New England was the strict Calvinism of the Reformed standards. In 1648 the Westminster Confession was formally adopted by the synod convened at Cambridge, and it remained the standard of faith for all “the New English churches” until 1680, when “the elders and messengers of the churches in the colony of the Massachusetts in New England” substituted the confession drawn up by the Congregationalists of the mother country, and known as the “Savoy Confession.” In 1708 the Connecticut churches made the same change. This substitution was in neither case demanded by a changed theological sentiment in the churches, the Savoy Confession being almost word for word identical with the Westminster, except on points connected with Church polity. Its Calvinism was equally strict. Not long after this, however, strong and independent minds began to appear in the ranks of the New England ministry, whose philosophical acumen and practical earnestness could not rest satisfied with a theological system which to them seemed palpably inconsistent in parts, and morally paralyzing as a whole.

These, prompted partly by their own subjective difficulties, and partly by the exigencies and influences of the period which witnessed the rise of New England Unitarianism, the introduction of Universalism, the visits of Charles Wesley and George Whitefield the planting of Methodism, the Revolutionary War, the abolition of slavery in the New England states, the defection from orthodoxy of Harvard College and the largest churches of Massachusetts, the end of the compulsory support of religion by taxes, the fall of the Lockean and the rise of a transcendental school of philosophy, the extension of the Baptist and of the Methodist Episcopal and Protestant Episcopal churches over all the New England States, the foundling of the noble missions of the American Board — not to mention remoter and less important events — commenced a series of modifications in the traditional Calvinistic system of doctrine designed to render it more rational, more palatable to the believer, and more easily defensible against the assailant. The process has been going forward with a good degree of steadiness ever since the days of president Edwards. One has suggested change in one  part, another in another; one has brought forward a metaphysical novelty, another a theological one, a third an ethical; liberal and progressive influences have become incorporated in organs and institutions; free pulpits have popularized the various innovations; new generations have grown up under the influence of the improved doctrination; in short, an almost complete theological revolution has gradually taken place. In their earliest development, the more generally received of these new views were styled'” New-light Divinity;” then “New Divinity,” afterwards “Edwardean;” sometimes “Hopkintonian” or “Hopkinsian.”

From the fact that Edwards, Hopkins, West, and Catlin resided in Berkshire County, the system was at one time called “Berkshire Divinity.” When embraced in Great Britain by Andrew Fuller, Dr. Ryland, Robert Hall, Sutcliffe, Carey, Jay, and Erskine, it was called “American Theology,” to distinguish it from the European systems. In this country it has often been denominated “New England Theology,” in order to discriminate it from systems that have prevailed in other parts of the land. This term, however, is far from satisfactory, partly because the New England theology of to-day is very different from the New England theology of a hundred and fifty years ago, and partly because, in speaking of the New England theology of recent times, the term must be used in a sense sufficiently wide and vague to include differing types of doctrine historically associated with various individual divines and with the Andover, New Haven, and East Windsor (now Hartford) schools.

The precise relation sustained by the elder Edwards (1703-58) to this theological development has long been, and still remains, a subject of controversy. The advocates of the most advanced -new views are anxious to claim him as the real father of the whole movement, while the Old- school writers, with equal zeal, endeavor to guard the good man's memory from so “slanderous” an allegation. The former appeal to the “Ten Improvements in Theology,” enumerated by the younger Edwards (Works, 1, 481) as having been “made by his father,” and claim that such a list entitles their author to the very first rank among the innovators upon New England orthodoxy. The latter find in this enumeration of the younger Edwards only an effort on the part of its author to magnify the number and character of his father's theological novelties, in order the better to prepare the way for the introduction of his own more radical and dangerous ones. One writer (in Princeton Rev. Oct. 1858) has attempted to show that president Edwards's only deviations from the current Calvinism of his age  were confined to two points-viz., he held to mediate instead of immediate imputation; and, secondly, advocated “an eccentric philosophical theory of virtue.” The true state of the case would seem to be that Edwards, without intending to initiate, or even to occasion, such a grand revolution, really advanced principles and made statements which afterwards suggested, and almost logically necessitated, the peculiar views and even phraseology of his successors (see Park, On the Rise of the Edwardean Theory of the Atonement).

To present a complete delineation of New England theology, it would be necessary to write a critical history of New England speculation. Contributions and modifying influences have come from so many sources that even then it would be exceedingly difficult to apportion to each of the original elaborators his precise due. This difficulty is greatly enhanced by the intimacy of the relations, which subsisted among them. So close were those relations that in some instances it is next to impossible to determine the real authorship of important modifications. Edwards. Bellamy, and Hopkins, the “great triumvirate of New England theologians,” were not merely contemporaries, they were confidential friends, reciprocal teachers and learners, mutual givers and receivers, allied investigators of divine truth: Each had peculiarities of belief, each held fast to the substance of the old Calvinistic system; but there was substantial agreement in much that was new and revolutionary. For many years they enjoyed the most favorable opportunities for the interchange of sentiments, mutual stimulation, and influence. Their relations to the generation succeeding were also intimate. The first was father of Dr. Edwards, the second his theological teacher, the third was his most valued counselor, and was intimately associated with him in the examination of his father's MSS. West was a confidential companion of Bellamy and Hopkins, intimate also with Drs. Edwards, Smalley, and Emmons. Through Dr. Edwards the spirit of the triumvirate was transmitted to his pupils Dwight and Griffin, to his friends Backus and Smalley. Smalley was a pupil of Bellamy, the instructor of Emmons, the friend of Hopkins and West. To ascertain the exact contribution of any one of these to the actual development is evidently a task of the greatest difficulty.

About the year 1756 there were four or five clergymen whose views had come to be popularly distinguished as “Edwardean.” In 1773 the number had increased, according to Dr. Stiles, to about forty-five. During this year Dr. Hopkins published his Inquiry into the Nature of True Holiness,  elaborating the Edwardean theory more perfectly than Edwards had done; and, in a voluminous appendix, defending it against the objections which Mr. Hart and others had published against it. Thenceforth the Edwardeans were generally denominated “Hopkinsians.” This new term, though first applied to the New Divinity with special reference to its doctrine of the utter sinfulness of all acts preceding regeneration, was soon used to designate all Calvinistic divines who favored the doctrines of general atonement, natural ability, the active nature of all holiness and sin, and the justice of God in imputing to men none but their own personal transgressions. Their number in 1796, according to Dr. Hopkins, was upwards of a hundred. Dr. Stiles enumerates as among the champions of the new system in 1787 the two Edwardses. Bellamy, Hopkins, Trumbull, Smalley, Judson, Spring, Robinson (father of Dr. Edward Robinson), Strong, Dwight, Emmons. In 1799 Hopkins appended the names of West, Levi Hart, Backus, presidents Balch and Fitch. A later pen has added the honored names of Dr. Catlin, president Appleton, and Dr. Austin. At the present time the peculiarities of New-school New England theology have very general prevalence in the orthodox Congregational churches of the New England and Western States, and are favored by many in other Calvinistic bodies. They are taught in the theological seminaries of Andover, New Haven, Bangor, and Chicago. They are disseminated by quarterly and other organs of marked ability, among which the Bibliotheca Sacra and The New-Englander, hold the first rank. They have affected the current theological teachings of the Baptist churches not a little; and the great schism which divided the Presbyterian Church in 1837 was chiefly traceable to their influence in that communion. SEE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

II. Relation to Original Calvinism. —The metaphysical and ethical principles accepted by the New-school representatives of modern New England theology, and fundamental to their system of doctrine, are the following:

(1.) There is a radical distinction between necessity and certainty.

(2.) All sin is of an active and voluntary nature; the same is true of all holiness.

(3.) Although in every exercise the human will possesses the natural power of contrary choice, still, as a matter of fact, it is invariably  determined by motives. In other words, although the will always can choose the least apparent good, it always will choose the greatest apparent good.

(4.) Natural ability must in all cases equal obligation.

(5.) Moral character or deserts are in no case transferable. In logically adhering to these principles and such as these in all their theological applications, the Edwardean divines have deviated from the old Calvinistic system in the following important theological, anthropological, and soteriological points:

1. Predestination. —They do not teach that God decrees the violations of moral agents in such a sense as to make those volitions necessary, but only that he has determined so to make and place men that they will act just as they do. In this manner God's decrees secure the certainty of men's choices, but do not secure their necessity. He predetermines all that lies back of the volition — the sensibilities of the agent and whatever may act on these — which predetermination enables him to foresee the result. At the same time, the agent is able in any case to choose otherwise than he actually does; and ought to make a holy choice even where God foresees that the choice will be sinful, and actually decrees to do that which will in fact result in the sinful choice or to omit that which would prevent it.

2. Original Sin. —Denying that there can be any ill desert prior to personal transgression, they repudiate the old Calvinistic doctrine respecting the imputation of Adam's guilt to his posterity, both in its mediate and immediate forms, with their realistic and diathetic justifications or theodicies. In its place they maintain that, in consequence of Adam's transgression, all men are so made and placed that they will uniformly, certainly, but freely, choose wrong rather than right. This constitution is not sin, but merely the sure occasion of it.

3. The Atonement. —

(1.) As to its nature, they teach that the sufferings of Christ were a satisfaction, not to the distributive, but only to the general, justice of God. He suffered not the exact penalty of the law, but pains substituted for that penalty and answering its purpose in the securement of the ends of the moral government.

(2.) As to the ground of its necessity. The necessity for an atonement was governmental, not arbitrary or ontological.

(3.) Fruits:

(a) simply release from the curse of the law, and thus mediately the blessings to the reception of which that curse was a bar (Emmons), or

(b), all blessings whatsoever (Griffin and the main body).

(4.) Extent. The atonement was not designed for the elect alone, but was made for all men as truly as for any.

4. Justification does not consist in any real or hypothetical transfer of the righteousness of Christ to the believer, but in pardoning his sins for Christ's sake and treating him as if innocent (Emmons), as if holy (main body).

5. Regeneration. —Objecting to old Calvinistic descriptions of this work, the New England theologians define it

(a) as a divine communication of a new spiritual taste or relish (elder Edwards, Dwight, etc.); or

(b), as a spiritual illumination (Bellamy); or

(c), as a (human) change of governing purpose under the influences of the Holy Spirit (Taylor, Finney, etc.); or

(d), as a gradual conversion by the moral suasion of the Holy Spirit (peculiar to Gilbert and his sympathizers); or

(e), as that radical change of the soul which is produced by the interposition of the Holy Spirit, and which consists in a change in the balance of the sensibilities and a change of preference from wrong to right (Prof. Park); or

(f), as a restoration of that life-communion with which God was lost by sin (Bushnell). Professor Park would apply the term regeneration to the work instantaneously wrought by the Holy Spirit on the nature of the soul, and the term conversion to the first holy act of the soul itself, the work of God preceding the free act of the soul in the order of nature, though not of time. By some the soul in this change is called wholly active (Emmons, Spring,  Pond); by others, wholly passive (Smalley, Burton); by others, both active and passive (Park).

6. Perseverance. —The elect can fall away after regeneration, even totally and finally, but never will. This is maintained by most on purely Biblical, as distinguished from psychological, grounds.

Other points might be adduced on which original Calvinism and the new tenets are far from accordant; but these are the most fundamental, and the differences above indicated will be found a key to the whole system. Perhaps nothing better illustrates the spirit of the two than their respective views of the final end of God in creation and providence. According to Old Calvinism, that end — the end to which all minor ones are subordinated — is the manifestation of God's character, particularly his justice and mercy, to intelligent creatures; according to Dr. Taylor, of New Haven, as understood by many, it is the production of the largest amount of happiness possible, holiness being simply a means thereto; according to Andover, and perhaps the main body of New England Calvinists of the New School, it is the securement of the largest amount of holiness, the highest happiness being simply a natural consequence. (But see a somewhat different representation of Taylor's views by president Porter in The New-Englander for 1860, p. 726-773.)

The controversy respecting the “Doings of the Unregenerate” has been quite too prominent in the history and development of this New Divinity to be passed over in silence. There have been three theories:

(1.) That man is under obligation to repent at once, and that all moral choices before repentance are sinful and must be utterly forbidden (Emmonis, Spring, Park).

(2.) That man is under obligation to repent immediately, but lie may perform preliminary acts which are neither sinful nor holy, and hence are not forbidden (Taylor).

(3.) (Corresponding with the Old-school theory) That while all acts of choice are sinful before repentance, it is still right to exhort men to the performance of certain acts before repentance, as this is the most probable method of securing their repentance (Dwight).

III. Relation to Original Arminianisn. —The representatives of old- fashioned Calvinism have often charged that the modifications introduced  by the Edwardean divines have simply brought about a substitution of the Arminian system for the Calvinistic one of the primitive New England churches. The teachings of New England theology with respect to the absolute dependence of individual salvation upon individual divine election, as also with respect to “special” grace and to human ability considered apart from the gracious aids of the Holy Spirit, do not sustain this charge; but in almost every other principle and doctrine the allegation is, in our view, susceptible of the fullest substantiation.

1. Take the “five points” of the original Arminian controversy. The Calvinists affirmed and the Arminians denied

(1) that the decrees of God respecting the eternal salvation or damnation of individual men are irrespective of the use they may make of their own freedom;

(2) that in the divine purpose and by divine decree the benefits of the atonement are limited to unconditionally elected individuals;

(3) that in consequence of original sin all persons naturally engendered from Adam are in such a condition of spiritual death that without that effectual calling and supernatural renovation which is by divine decree limited to the elect they can do absolutely nothing either towards the fulfillment of God's law or towards an effectual appropriation of the benefits of redemption;

(4) that those gracious influences of the Holy Spirit which are adapted and sufficient to lead a sinner to true repentance and salvation are restricted to a portion of the race, namely, to the unconditionally elect; and

(5) that true believers cannot, by any possibility, totally and finally fall from grace. In every one of these memorable issues of the Remonstrant and Contra-Remonstrant parties the representatives of New England theology stand with the original Arminians.

2. The same metaphysical and ethical principles underlie the two systems. We will review them in the order before given:

(1.) Certainty as distinguished from necessity. This was a favorite Arminian distinction (see Arminius, 1, 280, 281; 3, 402, 411, 416, 423, 425; Epistolae Theologicae, epist. 19:72 [Arminius]; Curcellaets, p. 774, etc.).

(2.) Active and voluntary nature of sin and holiness, universally maintained by the Arminian divines (see, for instance, Episcopius, 2, 92 b; Curcellseus, p. 136, 137, 902, 904; Limborch, II, 23:15; III, 4:8; V, 3, 2).

(3.) Self-determination in view of motives. According to New school New England theology, the will invariably chooses the greatest apparent good. This may be deemed incompatible with Arminian principles. Properly explained, however, it does not seem to be so. The theory is not that the will invariably chooses the greatest real good proffered for choice, nor even the greatest apparent good as estimated by the cool exercise of judgment, but simply that it chooses that good which appears to the subject, organized, circumstanced, and disposed as he is, as most desirable. It is only saying, in other words, that a man invariably chooses just as under the circumstances at that moment the state of his mind prompts him to choose. But,

(a), the Arminian authorities never denied this position. They denied that the mere absence of co-action constituted liberty (Episcopius, 1, 356,357 a); but New England divines do the same. They denied that mere spontaneity is liberty in its full sense (ibid. p. 198 b; Curcellaeus, p. 158,159); but the New England divines do the same. They denied, as did Leibnitz, that the decision of the will is invariably determined “ab ultimo judicio rationis practico” (Episcopius, 1, 209 b sq.; Curcellaeus, p. 985; Limborch, p. 131, etc.); but in the form propounded to them, the divines of New England would ill like manner repudiate it. They denied that the will is necessarily determined by motives; but this doctrine is rejected with equal explicitness by champions of Newschool New England theology.

(b.) The will in all rational choices invariably acts in view of a good (Episcopius, 1, 202 b, et al.).

(c.) The will is able to choose the least apparent good. This follows from the Arminian doctrine of power to the contrary. It is also illustrated in choices between objects of equal apparent desirableness. “Si paria offerat, quorum alterum talltumn eligendum est, libertas plenaria locum habebit” (ibid. p. 207).

(d.) In all deliberate choices men ordinarie follow the decision of the judgment; when not, it is because “alia quaedam causa impediat” (ibid. De Libero Arbitrio, VIII, 9).

(e.) They will never choose evil as evil, or “sub ratione mall” (ibid. 1, 215 b, 318 sq.).

(f.) Though the will does not invariably choose the greatest good according to the decision of the judgment, it does in all rational choices invariably choose thatgood which seems the most desirable to the whole man. This doctrine seems to be clearly implied in cap. 10 of Episcopius, Examen Sententiea Cameronis. The apparent contradiction found in cap. 8 of his Responsio ad Defensionem Cameronis is easily solved by observing that according to the doctrine of Episcopius, as according to that of the New England divines, the will does not invariably follow the dictate of reason, nor invariably follow the dictate of the natura appetitiva, both which maintenances are perfectly consistent with the doctrine in question — to wit, that the will invariably chooses the good which to the whole man under the inward, and outward conditions seems the most desirable. On this point, then, so far is the doctrine of the Newschool divines of New England from being incompatible with Arminian teachings that, on the contrary, that doctrine finds in Remonstraint literature some of its earliest and most carefully guarded enunciations.

(4.) Obligation cannot transcend ability-an axiom with the Arminians (see Arminius, Declaratio, passim; Curcellaeus, p. 96 b; also VII, 2, passim; Limborch, III, 4:7, etc.). Here we may remark that the distinction between natural and moral ability is much older than its emergence in New England theology, being clearly laid down in several of the elder Arminian divines (see Episcopius, 2, 94 a; Curcellaeus, p. 156, 421).

(5.) Intransferableness of moral character and deserts, strongly asserted by Episcopius, 2, 151 b; by Curcellaeus, p. 131-137, 424, 470, 896-902; by Limborch, V, 77, 18; III, 3, 11, etc.

3. In positive theological, anthropological, and soteriological teachings the two systems are in marked accord.

(1.) The Decrees of God. —The New-school divines of New England hold to a universal foreordination, absolute as respects all divine acts, effectual as regards all consequences of those acts. One of the consequences of those acts is the establishment and maintenance of human freedom. What said Arminian theology?

(a.) All divine acts are absolutely decreed--” Deus nihil facit, nisi prius apud se id decreverit facere” (Curcellaeus, p. 82).

(b.) God foreordains (positively or permissively). whatsoever cometh to pass” Nihil absque ipsius permissu ant directione evenit” (ibid. p. 87).

(c.) God decrees to do things which he knows will occasion sinful choices on the part of men, and to abstain from acts which, if wrought, he knows would prevent sinful choices. This also is clearly involved in what is laid down by Arminius (3, 418-429), Episcopius, Curcellaeus, and Limborch on Permissio, Exccecaiio, and Induratio.

(d.) God decrees to do that which he knows will occasion sin, for a specific end, and that end is the best possible (Arminius, 3, 419).

(e.) A decree to do that which will as a matter of fact occasion sin does not in any wise necessitate that sin (Curcellieus, p. 382, 1021).

(2.) The Constitution of Men not Sin, but the Invariable Occasion of Sin. —No New England divine has produced all abler exposition and defense of this view than are found in Curcellaeus, Dissertatio de Peccato Originis, and in Limborchb III, 4.

(3.) The Atonement. —The identity of the Edwardean theory of the atonement with the Dutch Arminian, as respects the nature of the atonement, ground of its necessity, and its extent is articulately proven in art. 3 of the Meth. Quar. Rev. July, 1860.

(4.) Justification. —Arminius's definition of justification could be subscribed to by the whole body of New England divines with perhaps the exception of Emmons. “Justification is a just and gracious act of God as a judge, by which, from the throne of his grace and mercy, lie absolves from his sins man, a sinner, but who is a believer, on account of Christ and the obedience and righteousness of Christ; and considers him righteous [justum], to the salvation of the justified person, and to the glory of divine righteousness and grace” (2, 116).

(5.) Regeneration. —By the elder Arminius, Calvinistic, and Lutheran divines this operation of the Spirit is not sharply and definitely distinguished from sanctification, but in the definitions of the representative New England divines there is nothing to which Arminius or his disciples would have objected.

(6.) Perseverance. —

(a.) The regenerate can fall away. This is universally maintained by the Arminians.

(b.) The regenerate in point of fact never do fall away. Arminius did not decide. He says, “At no period have I asserted that believers do finally decline or fall away from faith and salvation” (2, 281). Like New England Calvinists, he asserted the possibility, but not thefact, of a total and final defection of the elect.

From the foregoing it is evident that the evangelical New England reaction against Calvinism, while remarkably indigenous and original, resembles in a most striking manner the earlier Arminian reaction. The Remonstrants repudiated no part of standard Calvinism which these New England theologians do not repudiate; they revolted from traditional tenets from the same honorable motives; they anticipated by two centuries nearly every favorite idea of their New England successors, and would perhaps have anticipated every one explicitly, had it not been for the backwardness of the psychological and ethical sciences. Nevertheless, there ever remains this radical difference, that according to New England theology, as according to original Calvinism, the real reason why one man is saved and another is not, is always in the last analysis to be found in the different foreordinations of God respecting the two, and this difference of foreordinations is referable solely to the sovereign good-pleasure of God.

IV. Variations and Side-issues. —Several noteworthy views and speculations, to which their respective authors owed no small share of their reputation, are either not adopted: or positively repudiated by the great mass of recent New England Calvinists. For example:

1. The Edwardean notion of human liberty. President Edwards is generally understood to have accepted the definition of Locke and of the sensational school, making the liberty of the human will “the power, opportunity, or advantage that any one has to do as he pleases ;” in other words, one's ability freely to execute volitions philosophically or coactively necessitated. The inadequacy of this definition is now universally admitted. SEE EDWARDS.

2. Hopkins's doctrine of disinterested benevolence. This was at one time the most vital and essential element in the New Divinity. With Hopkins it was the corner-stone of systematic theology. SEE HOPKINS.

3. Emmons's hypothesis of God's efficient causality of ever moral act of man. Emmons held that God was the efficient originator of every volition of the human mind, good or evil, holy or sinful. He has had but few adherents, and doubts are expressed as to whether he has been correctly understood by many on this point (Park, Memoir, p. 385 sq.). SEE EMMONS.

4. Nathaniel W. Taylor's view of the non-preventability of sin, his doctrine of the basis of virtue, and his metaphysical explanation of the Sacred Trinity. SEE TAYLOR.

5. The perfectionism of Prof. Finney. SEE CHRISTIAN PERFECTION; SEE OBERLIN THEOLOGY.

6. Dr. Edward Beecher's doctrine that all the descendants of Adam have enjoyed an equitable probation in a previous state of being, and that they are born under the curse of original sin on account of having sinned in that pre-existent state. See his Conflict of Ages and Concord of Ages. SEE PRE-EXISTENCE.

7. Dr. Horace Bushnell's view of Christ and of the Sacred Trinity, of revelation, sin, and the atonement. See literature below.

V. Literature. —

1. In General. —A Memoirs and Works of the Edwardses, Bellamy, Hopkins, Stephen and Samuel West, Samuel Spring, John Smalley, Emmons, Dwight, Leonard Woods, N. W. Taylor, Benlnet Tyler; Lynman Beecher, Horace Bushnell, and others above mentioned; Park, Essay on the Development of the Edwardean Theory of the Atonement (prefixed to his collection of Discourses and Treatises on the Atonement by Edwards, Smalley, Maxcy, Emmons, Griffin, Burge, and Weeks); Woods, Old and New Theology (from an Old-school Presbyterian standpoint); Hodgson [Meth.], New Divinity Examined; Fisk [Meth.], The Calvinistic Controversy; Ellis [Unit.], Fifty Years of the Unitarian Controversy; Fiske [Cong.], New Eng. Theol. in Bill. Sac. 22:477, 568;. Lawrence, in Amer. Theol. Rev. May, 1860; Bibl. Sac. and Princeton Bibl. Repertory, 1851- 52, and passim; The Church Review, 2, 89; 5, 349; Smith, Church History  in Tables, p. 78; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philippians (Amer. ed.), 2, 443-460; Sherman, New England Divines; Sprague, Annals.

2. The Pre-Edwardean Period. —See Sprague, Annals, vol. 1; SEE COTTON, JOHN; SEE DAVENPORT, JOHN; SEE MATHER, COTTON, SEE INCREASE, and SEE RICHARD; SEE STODDARD, SOLOMON; SEE WIGGLESWSORTH, EDWARD.

3. Jonathan Edwards and his Theology. —Reviews of his work on the Will by Dr. James Dana (1770), J. Day (1841), A. T. Bledsoe (1845), D. D. Whedon (1859); Oliver Wendell Holmes's art. in the International Rev. July, 1880. The Bibliotheca Sacra will give some of Edwards's yet unpublished manuscripts in 1881. One on Trinity and Redemption, ed. by Smyth, N. Y. 1880. SEE EDWARDS.

4. Hopkins and Hopkinsianism. —Memoir and Works, 3 vols.; Bibl. Sac. 9:174 sq.; 10:63 sq.; 19:633; Ely, Calvinism and Hopkinssianism. SEE HOPKINS, SAMUEL.

5. Emmons and Emmonsism. —Memoir and Works, 6. vols.; abstract of his theology in Bibl. Sac. 7:254 sq., 479 sq.; see also 9:170 sq., and 22:467 sq.; Smith, Faith and Philosophy, p. 215-263.

6. Taylor and Taylorism. —Memoir and Works, 4 vols.; Bibl. Sac. 17:355 sq., 452 sq.; Lord, in the Evang. Mag. 1832-36; Tyler, Letter to Dr. Hawes; essays in Christian Spectator and Spirit of Missimos, passim; Pigeon, New Haven Theology, in Lit. and Theol. Review, 5, 149 sq.; 6:121, 280, 557; Fisher, Discussions in History and Theology (1880), p. 285 sq.; Thasher, Taylorism Examined (1834,12mo); Meth. Quar. Rev. Oct. 1860, 1862; New-Englander, 1859, 1860.

7. Bushnell and Bushnellism. —Life and Letters; Works, especially God in Christ; Forgiveness and Law : —Vicarious Sacrifice; Turnbull, Review of Bushnell's Theories; Hovey, God with Us, an Exam. of Bushnell's Vic. Sac.; Bartol, Principles and Portraits, p. 366 sq.; The New-Englander, 2, 309,440; 5, 6; Meth. Quar. Rev. 1866.

8. New Divinity in the Presbyterian Church. —Memoirs and writings of Rev. Albert Barnes; Beman, On the Atonement; Duffield, Regeneration; Whelpley, Triangle; E. S. Ely, E. D. Griffin, etc.; Hodge, Essays and Reviews; Bibl. Sac. 20:561. SEE PRESBYTRIAN CHURCH, NEW- SCHOOL.

9. The “Old School” in New England Theology. Tyler, Memoir and Lectures; Woods, Works (6 vols.); Burton, Essays; Fisher, Discussions in History and Theology, p. 227 sq.; Bibl. Sac. 20:311 sq.; 30:371 sq.; Parsons Cooke, New England Puritan; Recorder, etc. (W. F. W.)

## Theology, Practical[[@Headword:Theology, Practical]]

             SEE PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

## Theology, Scholastic[[@Headword:Theology, Scholastic]]

             SEE SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY.

## Theology, Speculative[[@Headword:Theology, Speculative]]

             This title has come into use, particularly in Germany, to designate that method in systematic theology which, availing itself of all the helps subsidiary to theology, collects its material under the guidance of a philosophical, or speculative, survey of the field, and combines it into a systematic whole.

1. The necessity for such a term is shown by the fact that neither systematic theology nor Christianity itself can be compressed within the compass of a system of practical doctrines only. Christianity is designed to benefit the entire man, his intellect as well as his feelings and will Indeed, Christian piety is based on the truth; and Christianity is the revelation of the truth and the absolute religion. To attain a direct objective knowledge of God, as distinct from the indirect knowledge obtained from the contemplation of his works, etc., is evidently the work of speculation; and the same is true of that defense of Christianity which not only undermines the arguments of assailants, but establishes the reasons for Christianity in truth.

2. The material of speculative theology is gathered from the realm of experience everywhere, mundane and super mundane, and more directly still from the Christian faith. The task of speculative theology is to combine the experimental facts of the religious life into a harmonious system in which thought and scientific knowledge are the other elements. Its method is to seize on the historical facts connected with Christianity and trace them up until it arrives at the great central fact — the divine life incarnated in the  person of Jesus Christ. Faith, by which we mean an immovable footing on the truths and realities of Christianity, is therefore a prerequisite for this science; but this can never become fanaticism, because the science is equally based on the safe ground of known historic fact.

Christianity is specially adapted for speculative treatment by reason of its possessing a point of internal unity which combines both idea and fact, God and man, and therefore concentrates in itself the power to overcome all contrasts. The ancient Church correctly fixed that point in the incarnation of the Logos (Ignatius, Irenius, Origen, Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa). The dangers of speculation in theology are well illustrated in the intellectualism of contemplation as displayed in the Eastern Church. The more practical and ethical tendency of the West served to complete, and, to some extent, correct the Eastern intellectualism. Tertullian and Augustine gave themselves to practical speculation; but Anselm was the father of genuine Christian speculation (Cur Deus Homo ?). Aquinas and Duns Scotus, though inferior to him, rendered good service in the same field. The Reformation was concerned rather with the distinctively religious than the speculative interests of Christianity, though Auselm's ideas were carried forward and established in its progress. Not until after fundamental inquiries into the philosophy of knowledge and into the facts connected with God and the world which we possess had been made ‘was it entirely possible to utilize, for speculative purposes, the treasures of Christianity for defense, attack, and positive development. The fruitage of such investigations may be seen in the works of Schleiermacher, Damib, Marheinecke, Rothe, Martensen, etc. SEE PHILOSOPHY.

Upon the whole subject consult Baur, Chrisfl. Gnosis (1835); Ritter, Gesch. d. christl. Philosophie (1841-51, 6 vols.). See Herzog, Real- Encyklop. s.v.

## Theomancy[[@Headword:Theomancy]]

             (θεός, God, and μαντεία, divination), a kind of divination drawn from the responses of the oracle among heathen nations.

## Theonas, or Theon[[@Headword:Theonas, or Theon]]

             (see the extract from Philostorgius given by Photius), was bishop of Marmarica, in Cyrenaica, n the 4th century, and one of the most devoted adherents of Arius. The synodal circular given in Athanasius, 1, 398 sq.  (ed. Montfaucon), from bishop Alexander, which mentions the earliest measures taken against Arius, contains the names of Theonas and his colleague and neighbor Secundus of Ptolemais. The circular referred to indicates that both Theonas and Secundus had been deposed; but it would seem that; the deposition was not enforced, since they appeared at the Council of Nice in the character of qualified members. They achieved notoriety in that synod by resisting the Homoousion more firmly even than did their leaders, Eusebius and others; and as they refused to unite in the condemnation of Arius, they were again deposed and banished. Philostorgius (1, 2, 1) states that Theonas was recalled by the emperor Constantine; but he would seem to have taken no further part in the ecclesiastical conflicts of the time. His name occurs no more in the lists of combatants. See Theodoret, Hist. Ecclesiastes 1, 7 sq.; Socrates, Hist. Ecclesiastes 1, 9 (Decrees of Nice); Epiphanius, Haer. 69. 8, and comp. 68, 6, and 69, 11; Tillemont, Memoires pour servir a l'Histoire Eccls. (Brussels, 8v-o ed.), 6:2; Hist. Abrgee des Ariens, art. 6:7; and History of the Council of Nice, art. 6:11. —Herzog, Real Encyklop. s.v.

## Theopaschites[[@Headword:Theopaschites]]

             (from θεός, God, and πάσχω, to suffer). This term was applied to those persons in the ancient Church who pronounced in favor of the formula that God had suffered and been crucified, and occurs for the first time in the letters of Isidore of Pelusium (q.v.) (Epp. 1, 102,124). The addition of the clause θεὸς ἐσταυρώθη to the Trisagion by Peter Fullo (q.v.) gave greater currency to its use (Theophanis, Chronographia, p. 97, 184), and formed an element in the Monophysite disputes. Fulgentius Ferrandus and Fulgentius of Ruspe declared in favor of the formula “One belonging, to the Trinity has been crucified” (see Gieseler, 1, 2, 365; Schröckh, 18:582), which was subsequently approved by the Fifth (Ecumenical Synod of Constantinople in 553 (Anathema 10). Fillo's addition to the Trisagion was in use among the Catholics of Syria until its rejection by the Concilium Quinsextum in 692 (Canon 81), after which only Monophysites and Monothelites continued its use. The Catholics, in the meantime. had reached the conclusion that every addition to the Trisagion involved a quaternary. Theopaschitism is a very general conception of the popular mind, even in Protestant countries, and has found support in many hymns which have been admitted into use in the churches. It is also most intimately connected with the conception which underlies the expression “Mother of God;” for if it may be said that God was born of Mary, it may  with equal propriety be said that God was crucified. See the Church Histories; Smith's Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, § 102; Herzog, Real- Encyklop. s.v.

## Theopathetics[[@Headword:Theopathetics]]

             a designation of those mystics who have resigned themselves, more or less passively, to an imagined divine manifestation. Among these may be mentioned Tanchen, who appeared in the 12th century, and announced himself as the residence of Deity; Gichtel, who believed himself appointed to expiate by his prayers and penance the sins of all mankind; and Kuhlmann, who traversed Europe the imagined head of the fifth monarchy, summoning kings and nobles to submission.

## Theopathy[[@Headword:Theopathy]]

             (θεός, God, and πάθος, feeling), a word used by Dr. Hartley as synonymous with piety or a sense of Deity.

## Theophanes[[@Headword:Theophanes]]

             styled CERAMIEUS, archbishop of Tauromemium, between Syracuse and Messina, in the firmer half of the 11th century (? see his own Homily 26, and Leo Allatius; but comp. Scorsus, ut infra). He also bore, it would seem, the name of Gregory, which occurs in several MSS. He wrote Homilies, sixty-two of which were publisher in 1644 by the Jesuit Scorsus at Paris, with notes and two proems setting forth the life, teachings, and literary qualities of Theophanes, etc. The Homilies are written in Greek, and the style is flowing and easy, but vitiated by an excessive tendency to allegorize. Image-worship and invocation of the Virgin are taught everywhere. Consult Cave, Hist. Lit. 2, 132, and see Herzog, Real- Encyklop. s.v.

## Theophanes of Byzantium[[@Headword:Theophanes of Byzantium]]

             the designation of two early ecclesiastical characters.

1. A historian who is supposed to have lived at Constantinople at the close of the 6th century. He wrote a history of the war waged with Persia from 567 to 573, and also, it is said, a history of the reign of Justinian. Photius mentions both works, and quotes from the former (Cod. 64). See Labbeus, Excempta Legationum (Paris, 1647).

2. The chronographer, confessor, and saint. Of this man an ancient biography, said to be the work of Theodore Studita (q.v.), relates that he was born in or about the year 578, and that the emperor Constantine Copronymus became his guardian. The monastic impulse led him to bind himself to a life of continence on the eve of his marriage with the daughter of a wealthy patrician chosen to be his bride by the emperor himself, and subsequently to separate himself from his wife altogether. Leo IV called him to court, laid upon him official responsibilities, and placed him over the public buildings in Mysia; but, in Irene's reign, Theophanes became a monk in Lesser Mysia, and in time abbot of the monastery of Ager, which he had built. He was a zealous image-worshipper, and present as such at the second Council of Nice in 787. In 813 Leo the Armenian sought to persuade him to renounce the worship of images, and punished his.  obstinate refusal with imprisonment and banishment to the island of Samothrace, where Theophanes died about 816. A Chronography by him is extant, which records both ecclesiastlcal and secular matters from the first year of the reign of Diocletian to the first year of Leo the Armenian. It lacks many excellences, and has been attributed, though without sufficient reason, to other authors; but its statements possess considerable value as sources for the Iconoclastic troubles. The best edition is that of Classen (Bonn, 1839, 2 vols.), preceded by a Greek Vita and an Officium S. Patris Nost. Theophanis, etc., of March 12. See Vossius, De Hist. Gr. 2, 24; Cave; Oudin; Fabr., Bibl. Gr. 6:151 (old ed.), etc. —Herzog, Real- Encyklop. s.v.

## Theophany[[@Headword:Theophany]]

             The ancient Greeks were accustomed, during a certain festival named τὰ θεοφάνια, to display at Delphos before the public gaze the images of all their gods. θεοφάνεια denoted the apparition of one or more gods. The term thus understood was applied by ancient Christian writers to the manifestations of God under the Old Covenant and to the incarnation of Christ;. in the latter instance with reference to the birth, the baptism, and the second advent of Christ. ῾Η ἐπιφάνεια was, however, a usual substitute for its employment as respects his birth. SEE EPIPHANY.

Later usage has given to the term a doctrinal meaning, by which it is made to designate a special form of the divine revelation, to determine which form it is necessary to examine the entire series of modes of the divine manifestation (see Bretschneider, Systemat. Entwicklung. p. 196). Without  delaying to undertake a survey of this kind, we sketch the scriptural view of the theophany in the following paragraphs.

1. The theophany is never an immediate revelation of the super mundane Deity itself (Joh 1:18; 1Ti 6:16). God reveals himself only in Christ (Mat 11:27). The theophany is therefore more accurately defined as a Christophany, or an epiphany of God in Christ; and all nature is a storehouse of signs of the divine presence, which uniformly point to Christ (Rom 1:20; Col 1:16). SEE LOGOS.

2. The theophany, regarded as a Christophany, is developed in three great stages: (1) under the Old Test.; (2) in the incarnation; (3) in Christ's second advent. In that ‘advent the theophany, or revelation of the divine glory, will reach its consummation (Tit 2:13). The first advent was also a revelation, of the kindness and love of God (3, 4) and of his grace and truth (Joh 1:14-17; Joh 14:9); and with that revelation corresponded the fact that Christ saw the Father in all his work, even as the future manifestation of Christ shall be accompanied with the blessed vision of the saints (1Jn 3:2). Our attention is, however, confined by dogmatics to the modes of manifestation which occurred under the Old Test. prior to the advent of Christ, or under the New as accompanying or representing his presence. SEE ADVENT.

3. The theophany or Christophany of Scripture is the epiphany of the coming Christ, mediated through the angel of the Lord (Gen 16:7, etc.), of the face (Exo 33:14; Isa 3:9), or of the covenant (Mal 3:1). This angel was not a created being. His symbolic sign was the pillar of cloud and fire; his attribute the display of the glory or majesty of God (δόξα,כָּבוֹד); his later Rabbinical and theological designation the Shechinah (q.v.).

4. The manifestation of God in Christological theophany begins with the voice or the miracle of hearing (the voice of God and of heaven being identical, but different from the Bath-Kol of the later Jews), and progresses towards apparition proper, which is a miracle addressed to the eye, and in which the angel of the Lord appears escorted by actual angels, at first only two, but in later instances myriads in number. SEE BATH-KOL.

5. Theophany, the objective mode of revelation, never takes place without being accompanied in the mind of the observer with an ecstatic vision. This connection with the theophany distinguishes the vision from the ordinary  historical occurrence (2Ki 6:17; Joh 20:12; Act 9:7; comp. Act 22:9; Act 12:11). On the other hand, no vision is without its element of theophany, which fact distinguishes it from mere subjective hallucination (Isa 6:1 sq.; the book of Daniel; Zechariah; Act 10:3). SEE VISION.

6. The various modes of manifestation can be distinguished, therefore, only when the predominantly objective facts of the theophany are compared with the predominantly subjective facts of the vision. SEE PROPHECY.

7. Theophanic Christophany enters fully into earthly conditions by being incorporated in elements of nature and of soul life. It completes itself in one direction by the apparition of angels, and in the other by symbolical representations of an earthly nature (Gen 3:24; Exo 4:16; Psa 18:11; Psa 104:4; Isa 61:2; Mal 2:7); but most of all by the Urim and Thummim (q.v.).

8. Vision takes place in the way of a momentary vacating of the body or an ecstasy (2Co 12:4). It expands in an abundance of symbolical and allegorical visions (Ezekiel, Daniel, Zechariah, Rev.), and finds its completion in the prophetic dream. The latter is conditioned in a higher determination of the ordinary life of the person chosen, and occurs chiefly where the common life has not been developed to any considerable extent, as with the Old-Test. Joseph; or where it is involved with a secular calling, as in the case of the New-Test. Joseph. SEE DREAM.

9. The life of Christ combined into a higher unity all the fragmentary features of pre-Christian theophanies (πολυτρόπως, Heb 1:1). His personal life revealed God to the world, and the entire universe became for him, in turn, a theophanic environment attesting himself; because his whole inner life became an incessant subjective vision, in which the contrast between ecstasy and ordinary consciousness of the world no longer exists. Consult Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Buttstedt, De Adparitionibus Deorum Gentilium (Ger. 1744); Millies, De Variis Generibus θεοφανειῶν (Hal. 1802); Stud. u. Krit. 1859, No. 2. SEE CHRISTOLOGY.

## Theophilanthropists[[@Headword:Theophilanthropists]]

             (Gr. lovers of God and man), the name assumed by a party of French deists during the Reign of Terror to indicate their adherence to a natural or  theistic religion and worship which were intended to supersede Christianity. In February, 1795, freedom of religious opinion, and with it of religious worship, was allowed; and it was clear that neither Christianity nor Catholicism in its usual forms had been driven out of the hearts of the people. The civil authorities were much concerned lest the old political sympathies for royalty should revive with Catholicism. Still, a felt consciousness of the necessity of some religion led may to adopt a form of worship adapted to a natural religion. The foundation of this new religion was laid in 1796 by five heads of families, who, having declared themselves Theophilanthropists, met together every week for united prayer, to listen to moral remarks, and to sing hymns in honor of God. In the same year a kind of catechism or directory for public or social worship was published at Paris under the title of Manuel des Theantrophiles. This breviary was based on the simple fundamental articles of a belief in the existence of God and'in the immortality of the soul.

In 1797 Lareveillere-Lepaux stood at the head of the society; the Directory assigned ten parish churches to the rapidly growing association, and the new worship soon spread over the provinces. As to their mode of worship, there was a simple altar-whereon flowers and fruit, according to their season, were placed as thank- offerings-and a rostrum for the speaker. The walls were adorned with moral mottoes, such as, “Children, honor your parents and respect your elders;” “Husbands and wives, be kind to one another.” Instead of the traditional festivals, there now occurred those of nature, arranged according to the seasons of the year; in the place of sacraments, there were arbitrary and highly sentimental ceremonies, which took place at the birth of a child, at the reception of new members, at celebrations of marriage, at distribution of prizes to children, and at funerals. They had four special festivals, in honor of Socrates, St. Vincent de Paul, Jean Jacques Rousseau, and Washington. As religious feeling began to revive, the Theophilanthropists began to decline. They and their sentimental trumpery were turned out of the churches; the Revolutionary government forbade them, Oct. 4, 1801, to use even the three churches which were left in their hands; and when their petition for holding their services elsewhere was refused, the Theophilanthropist religion soon died of inanition, despised by the infidel party as well as by those who still remained Christians. An attempt to revive it after the revolution of 1830 utterly failed. See Blunt, Dict. of Sects, s.v.; Gardner, Faiths of the World, s.v.; Gregoire, Histoire des Sectes Religieuses; Hagenbach, Hist. of the Church in the 18th and 19th Centuries, 2, 435.

## Theophilestati[[@Headword:Theophilestati]]

             (θεοφιλέστατοι, most dear to God), a title of respect given to bishops in the early Church. This title frequently occurs in the emperor's rescript in the civil law, and was of such common use in those times that Socrates (Proem. ad lib. vi) thinks himself obliged to make some apology for not giving it to the bishops that were then living. See Bingham, Christ. Antiq. bk. 2, oh. 10:§ 6.

## Theophilus[[@Headword:Theophilus]]

             (θεόφιλος, friend of God), the name of two men associated with sacred history, one of them being mentioned in the New Test. and the other by Josephus..

1. The person to whom Luke inscribes his Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles (Luk 1:3; Act 1:1). A.D. cir; 56. The important part played by Theophilus as having immediately occasioned the composition of these two books, together with the silence of Scripture concerning him, has at once stimulated conjecture, and left the field clear for it. Accordingly we meet with a considerable number and variety of theories concerning him.

r. Several commentators, especially among the fathers have been disposed to doubt the personality of Theophilus, regarding the name either as that of a fictitious person or as applicable to every Christian reader. Thus Origen (Hom. 1 in Luc.) raises the question, but does not discuss it, his object being merely practical. He says that all who are beloved of God are Theophili, and may therefore appropriate to themselves the gospel which was addressed to Theophilus. Epiphanius (Haeres. 2, 429) speaks doubtfully: εἴτ᾿ ουν τινὶ θεοφίλῳ τότε γράφων ἔλεγεν, ἣ παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ θεὸν αγαπῶντι. Salvianus (Epist. 9 ad Salonium) apparently assumes that Theophilus had no historical existence. He justifies the composition of a work addressed Ad Ecclesiam Catholicam, under the name of Timotheus, by the example of the evangelist Luke, who addressed his gospel nominally to a particular man, but really to “the love of God” “Nam. sicut Theophili. vocabulo amor, sic Timothei honor divinitatis exprimitur.” Even Theophylact, who believes in the existence of Theophilus, takes the opportunity of moralizing upon his name: καὶ πᾶς δὲ ἄνθρωπος θεοφιλής, καὶ κράτος κατὰ τῶν παθῶν ἀναδειξάμενος θεόφιλός ἐστι κράτιστος, ὃς καὶ ἄξιος τῷ ὄντι ἐστὶν ἀκούειν τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου (Argum. in Luc.). Among modern  commentators, Hammond and Leclerc accept the allegorical view; Erasmlus is doubtful, but, on the whole, believes Theophilus to have had a real existence.

2. From the honorable epithet κράτιστε applied to Theophilus in Luk 1:3, compared with the use of the same epithet as applied by Claudius Lysias and Tertullus severally to Felix, and by Paul to Festus (Act 23:26; Act 24:3; Act 26:25), it has been argued with much probability, but not quite conclusively, that he was a person in high official; position. Thus Theophylact (Argum. in Luc.) conjectures that he was a Roman governor, or a person of senatorial rank, grounding his conjecture expressly on the use of κράτιστε. (Ecumenius (Ad Act. Apost. 1, 1) tells us that he was a governor, but gives no authority for the assertion. The traditional connection of Luke with Antioch has disposed some to look upon Antioch as the abode of Theophilus, and possibly as the seat of his government. Bengel believes him to have been an inhabitant of Antioch, “ut veteres testantur.” The belief may partly have grown out of a story in the so-called Recognitions of St. Clement (lib. 10), which represents a certain nobleman of Antioch of that name to have been converted by the preaching of Peter, and to have dedicated his own house as a church, in which, as we are told, the apostle fixed his episcopal seat. Bengel thinks that the omission of κράτιστε in Acts 1, 1 proves that Luke was on more familiar terms with Theophilus than when he composed his gospel.

3. In the Syriac lexicon, extracted from the Lexicons Heptaglot of Castell, and edited by Michaelis (p. 948), the following description of Theophilus is quoted from Bar-Bahlul, a Syrian lexicographer of the 10th century: “Theophilus, primus credentium et celeberrimus apud Alexandrienses, qui cum alis AEgyptis Lucam rogabat, ut eis evangelium scriberet.” In the inscription of the Gospel according to Luke in the Syriac version, we are told that it was published at Alexandria. Hence it is inferred by Hase (Bibl. Bremensis Class. ch. 4 fasc. 3, diss. 4, quoted by Michaelis, Introd. to the New Test. [ed. Marsh], vol. 3, ch. 6:§ 4) and by Bengel (Ordo Temporum [2nd ed.], p. 196) that Theophilus was, as asserted by Bar-Bahlul, a convert of Alexandria. This writer ventures to advance the startling opinion that Theophilus, if an Alexandrian, was no other than the celebrated Philo, who is said to have borne the Hebrew name of Jedidiah (יְדַידְיָה, i.e. θεόφιλος). It hardly seems necessary to refute this theory, as Michaelis has refuted it, by chronological arguments.

4. Alexander Morus (Ad Quaedam Loca Nov. Fced. Notae: ad Luc. i, 1) makes the rather hazardous conjecture that the Theophilus of Luke is identical With the person who is recorded by Tacitus (Annals. 2, 55) to have been condemned for fraud at Athens by the court of the Areopagus. Grotius also conjectures that he was a magistrate of Achaia baptized by Luke. The conjecture of Grotius must rest upon the assertion of Jerome (an assertion which, if it is received, renders that of Morrs possible, though certainly most improbable), namely, that Luke published his gospel in the parts of Achaia and Boeotia (Jerome, Comm. in Matthew Procem.).

5. It is obvious to suppose that Theophilus was a Christian; but a different view has been entertained. In a series of dissertations in the Bibl. Bremensis, of which Michaelis gives a resume in the section already referred to, the notion that he was not a Christian is maintained by different writers and on different grounds. Heumann, one of the contributors, assuming that he was a Roman governor, argues that he could not be a Christian, because no Christian would be likely to have such a charge entrusted to him. Another writer (Theodore Hase) believes that the Theophilus of Luke was no other than the deposed high-priest Theophilus the son of Ananus (see below). Michaelis himself is inclined to adopt this theory. He thinks that the use of the word κατηχή θης in Luke 1, 4 proves that Theophilus had an imperfect acquaintance with the facts of the gospel (an argument of which bishop Marsh very properly disposes in his note upon the passage of Michaelis), and further contends, from the ἐν ἡμῖν of Luk 1:1, that he was not a member of the Christian community. He thinks it probable that the evangelist wrote his gospel during the imprisonment of Paul at Caesarea, and addressed it to Theophilus as one of the heads of the Jewish nation. According to this view, it would be regarded as a sort of historical apology for the Christian faith.

In surveying this series of conjectures, and of traditions which are nothing more than conjectures, we find it easier to determine what is to be rejected than what we are to accept. In the first place, we may safely-reject the patristic notion that Theophilus was either a fictitious person or a mere personification of Christian love. Such a personification is alien from the spirit of the New-Test. writers, and the epithet κράτιστε is a sufficient evidence of the historical existence of Theophilus. It does not, indeed, prove that he was a governor, but it makes it most probable that he was a person of high rank. His supposed connection with Antioch, Alexandria, or Achaia rests on too slender evidence either to claim acceptance or to need  refutation; and the view of Hase, although endorsed by Michaelis, appears to be incontestably negatived by the Gentile complexion of the third gospel. The grounds alleged by Heumann for his hypothesis that Theophilus was not a Christian are not at all trustworthy, as consisting of two very disputable premises; for, in the first place, it is not at all evident that Theophilus was a Roman governor, and, in the second place, even if we assume that at that time no Christian would be appointed to such an office (an assumption which we can scarcely venture to make), it does not at all follow that no person in that position would become a Christian. In fact, we have an example of such a conversion in the case of Sergius Paulus (Act 13:12). In the art. SEE LUKE, GOSPEL ACCORDING TO, reasons are given for believing that Theophilus was not a native of Palestine… not a Macedonian, nor an Athenian, nor a Cretan. But that he was a native of Italy, and perhaps an inhabitant of Rome, is probable from similar data.” All that can be conjectured with any degree of safety concerning him comes to this, that he was a Gentile of rank and consideration, who came under the influence of Luke, or (not improbably) under that of Paul, at Rome, and was converted to the Christian faith.

It has been observed that the Greek of Luke, which elsewhere approaches more nearly to the classical type than that of the other evangelists, is purer and more elegant in the dedication to Theophiilus than in any other part of his gospel. From all these circumstances, and especially from the fact that both the gospel and the Acts were dedicated to Theophilus-both, therefore, being written, in all probability, about the same time, and that time being Paul's imprisonment at Rome, where the latter ends-we may reasonably infer that Theophilus was one of the apostle's converts in the imperial city during the two years sojourn of Paul there, for a part, if not the most, of which Luke was his companion, and hence likely to be acquainted with, and interested in, the noble convert. SEE LUKE; SEE PAUL. Monographs in Latin have been written on Theophilus by Heumann (in the Bibl. Bremensis, 4:483). Osiander (Tüb. 1659), Stoltze (Viteb. 1693), and Schelvig (Ged. 1711).

2. A Jewish high-priest, the son of Annas or Ananus, brother-in-law to Caiaphas, SEE ANNAS; SEE CAIAPHAS, and brother and immediate successor of Jonathan. The Roman prefect Vitellius came to Jerusalem at the Passover (A.D. 37), and deposed Caiaphas, appointing Jonathan in his place. In the same year, at the feast of Pentecost, he came to Jerusalem, and deprived Jonathan of the high-priesthood, which he gave to Theophilus  (Josephus, Ant. 18:4, 3; 5, 3). Theophilus was removed; from his post by Herod Agrippa I after the accession of that prince to the government of Judaea in A.D. 41, so that he must have continued in office about five years (ibid. 19:6, 2). Theophilus is not mentioned in the New Test., as no events occurred during his pontificate in which the apostles were specially involved. SEE HIGH-PRIEST.

## Theophilus of Alexandria[[@Headword:Theophilus of Alexandria]]

             a bishop in the latter part of the 4th and the beginning of the 5th century, is distinguished for his persecution of the Origenists; for his hostility to Chrysostom, and as being one of the most violent and unscrupulous even among the ecclesiastics of the 5th century. He succeeded Timotheus as bishop of Alexandria in A.D. 385, and soon after secured the favor of the emperor by a characteristic maneuver. When the fate of the empire was suspended on the battle which was to decide between Maximus and Theodosius (388), he sent his legate, Isidore, to Rome provided with letters to both, the one or the other of which he was to deliver with certain presents, according to the issue of the battle. He was also very zealous against heathenism, and in 391 obtained the emperor's consent to use severe measures against the pagans in his district, which resulted in the most of them being driven out of Egypt. His behavior to the different sects of Christians was marked by the same unscrupulous inconsistency. He appears to have passed a part of his early life among the monks of Nitria, some of whom were Origenists and others Anthropomorphites. At first he declared himself decidedly against the latter, and, in opposing them, he sided openly with the Origenists, drawing his arguments from the works of Origen.

When, however, it became evident that the majority of the Egyptian monks were Anthropomorphites, Theophilus went over to them about 399, condemned the writings of Origen, commanded all his clergy to burn them, and commenced a cruel persecution of all who opposed the Anthropbmorphites, while he himself continued to read the works of Origen with admiration. In 401 he issued a violent letter in which he condemned the writings of Origen and threatened. the latter's adherents; in the following year he sent forth another of like character, to the unbounded delight of Jerome. Theophilus was subsequently called to Constantinople by the empress Eudoxia, and secured the deposition and banishment of Chrysostom (q.v.) in 403. During the tumult which followed, Theophilus escaped and returned to Alexandria, where, in 404, he issued a third Paschal letter against the Origenists, and where he died in 412. The works  of Theophilus mentioned by the ancient writers are, Προσφωνητικὸν πρὸς τοὺς φρονοῦντας τὰ ᾿Ωριγένους, quoted by Theodoret (Didl. 2, 1291); and which Gennaldius (33) calls “adversus Origenem unum et grande volumem,” Letter to Porphyry, Bishop of Antioch, quoted in the Acta Concil. Ephes. pt. 1, c. 4: the three Paschal Letters already mentioned and one more: —and some other unimportant orations, letters, and controversial works. The Paschal Letters are still extant in a translation by Jerome, and are published in the Antidot. contra Dicers. Omnium. Sceculorum laeresias (Basel, 1528 fol.); and the whole of his extant remains are contained in Galland, Biblioth. Patr. 7:603 fol. Cave, Hist. Lift. s. a. 385, p. 279, 280; Murdock, note to Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. 1, 444 (Engl. ed.). —Smith, Dict. of Greek and Latin Biog. s.v.

## Theophilus of Antioch[[@Headword:Theophilus of Antioch]]

             a writer and bishop of the primitive Church, was educated a heathen; and afterwards converted to Christianity. He was ordained bishop of Antioch, succeeding Eros, about A.D. 170, and governed the Church twelve or thirteen years, at the end of which he died. Having been converted from heathenism by the study of the Scriptures, he wrote an apology for the Christian faith, addressed in the form of a letter to his friend Autolycus. The work shows much learning and more simplicity of mind. In its general structure it resembles the works of Justin Martyr and the other early apologists; but it contains a more detailed examination of the evidence for Christianity, derived both from Scripture and from history. The three books of Theophilus to Autolycus were first published in the collection of the monks Antonius and Maximus entitled Sententiarum sive Cajitum, Theologicorum prcecipue, ex Sacris et Profanis Libris, Tomi Tres. There have been a number of editions, the most complete being that of Johann Christoph Wolf (Hamb. 1724, 8vo), and an English translation by Joseph Betty (Oxford, 1722, 8vo). Theophilus was the author of several other works which were extant in the times of Eusebius and Jerome. Among them were works against the heresies of Marcion and Hermogenes: — Commentary on the Gospels (still extant in Latin, and published in the Bibliotheca Patrum [Paris, 1575, 1598, 1609, 1654, etc.]). Jerome refers to his Commentaries on the Proverbs. See Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. s.v.; Fabric. Bibl. Graec. 7:101-106; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Theophilus of Caesarea[[@Headword:Theophilus of Caesarea]]

             a bishop who presided over the Council of Caesarea in Palestine, and signed the letter of that council, which appears to have been drawn up by himself, on the Paschal controversy, A.D. 198.

## Theophilus of Cilicia[[@Headword:Theophilus of Cilicia]]

             So often mentioned in legend, is said to have originally been the administrator of the Adana bishopric. Out of modesty, he declined the episcopal see, and was deprived of all his honors by the new bishop. He now applied for help to a Jewish sorcerer, who brought him into a nightly convention of devils. Here help was promised to him provided he would deny Christ and Mary and would assign his soul. He was restored to his former position; but, regretting what he had done, he prayed as a penitent to Mary, and through her intercession Christ took the assignment away from the devil and placed it upon his breast while asleep in the church, tired out by prayer. He now openly confessed his sin and died three days later. The author of the legend is said to have been a Greek cleric, Eutychianus; while a Neapolitan priest, Paulus (9th century), made it known in the West. In the Acta. SS. for Feb. 4 we find this legend in a poetical dress, by the bishop Marbod of Rennes. See. Jubinal, Euvres de Rutebeuf, vol. 2; Pfeiffer. Marienlegenden (Stuttgart, 1846); Blomaert, Theophilus (Ghent, 1836); Hoffmann von Fallersleben, Theophilus (Hanov. 1853-54); Meyer, Radewins Gedicht über Theophilus (Munich,'1873; edited after a Munich MS. of the 13th century). (B. P.)

## Theophilus of the Indies[[@Headword:Theophilus of the Indies]]

             bishop of the Homerites, was born in the isle of Diu. When yet a youth he was brought as a hostage to Constantinople, where he became a Christian (Arian). He was made deacon, and finally bishop for the Arabic mission about 350. Being supplied by Constantius with rich presents for the princes at home and with money for the building of churches, he converted the king of the Homerites, and built churches at Taphar, Aden, and Hormulz. The large number of Jews, however, residing in tile country prevented a further propagation of Christianity. In the year 356 Constantius appointed him bishop of the Ethiopic Church. From the isle of Socotra he went to Axum, but was soon obliged to leave the place. See Le Quien, Oriens Chrislianus, 2, 644; Theolog. Universal-Lexikon, s.v. (B. P.)

## Theophori[[@Headword:Theophori]]

             (θεοφόροι, God-bearers), a name assumed by some of the early Christians, signifying that they carried about with them the presence of God. St. Ignatius gives himself this title in his inscriptions to his epistles, both of which begin Ι᾿γνάτιος ὁ καὶ θεο φόρος ; and explains his meaning in his dialogue with Trajan, “Theophorus is one that carries Christ in his heart.” “Dost thou, then,” said Trajan, “carry him that was crucified in thy heart?” Ignatius answered, “Yes; for it is written, ‘I will dwell in them and walk in them.'” Anastasius Bibliothecarius, indeed, gives another reason why Ignatius was called Theophorus (θεόφορος, God-borne) because he was the child whom our Savior took and placed in the midst of his disciples, laying his hands upon him; and, therefore, the apostles would never presume to ordain him by imposition of hands after Christ. But, as bishop Pearson and others observe, this is a mere invention of the modern Greeks. Vincentius Bellovacensis and others advance this ridiculous reason: that Ignatius was so called because the name of Jesus Christ was found written in golden letters in his heart. ‘But against these traditions we have the fact that the title was not peculiar to Ignatius, but common to all Christians. See Bingham, Christ. Antiq. bk. 1, ch. 1, § 4.

## Theophylact[[@Headword:Theophylact]]

             archbishop of Achridia and metropolitan of all Bulgaria, an eminent ecclesiastical writer, was born and educated at Constantinople. He was bishop in 1077, and perhaps some years later. The date of his death is uncertain, but probably about 1112,'or later. After he was made bishop. he labored diligently to extend Christianity in his diocese, but met with much opposition, of which he complained in his epistles. The works of Theophylact are: Commentaria in Quatuor Evangelia (Paris, 1631, fol.): —Commentaries on the Acts of the Apostles, Greek and Latin (Colon. 1568): —Commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles, Greek and Latin (Lond. 1636,fol.): —Commentaries on Four of the ( Minor Prophets; namely, Habakkuk, Jonas, Nahum, and Hosea, in Latin (Paris, 1589, 8vo). The Commentaries on all the twelve minor prophets are extant in Greek in the library of Strasburg, and have been described by Michaelis in his Biblioth. Orientalis. These commentaries are founded on those of Chrysostom; but his exegesis is so direct, precise, and textual, and his remarks are often so felicitous and to the point, that his commentaries have always been highly prized: —Seventy-five Epistles, in Greek, with notes by John Meursius  (Leyden, 1617, 4to), and also in the Bibliotheca Patrum: —besides several tracts, some of which are rather doubtful. A splendid edition of all his works in Greek and Latin was published by J. F. Bernard Maria de Rubeis (Venet. 1754-63, 4 vols. fol.). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Latin Biog. s.v.

Theophylactians, a name given to the orthodox Christians of Alexandria by the Jacobites in the 7th century. See Neale, Hist. of the Eastern Church, 2, 87.

## Theosebites[[@Headword:Theosebites]]

             a sect which spread in Palestine and Phoenicia during the first half of the 5th century, and appear to have been similar to, if not identical with, the HYPSISTARIANS SEE HYPSISTARIANS (q.v.). The Theosebites exalted the sun, moon, and stars into objects of worship, and yet acknowledged the Supreme Deity over all. Their religion thus appears to have been an adulteration of Christiainity with Magianism. Probably these sects are to be traced to the Therapeutse and Essenes, who worshipped τὸ ὃν or ῞Υψιστος, kept the Jewish Sabbath, and Jewish observances respecting food. They professed a partial belief in Christ, but were, at the same time, strict Unitarians.

## Theosophy[[@Headword:Theosophy]]

             (θεοσοφία, divine wisdom), the name given to a so-called sacred science, which holds a place distinct as well from that of philosophy as from that of theology, even in questions where these latter sciences have the same object with it: namely, the nature and attributes of God. In investigating the divine nature and attributes, philosophy employs as the basis of its investigation the ideas derived from natural reason, while theology superadds to the principles of natural reason those derived from authority and revelation. Theosophy, on the contrary, professes to exclude all dialectical process, and to derive its knowledge of God from direct and immediate intuition and contemplation or from the immediate communications of God himself. Theosophy, therefore, so far as regards the science of God, is but another name for mysticism (q.v.); and the direct and immediate knowledge or intuition of God, to which the Mystics laid claim, was, in fact, the foundation of that intimate union with God and consequent abstraction from outer things, which they made the basis of their moral and ascetical system. Theosophy has existed from a very early  date; and within the Christian period we may number among Theosophs the NeoPlatonists, especially Plotinus, lamblichus, and Proclus; the Hesychasts of the Greek Church; all those of the mediaeval Mystics who laid claim to any dogmatical theory; and in later times the Paracelsists, Bodenstein and Thalhauser, Weizel, Jacob Boehme, and Swedenborg.

Below is a brief outline of Theosophy as taught by Boehme (q.v.). Finite existences of every kind are an efflux from the One Infinite Existence, and such an efflux is a necessary attribute of God's own being. All things come from a working will of the holy, triune, incomprehensible God, who manifests himself through an external efflux of fire, light, and spirit. Angels and men are the true and real offspring of God, their life originating in the divine fire from which light and love are generated in them. This triune life in God is the perfection of being, and the loss of it constituted the fall of angels and men. Thus man having been made a living image if the divine nature and endowed with immortality, he exchanged the light, life, and Spirit of God for the light, life, and spirit of the world. He died to the influences of the Spirit of God on the very day of his, transgression, but remained subject to all the external influences of the world; and the restoration of the influence of the Spirit constitutes the work of redemption and sanctification. Christ restored to men the germ of the paradisiacal life, which is possessed by all through new birth and his indwelling. No son of Adam can be lost except by the willful loss of this paradisiacal germ of the divine life; and its development is the development of salvation. In the hands of Law, the theosophy of Boehroe assumed a much more reasonable form than that in which it had been clothed by its author, whose language was a medley of alchemy, obscure analogies, and false etymologies. It was then exhibited as a philosophy of redemption and spiritual life, which only wanted the keystone of sacramental psychology to make it a firm system of truth. For very full information on the subject, see Walton, Notes and Materials for an Adequate Biography of William Law, comprising an Elucidation of the Scope and Contents of the Writings of Jacob Boehme, and of his Great Commentator Dionysius Andrseas Freher, etc. (1854). See Blunt, Dict. of Doctrinal Theology, s.v. Chambers Encyclop. s.v.

## Theotokos[[@Headword:Theotokos]]

             (θεοτόκος, God-bearing).

1. A title applied by various Romish writers to the Virgin Mary as the “mother of God.” SEE MARTOLATRY.

2. An ecclesiastical term adopted at the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon to assert the doctrine of the divinity of our Lord's person. The truth which it was designed to teach is that although two natures are united in one Christ, yet there are not two persons, but one. Our Lord was a divine person from all eternity, and upon his incarnation he did not cease to be the person he had been before. There was, therefore, no change or interruption of his identity, for the Godhead became incarnate, not by the conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking the manhood into God. Although the nature, which he took of the substance of his, mother was human, the person who was born was divine, and this was the truth declared in the adoption of the term θεοτόκος. It is not, of course, meant that the Virgin was the mother of the Godhead of our Lord, but that the human nature, which he had assumed of her substance, was so united to the divinity that the person begotten of her was God as well as man. In this sense she might be called the mother of God. Equivalent expressions are used by Irenaeus and Ignatius, while θεοτόκος is used by Alexander of Alexandria, Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Origen, and Gregory Theologus. This doctrine has been the cause of much debate, and of more than one council. SEE CHRISTOLOGY.

## Therapeutae[[@Headword:Therapeutae]]

             (θεραπευταί [attendants, i.e. worshippers, sc. of God] and θεραπευτρίδες), a Jewish sect in Egypt, which is described by Philo in a separate treatise Περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ ἣ περὶ περὶ ἱκετῶν ἀρετῶν, or De Vita Contemplativa (Opp. [ed. Mangey], 2, 471486). It is strange that no other writer of that period, not even Josephus, knows anything about the Therapeutae; for what we find in ecclesiastical writings about them since the time of Eusebius is nothing but a reproduction of the Philonic narrative; and the erroneous opinion of Eusebius, who regarded the Therapeutae as Christians, has been followed by all Church fathers, with the exception of Photius. Modern critics have, with a few exceptions, identified the Therapeutae with the Essenes, but with this difference, that while the former were only theorists, the latter were men of practical life. Of late the question as to who the Therapeutae were has become superfluous, since some scholars, especially the Jewish historian Gritz, believe Philo's treatise to be spurious, and only an embellishment of  Christian monachism as it began in Egypt. But, before deciding the question as to whether this treatise is spurious or genuine, we must examine first what Philo tells us about the Therapeutae.

I. Manners and Usages of the Therapeutae. —The fatherland of the Therapeutae is Egypt, and beyond this country the order has probably not been propagated. When Philb speaks of their diffusion through the whole world (πολλαχοῦ μνὲ ουν τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐστὶ τοῦτο τὸ γένος), we cannot take his words in their literal sense, as does Lucius (Die Therapeuten [Strasburg, 1880], p. 16 sq.), but ill a more general sense, because we have no notice whatever of the Therapeutae outside of Egypt. What he meant to say is that, outside of Egypt, there were also men of a similar tendency, without believing that they really belonged to this order in Egypt. Keim thinks, therefore, that Philo's words are an exaggeration, or rather that he confuses the hermit life of the Jews with like “phenomena among the Greeks and barbarians.” Gratz, however, holds a different opinion, and adduces this as an argument for Christian monks, who were generally diffused at an early age (as early as the time of Eusebius or of Philo ?). “Bt,” asks Dr. Keim, “has not Philo compared both the Essenes and Therapeutie with the Gymnosophists and Magi, with the wise man Kalanos, with Anaxagoras and Democritus?” It is evident that Philo, in describing this order, had a certain colony in view near the Lake Mareotis, to the south of Alexandria, where the Therapeutae lived. They dwelt at no great distance from each other, but every man in his own little house, his sanctuary, and his cell. They lived alone for the whole week, not stepping over the threshold, nor looking out (τὴν αὐλεῖαν οὐχ ὑπερβαίνοντες, ἀλλ᾿ οὐδὲ ἐξ ἀπόπτου θεωροῦντες).

Simple as was their house, their raiment was equally so, being a cloak of some shaggy hide for winter, and a thin mantle or linen shawl in the summer; and in their religious assemblies they appeared in a white garment. As temperance was regarded as the highest virtue, their mode of living was very simple. None of them took any meat or drink before the setting of the sun because they believed that the work of philosophizing was one worthy of the light, and that the care for the necessities of the body was suitable only to darkness; on which account they appropriated the day to the one occupation, and a brief portion of the night to the other (ἐπειδὴ τὸ μὲν φιλοσοφεῖν ἄξιον φωτὸς κρίνουσιν ειναι, σκότους δὲ τὰς σωματικὰς ἀνάγκας, ὅθεν τῷ μὲν ἡμέ ρας, ταῖς δὲ βραχύ τι μέρος τῆς νυκτὸς ἔνειμαν). Many fasted for three days, several for six. They  ate nothing of a costly character, but plain bread with a seasoning of salt, which the more luxurious of them further seasoned with hyssop, and their drink was water from the spring. For such a simple mode of living they naturally had no need of great earthly possessions; but, as Philo says, they left their possessions to their relatives or friends, and without any property they went out, as if their mortal life had already come to an end, only anxious for an immortal and blessed existence (ειτα διὰ τὸν τῆς ἀθανάτου καὶ μακαρίας ζωῆς ἵμερον τετλευτηκέναι νομίζοντες ἤδη τὸν θνητὸν βίον ἀπο λείπουσι τὰς οὐσίας υἱοῖς ἣ θυγατράσιν, εἴτε καὶ ἄλ λοις συγγενέσιν).

They prayed twice every day, at morning and at evening. When the sun rose, they entreated God that the happiness of the coming day might be real happiness, so that their minds might be filled with heavenly light, The interval between morning and evening was devoted wholly to meditation on, and the practice of, virtue. They took up the Sacred Scriptures and philosophized concerning them, investigating the allegories of their national philosophy, since they looked upon their literal expressions as symbols of some secret meaning of nature intended to be conveyed in those figurative expressions (ἐντυγχάνοντες γὰρ τοῖς ἱεροῖς γράμμασι φιλοσοφοῦσι τὴν πάτριον φιλοσοφίαν, ἀλληγοροῦντες, ἐπειδὴ σύμβολα τὰ τῆς ῥητῆς ἑρμηνείας νομίζουσι φύσεως ἀποκεκρυμμένης, ἐν ὑπονοίαις δηλουμένης). As a canon of such allegorical exposition of Scripture, the real home of which was in Egypt, they used the, writings left by the founders of their sect (ἐστὶ δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ συγγράμματα παλαιῶν ἀνδρῶν οι τῆς αἱρήσεως ἀρχηγέται γενόμενοι πολλὰ μνημεῖα τῆς ἀλληγορου μένης ἰδέας ἀπέλιπον, οις καθάπερ τισὶν ἀρχετύποις χρώμενοι μιμοῦνται τῆς προαιρέσεως τὸν τρόπον). They also composed psalms and hymns to God in every kind of meter and melody imaginable, which they sang at their meetings. Having thus passed the day, they prayed again that their soul, being entirely lightened and relieved of the burden of the outward senses, might be able to trace out truth existing in its own consistory and council-chamber (ἐν τῷ ἑαυτῆς συνεδρίῳ καὶ βουλευτηρίῳ ἀλήθειον ἰχνηλατεῖν); and many of them, if Philo's statement is to be given credence, are said to have spoken in their sleep, divulging and publishing the celebrated doctrines of the sacred philosophy (πολ λοὶ ουν καὶ ἐκλαλοῦσιν ἐν ὑπνοῖς ἀνειροπολουμενοι τὰ τῆς ἱερᾶς φιλοσοφίας ἀοίδιμα δόγματα).  Women were also received into their order, the greater part of whom, though old, were virgins in respect to their purity, and were animated by the same admiration for, and love of, wisdom, in the exercise of which they were desirous to pass their lives. These women, like the male members of the order, lived separately, performing the same duties; but at the meetings and banquets both sexes were united.

Slave-labor was dispensed with, because they looked upon the possession of slaves as something absolutely and wholly contrary to nature-for nature had created all men free; but the injustice and covetousness of some men who preferred inequality that cause of all evil-having subdued the weaker, had given to the more powerful authority over the vanquished. At their common banquets, therefore no slaves ministered to their wants, but young men who were selected from their order with all possible care, and whose dress was such that nothing of a slavish character could be seen in it, or, to use the words of Philo, ἄζωστοι δὲ καὶ καθειμένοι τοὺς χιτιονίσκους εἰσίασιν ὑπηρετήσοντες, ἕνεκα τοῦ μηδὲν εἴδωλον ἐπιφέρεσθαι δουλοπρεποῦς σχήματος, εἰς τοῦτο τὸ συμπόσιον, i.e. they were ungirdled and with their tunics let down, in order that nothing which bears any resemblance to a slavish appearance might be introduced into this festival.

At the banquet they were presided over by a president (πρόεδρος), who addressed them and intoned a hymn, in which enjoined. They sat according to their, age, i.e. according to the length of time they belonged to the order. We must not, however, think that the president: or elders exercised any gubernatorial power, for this is nowhere inferred; their functions were only restricted to the assemblies, in which also ἡγεμόνες and ἔξαρχοι were mentioned, who acted as leaders of the choruses. The seventh day was especially distinguished. They anointed their bodies, and, clothed in white garments, they assembled in the common σημνεῖον. Here they sat down with all becoming gravity, keeping their hands inside their garments, having their right hand between their chest and their dress, and the left band down by their side, close to their flank. Then the oldest of them, who had the most profound learning in their doctrines, came forward and spoke with steadfast look and with steadfast voice, with great powers of reasoning, and great prudence not making exhibition of his oratorical talent like the rhetoricians of old or the sophists of the present day, but investigating with great pains and explaining with minute accuracy the precise meaning of the laws, which penetrated through their hearing into  the soul, and remained there lastingly. Quietly they listened in silence, showing their ‘assent only by nods of the head or the eager look of the eyes. In this sacred assembly the women also shared; but they had their own seats, being separated from the male members by a wall rising three or four cubits upwards, but in such a manner that they could hear the voice of the speaker.

The seventh Sabbath, the πεντηκοστή, was especially distinguished. The number fifty was regarded by them as the most holy and natural of numbers, being compounded of the power of the right-angled triangle, which is the principle of the origination and condition of the whole (ἔστι δὲ προεόρτιος μεγίστης ἑορτῆς, ἣν πεντηκοντὰς ἔλαχεν, ἁγιώτατος καὶ φυσικὠτατος αριθμῶν, ἐκ τῆς τοῦ ὀρθογωνίου τριγώνου δυνάμεως, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἀρχὴ τῆς τῶν ὅλων γενέσεως καὶ συστά σεως). Clothed in white garments, they came together to the common feast. Before they partook of the same, they lifted up their eyes and hands to heaven and prayed to God that it might be acceptable to him. After the prayer, they sat down, the men sitting on the right hand and the women on the left, on rugs of the coarsest material. Before the feast commenced, questions were asked and answered. A passage of the Scripture was explained and religious questions were settled. All listened attentively to the speaker, indicating their attention and comprehension by their nods and looks. When the president appeared to have spoken at sufficient length, and to have carried out his intentions adequately, so that his explanation had gone on felicitously and fluently through his own acuteness, and the hearing of the others had been profitable, applause arose from them all as of men rejoicing at what they had seen and heard; and then some one, rising up, sang a hymn which had been made in honor of God, either such as he had composed himself or some ancient one of some old poet. After him others also arose in their ranks, and in becoming manner, while every one else listened in decent silence, except when it was proper to take up the burden of the song and join in at the end. When each individual had finished his psalm, the young men brought in the table on which was the food-the leavened bread with a seasoning of salt, and mingled with some hyssop, out of reverence for the sacred table which was in the holy outer temple; for on this table were placed loaves and salt without seasoning, and the bread was unleavened, and the salt unmixed with anything else.

After the feast they celebrated the sacred festival during the whole night (μετὰ δὲ τὸ δεῖπνον τὴν ίερὰν ἄγουσι παννυχίδα). All stood up  together, and in the middle of the entertainment two choruses were formed at first, the one of men and the other of women. Each chorus had its leader and chief, who was the most honorable and most excellent of the band. Then they sang the hymns in honor of God in many meters and tunes, at one time all singing together, and at another moving their hands, and dancing in corresponding harmony. When each chorus of the men and each chorus of the women had feasted separately by itself, they joined together, and the two became one chorus-an imitation of that one which, in old time, was established by the Red Sea, on account of the wondrous works which were displayed there before Israel, and where both men and women together became all one chorus, Moses leading the men, and Miriam leading the women. When the sun arose, they raised their hands to heaven, imploring tranquility and truth and acuteness of understanding. After the prayer, each retired to his own separate abode, again practicing the usual philosophy to which each had been wont to devote himself.

II. Therapeutae and Essenes. —On account of the manifold similar traits which were found among the Therapeutae and Essenes, it has been inferred that the Therapeutae were but the Egyptian branch of Palestinian Essenism. This hypothesis is seemingly confirmed by what Philo says at the beginning of his treatise on the Therapeutae: “Having mentioned the Essenes, who in all respects selected for their admiration and for their especial adoption the practical course of life, and who excel in all, or what, perhaps, may be a less unpopular and invidious thing to say, in most of its parts, I will now proceed, ill the regular order of my subject, to speak of those who have embraced the speculative life, and I will say what appears to me to be desirable to be said on the subject.” The majority of critics have therefore not hesitated to believe in a causative connection between the two sects, and have thus, on account of Philo's words, separated the Egyptian Therapeutae, as the theorists, from the Palestinian Essenes, whom they designated the practitioners. In this assumption, there can only be a diversity of opinion as to which of the two sects justly claims the temporal precedence — whether the theory of the Therapeutae or the practice of the Essenes is the original, or, in other words, whether Egypt or Palestine is the fatherland of that tendency within Judaism which is designated by the name of Essenism. The opinion that the temporal precedence belongs to the Therapeutae, and that after Therapeuitsm had been planted on the soil of Judaea the Order of the Essenes originated, is advocated by Grorer (Kritische Geschichte des Uschrisfenthuis [Stuttg. 1831], 2, 335 sq.),  Lutterbeck (Die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe [Mayence, 1852], 1, 275 sq.), Mangold (Die Irrlehrender Pastor-albriefe [Marburg, 1856], p. 57 sq.), and Holtzmann (Geschichte des Volkes Israel und die Entstehungdes Christenthums [Leips. 1867], 2, 79 sq.). The opposite opinion is represented by Ritschl (Theologische Jahrbücher [ed. Baur and Zeller, 1855], p. 343 sq.), Hilgenfeld (Die jüdische Apokalyptik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung [Jena, 1857], p. 278 sq.), Herzfeld (Geschichte des Volkes Israel [2nd ed. Leips. 1863 ], 3, 406), Zeller (Geschichte der Philosophie der Griechen [ibid. 1868], III, 2, 288 sq.), Bellermann (Nalchrichten aus dem Alterthum liber Essener und Therapeuten [Berlin, 1821], p. 80, note), and Harnischmacher (De Essenorum apud Judaeos Societate [Bonn, 1866], p. 26), who admit a causative connection of both, without deciding the time of the origin. Now, denying, as we do, in opposition to the above-mentioned critics, any connection between these sects, and thus dismissing altogether the question which of the two formed the connecting link for the other, we will, for the sake of justifying our assertion, draw a parallel between the two sects, and first consider those points in which both agree.

Both sects diligently studied the Scripture, and interpreted the same allegorically. Besides the Old Test., both had a high consideration for the writings of the older members of their order. They favored the abolishing of slavery; lived in a very simple manner, and were accustomed to, appear at their religious exercises in white garments. More common traits cannot be proved, excepting, perhaps, the fact that both led an unmarried life. But even this is no proof, because, according to Josephus, at least one part of the Essenes, though perhaps only the minority, married. It cannot also be said that both agreed in leading a life entirely separated from the world. Of the Therapeutae, it is true, this can be said, but not of the Essenes, because, as Josephus tells us, they instructed the youth and took otherwise an active part in the weal and woe of their people, as they did, for instance, in the war against the Romans for the liberty of their country.

But more numerous and important are the differences which exist between the Therapeutae and Essenes. We call attention to the following:

1. The Therapeutae led a monastic, secluded life, given entirely to contemplation. The Essenes, according to the rules of their order, were obliged to work. Their labor was prescribed and regulated by officers  purposely appointed. They cultivated the fields, and were engaged in manual labors as well as in arts.

2. The Therapeutae lived separated from each other in cells, and only came together on the Sabbath and on special occasions. The Essenes, however, wherever they resided, had their common lodges, where they lived and dined together.

3. The Therapeutae, upon entering the order, left everything to their relatives and friends. The Essenes delivered their property to the order for the benefit of all.

4. The Therapeutae did not eat before the setting of the sun; the Essenes enjoyed two meals daily.

5. The Essenes were divided into four classes or graders which were so marked that a member of the upper class had to bathe himself when he touched anything belonging to a lower class. The Therapeutae had no such distinction. Of the Essenes we mare told that the members of the higher degrees had the knowledge of mysteries, which was not communicated to the lower degrees; of the Therapeutae we know nothing of the kind.

6. Each Esseue had to bathe himself daily; such lustrations were not in use among the Therapeutae.

7. The Therapeutae revered, the Temple at Jerusalem and the Levitical priesthood, and were not so far apart from orthodox Judaism. The Essenes, on the contrary, believed their lustrations and their mode of living to be of greater importance than the ordinances prescribed to the priests for the service of the Temple. They furnished no offerings to the Temple at Jerusalem, and thus became guilty of apostatizing from an important part of the Mosaic law. The Essenies were especially addicted to medicine and prophecy; we know nothing of these practices among the Therapeutae.

It is obvious that the differences between the two sects cannot consist in that the one was given to theory and the other to practice, because the supposition of a like ground-principle is not sufficient for explaining so many, and at the same time very important, differences. After all that we know of both these sects, the supposition of a causal connection between the two must appear very hazardous; for if there really were such a connection between them, and if both were essentially one and the same sect, it is surprising that Josephus has not recorded the fact. As little as we  believe with Philo in a real connection between the Jewish Essenes, the seven wise men of Greece, and the Indian Gymnosophists, whom he compares in his book Quod Omnis Probus Liber, just as little connection is there between the Essenes and Therapeutae, because Philo divided them into the theorists and practitioners. The Essenes did not originate from the propagation of Therapeutism in Palestine, because, as we know, Alexandrian religious philosophy did not find a fertile soil in Judaea, especially at the time in which both these sects originated. We cannot assume that the reverse should have taken place, otherwise the essential traits of Essenism would have been found again among the Therapeutae. The stamp of both sects is so different that they cannot be identical; and in treating of the Therapeutae no regard is therefore to be paid to the Essenes.

III. Therapeutae and Christianity. —Assuming that the Essenes were only consistent Chasidim has led the Jewish historian Gratz to make the assertion that Philo's treatise on the Therapeutae, according to which they were hitherto regarded as an Egyptian offshoot of Palestinian Essenism, could not be genuine. According to the same writer, it is not so much owing to the description of the Essenes by Josephus as to the book Περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ ἣ ἱκετῶν ἀρετῶν permv that those not coinciding with the former's views have arrived at a false result regarding the essence and origin of the Essene sect. Gratz also asserts that a Jewish sect of the Therapeutae never existed, but that they were Christians, ascetics of a heretic tendency, who sprang up by the dozen in the 2nd and 3rd centuries. The author of the book which has caused so much confusion is not Philo, but a Christian “who probably belonged either to the Encratico-gnostic or Montanistic party, and intended to write a panegyric on monasticism, the high antiquity of which Philo's authority was to confirm.” This is the result at which Gratz arrives; and although he takes it for granted that the attentive reader of the book Περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ must at once adopt the correctness of his assertion, he has nevertheless taken the pains to make good his hypothesis at great length.

This hypothesis of Gratz has been analyzed by Zeller, and the result is that the reasons adduced by the former are not sufficient and acceptable at all. In resuming the question once more, and examining the argument of Gratz in order to establish the Christian character of the Therapeutae, we do so because of its close connection with the essence and origin of the sect-in this we differ with Zeller-and because there are some points to be proved  against Gratz. The latter has denied the existence of a Jewish sect of the Therapeutae, and consequently also the genuineness of the Philonic treatise Περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ, on the ground of the silence of Josephus and Pliny, who wrote so much about the Essenes; while they know nothing of the Therapeutae, the alleged Egyptian branch of this sect. Against this, Zeller has argued that the silence of Josephus cannot be so remarkable, since the Therapeutae were a branch of the Essenes restricted to Egypt alone, and because Josephus tells very little about the later affairs of the Jews in that country. But if, according to Zeller, the Therapeutae were really an Egyptian branch of the Palestinian Essenes, or had some connection with them, the Essenes in Palestine ought to have known something about it; and even if Pliny's silence could be explained because he only knows one Essenic colony living by the Dead Sea, it might be supposed and in this Gratz is correct-that Josephus, who otherwise speaks very fully about the order, ought to have mentioned the Therapeutae. The silence of Josephus can therefore only be explained from the very fact that the Therapeutas had no connection whatever with the Essenes, but that they formed an independent sect within the Egyptian Judaism, the existence of which since its number and activity were less important was entirely unknown to Josephus.

What Philo narrates concerning the female Therapeutae (θεραπευ τρίδες), Gratz also finds incredible, because Josephus marks it as one of the characteristics of the Essenes to avoid all contact with the opposite sex; hence he believes that these female Therapeutae were nothing else than the sisters (sorores subintroductae) whom the Christian ascetics used to have about them for the sake of attaining, by constant temptation, a higher virtue, but who, as is known, have been the cause of great scandals. Against this, Zeller remarks that in this respect the Egyptian Essenes or Therapeutae might have had other institutions than those of the Palestinians, since their principles on the worth of an unmarried state were in the main not affected; and this difference of view does not indicate such a great deviation from the principles of the order as the practice of one branch of the Palestinian Essenes who married. We agree with Grätz that, according to Josephus, the wives of the married Essenes were not, like the female Therapeutae, members of the order. But this actual deviation-that while the Essenes excluded women entirely from the common feasts and meetings, this was not the case among the Therapeutae is only another proof that Essenes and Therapeutae are not, as Zeller believes, one and the same sect. This being the case, it must not be supposed, as Gratz believes, that the Therapeutae,  not being Essenes, were Christians. Gratz overlooks the circumstance that while the so-called sorores subintroductae lived in very close communication with the Christian ascetics, this cannot be said of the female Therapeutae. For can we safely infer, from the participation of women in the common feasts and meetings, that the Therapeutae really lived each with a female companion? Against such a hypothesis we have also the words of Philo, τὰς μὲν ουν ž ξ ἡμέρας χωρὶς ἕκαστοι μονούμενοι παρ ἑαυτοῖς ἐν τοῖς λεχθεῖσι, μοναστηρίοις φιλοσοφοῦσι, who emphasizes the fact repeatedly that they sought solitude and desired to be left to themselves in order not to be disturbed in their contemplative life (ὀχληρὸν γὰρ καὶ δυσάρεστον τοῖς ἐρημίαν ἐζηλωκόσι καὶ μεταδιώκουσιν αἱ γειτνιάσεις). But, above all, we ask, where is the passage in this treatise which indicates, as Gratz tries to prove, that the Therapeutae, like the Christian ascetics, had aimed at a higher degree of perfection by living together with the female members? From the introductory words of the Philonic treatise, Gratz also” infers that it cannot be genuine, since it connects itself with the treatise Περὶ τοῦ πάντα σπουδαῖον ειναι ἐλεύθερον erroneously, as with a writing on the Essenes. The words in question are Ε᾿σσαίων πέρι δια λεχθείς, ο‰ τὸν πρακτικὸν ἐζήλωσαν καὶ διεπόνησαν βιον ἐν ἃπασιν, κ.τ.λ.

Gratz thinks that Philo could not possibly say that he “wrote a treatise” on the Essenes (Ε᾿σσάιων πέρι διαλεχθείς), when the passage in question only occupies the twelfth part of the treatise, and he only mentions this sect as one of the many. But against this it must be argued that διαλέγεσθαι περι τινος does not mean “to write a treatise,” but to “speak on something,” and this, as Zeller remarks, Philo has evidently done concerning the Essenes. Moreover, such an association of topics is not comical at all, as Gratz thinks, because by this two Jewish sects which have at least some traits in common were brought into connection. But the main point for the spuriousness of the treatise on the Therapeutae and for its being written by a Christian, Gratz thinks to lie in the fact that Christians- so Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. 2, 17) and others after him recognized the Therapeutae as “flesh of their own flesh.” The holy cells of the Therapeutae are called monasteries. It is evident, argues Gratz, that we have here the beginning of the monastic cells, which existed even before Anthony of Thebes, the founder of-monasticism.. But even if we admit that the entire mode of living of the Therapeutae is similar to that of the later Christian monks, we are not at all justified to infer that the Therapeutae were Christian monks. Why — and herein we agree with Grätz should  there not have been in Egypt, the fatherland and the proper home of monasticism, ascetics even before Anthony of Thebes? And why should this not have been possible within the pale of Judaism? And are the Palestinian Essenes not a similar phenomenon?

To impress on the Therapeutae the Christian character because of the word μοναστήριον, which the Christian monks used for their cell, is not reasonable, because, as Zeller reminds us, the expressions μοναστήριον, and σεμνεῖον were only used by the Therapeutae for a part, and not, as did the Christian monks, for the whole, of the dwelling. The supposition seems to be that the Therapeuta, or rather Philo himself, formed the Words μοναστήριον and σεμνεῖον , and that Christian monks borrowed this nomenclature from their Jewish predecessors. That Philo, who was the first to use these expressions, has also-formed the same appears from the fact that he himself explains them when saying, ἐν ἑκάστῃ δὲ οἰκὶᾷ ἐστὶν ἱερὸν ὃ καλεῖται σεμνεῖον καὶ μοναστήριον, ἐν ῳ μονούμενοι τὰ τοῦ σεμνοῦ βίου μυστήρια τελοῦνται.

The Therapeutae, Gratz goes on to argue, had not only a common feast, but after the feast they had a kind of Lord's supper (παναγέστατον σιτίον), consisting of unleavened bread, of which all did not partake, but only the better ones. Gratz evidently believes that we have here the difference between the missa catechumenorum and the missa Jidelium. From the latter, which consisted in the celebration of the Lord's supper and in a kind of liturgy, those who were not yet baptized, together with those who were excommunicated, were excluded; for, he asks, is this not Christian? But this question we must also answer in the negative. Grätz, as Zeller remarks, has overlooked the fact that the so-called Lord's supper did not take place after the common meal, but it was this common meal itself. At this supper not unleavened, but leavened, bread was eaten (ἄρτος ἐζυμωμένος μετὰ προσοψήματος, ἁλῶν οις ὕσσωπος ἀναμέμικται δἰ αἰδῶ τῆς ἀνακειμένης ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ προνάῳ ἱερᾶς τραπέζης) out of reverence for the unleavened showbread in the Temple at Jerusalem. But, above all, Grätz has erred in asserting that this supper was a prerogative of the better ones. Now the words ἵνα ἔφωσι προνομίαν οἱ κρείττονες do not refer to the Therapeutae, but to the Jewish priests, to whom alone the Therapeutae conceded the use of unleavened bread as a special prerogative.

This unquestionably follows from the words of Philo: ὅταν δὲ ἕκαστος διαπεράνηται τὸν ὕμνον, οἱ νέοι τὴν πρὸ μίκροῦ λεχθεῖσαν  τράπεζαν εἰσκομίζουσιν, ἐφ᾿ ης τὸ παναγέστατον σιτίον ἐζυμωμένος μετὰ προσοψή ματος ἁλῶν οις ὕσσωπος ἀναμέμικται δἰ αἰδῶ τῆς ἀνακειμένης ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ προνάῳ ἱερᾶς τραπέζης· ἐπὶ γὰρ ταύτης εἰσὶν ἄρτοι καὶ ἃλες ἄνευ ἡδύσματος, ἄζυ μοι μὲν οἱ ἄρτοι, ἀμιγεῖς δὲ καὶ οἱ ἃλες. Προσῆκον γὰρ ην, τὰ μὲν ἁπλούστατα καὶ εἰλικρινέστατα τῇ κρατίστῃ τῶν ἱερῶν ἀπονεμηθῆναι μερίδι, λειτουργίας αθλον, τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους τὰ μὲν ὅμοια ζηλοῦν, ἀπεχεσθαι δὲ τῶν ἄρτων, ἵνα ἔχωσι προνομίαν οἱ κρείττο νες. That the Therapeutae were Christians, Gratz also finds in the fact that the presbyters among them occupied the first position; and that they were not presbyters because of their age, but because of their strict observance of the Therapeutic life (πρεσβυτέρους γὰρ οὐ πολυετεῖς καὶ παλαίους νομίζουσιν ἀλλὰ ἔτι κομιδῇ νέους παῖδας ἐὰν ὀψὲ τῆς προαιρέσεως ἐρασθῶσιν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἐκ πρώτης ἡλικίας ἐνηβήσαντας καὶ ἐνακμάσαντας τῷ θεωρητικῷ μέρει φιλοσοφίας, ὃ δὴ κάλλιστον καὶ θειότατόν ἐστι).

We have thus, Gratz argues, the presbyters, or ἐπίσκοποι, of the Christian congregations, who held one and the same office in the ante-Nicene time. But this conclusion is the less justifiable, since the office of presbyters was not exactly a Christian institution, but existed even before the Christian era, and was adopted by the Church from Judaism. Even among the Essenes we find such a distinction of rank, and yet Gratz would be the last to call them Christians, although he firmly believes that Christ belonged to the Essenes. The argument which Gratz takes from the vigils, so common among the Therapeutae, for the sake of making them Christians is also of no avail, because fasting was something peculiar to Judaism and was adopted by the Church; and as to the vigils, such nocturnal services existed before the Christian era. It. is therefore not necessary to think, as does Grätz, following Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. 2, 17), of Christian rites before Easter Sunday. From the liturgy, the metrical hymns, and typical mode of explaining the prophets, according to Gratz, other arguments for the Christian character of the Therapeutae might be made. But even these alleged Christian traits are purely Jewish.

Of the hymns of the Therapeutae. Philo expressly states that they were formed after the hymn of Moses and Miriam (Exodus 15); and as to the allegorical interpretation, it was used among the Alexandrian Jews before the Christian era, and even before Philo. But as to what Gratz understands of the liturgy of the Therapeutae and of its Christian character, he has not fully entered upon this point, nor can anything of the kind be deduced from Philo's statement. Gratz refers to  Eusebius, and to those after him who regarded the Therapeutae as Christians, but this proof is the least satisfactory. Eusebius regards the treatise Περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ as Philonian, and makes the Jewish philosopher a disciple of John Mark, who accompanied Paul on his first missionary tour, and afterwards labored at Alexandria. According to Eusebius, the Therapeutae existed as Christians in the 1st century. The opinion of Grätz that the Therapeutae were a Christian monastic sect of the 2nd or 3rd century of the Christian era has therefore no support in Eusebius. While, however, later Christian writers, with the exception of Photius (Myriobiblon sive Bibliotheca [Rothomagi, 1653], ed. Dav. Halschelius, p. 275), identify Therapeutae with monks, and while the writings falsely ascribed to Dionysius Areopagita use both expressions synonymously, Scaliger has called attention to the fact that the designation of Therapeutae for monks depends solely upon the interpretation of Eusebius (Scaliger, De Emeindatione Temporum, 6:252). With the exception of Gratz, no writer has regarded the Therapeut as as Christian heretical sect, and he himself is yet undecided in what series of heretical sects, which sprang up by the dozen within the Church in the 2nd and 3rd centuries, he should place them. According to Grätz, the author of the treatise probably belonged to the Encratico-gnostic or Montanistic party. But he has not tried to state any plausible reason for his hypothesis, which, in fact, would be impossible; and he himself says that this point is outside of his object, and must be left ‘to those critics who make this question their specialty. We ask, however, what reason could there have been for a Christian, even for a heretic, to father upon Philo such a book, for the sake of recommending monastic asceticism? We nowhere hear, except from Eusebius, whose erroneous view concerning the Therapeutae led him to the opinion, that Philo had such a good reputation within the Christian Church, and that Christians appealed to him for their views. And what is the more remarkable is the fact that in the whole treatise neither Christ nor the doctrines of Christianity are once mentioned. Where, then, is the Christian character of the Therapeutae? As for the linguistic character of the book Περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ, it entirely agrees with Philo's mode of representation; and there is no internal nor external argument for denying Philo to be the author of the book. The Therapeutae, as we shall see further on, were Jews.

IV. Character and Origin of the Sect of the Therapeutae. — From the manner in which Philo speaks of the Therapeutae, there can be no doubt  that he himself was very much prepossessed regarding them, for the book Περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ is nothing but a panegyric on the sect. This fact alone would lead to the supposition-which, in truth is also supported by the whole character of the sect — that the Therapeutae cultivated and adhered to Jewish religious philosophy, which numbered Philo among its most zealous disciples. It is hardly conceivable, as Gfrorer (Philo und die jüdischalexaendrüsche Theosophie, 2. 281 sq.) has indicated, that in a time like that in which Philo wrote, when the religious movement was at a high pitch, and when the most diverse religious parties existed side by side, a man with such peculiar religious views should write such a panegyric on a sect unless it represented his own views.

Now there can be no doubt that the Therapeutae represented a Jewish sect. They based their investigations and researches upon the writings of the Old Test. In their σεμνεῖα they had only the law and the prophets (νόμοι καὶ λόγια θεσπισθέντα διὰ προφητῶν). Philo calls them Μωσέως γνώριμοι, and further says that they gave themselves to philosophical speculation, according to the holy doctrines of the prophet Moses (κατὰ τὰς τοῦ προφήτου Μωσέως ἱερωτάτας ὑφηγήσεις). The Therapeutae strictly observed the Jewish Sabbath, and had great reverence for the Temple at Jerusalem and the Levitical priesthood. Their holy choruses are expressly said to be an imitation of those at the Red Sea. All these traits show that, on the one hand, the Therapeutae strictly adhered to the traditions and views of Judaism, while, on the other hand, they deviated in many particulars; hence they were characterized as a sect.

As to their name, Philo leaves us to choose between two views. They are called Therapeutae either because they profess an art of medicine more excellent than that in general use in cities (thus Therapeutae would be equivalent to “physicians for the soul” ), or because they have been instructed by nature and the sacred laws to serve the living God (θεραπεύιν τὸ ῎Ον); thus Therapeutae would signify those who “serve God.” The latter view is probably the more correct, since the Therapeutae, as the true spiritual “worshippers of God,” called themselves the contemplatives κατ᾿ ἐξοχήν, and this appellation accords more fully with the whole tenor and character of the sect than the designation “physicians for the soul.” Besides, Philo uses ἱκέται and θεραπευταί, γένος θεραπευτικόν, and γένος ἱκετι κόν synonymously, in order to designate the worship of God in the sense of Alexandrian theosophy, in opposition to the faith and worship of God of the great mass. (De. Victimas oferentibus  [Mangey], 2, 258: ἱκέται καὶ θεραπευταὶ τοῦ ὄντως ὄντος. De Monar; chi ( 2, 425: ἀνδρὸς ἱκέτου καὶ φιλοθέου θεὸν μόνον θεραπεύειν ἀξιοῦντος. Vita Mosis, 2, 164: τὸ θεραπευτικὸν αὐτοῦ [sc. τοῦ θεοῦ] γένος. De Profugis, 1, 552: τὸ γὰρ θεραπευτικὸν γένος ἀνάθημά ἐστι θεοῦ ἱερωμένον τὴν μεγάλην ἀρχιερωσύνην αὐτῷ μόνῳ)

From the Greek derivation of Therapeutae, we see that there existed a spiritual relationship between this sect and Jewish Alexandrian religious philosophy; and we are led to this assumption when we consider the object, which formed the basis of their contemplative life. Its purpose was to lead to the knowledge of the Deity. To achieve this it was necessary to suppress the material man and elevate the spiritual. For this reason they lived in a very simple manner, restricting their wants to the smallest measure. Abstinence and moderation they regarded as the foundation of all virtues, because by these man is brought nearer to the simple, which enables him to see the simple essence of the Deity, and to indulge. in the blessed intuition of the same. Therefore the Therapeutae lived secluded from the outside world; they denied themselves everything that could bring them in contact with others, thus living only to themselves and their contemplation. They denied themselves marriage, because they preferred to live together with the divine wisdom; and sought not after the mortal, but the immortal, fruits of a soul loved by God, and which the same only brings forth when she is impregnated by the spiritual rays of the heavenly Father. For this reason slavery was banished from their midst, because, in a community which was animated by such motives, men could not be tolerated who were degraded below the dignity of men. If the entire aim of the Therapeutae accords with the object and time of the Alexandrian religious philosophy, the relationship between the two shows itself more fully in the allegorical exegesis, which, distinguishing between spirit and letter, idea and symbol, endeavored to explain the writings of the Old Test.

According to Philo, the Therapeutae had the writings of the ancients, who, as the founders of this tendency, left behind them many memorials of the allegorical system. The same symbolic character we also find in their holy feast. The historical relation with which it connected itself was the exode from Egypt and the going through the Red Sea, as the choruses sung at this feast were in imitation of those songs which Moses and Miriam sang. Now, according to the allegory of the Alexandrians and Philo, Egypt is the symbol of the sensual life in earthly lust and bodily pleasure; the song of Moses  symbolizes the rapture which man feels after he has denied himself every earthly thing and suppressed all sensual lust, and now, as a purely spiritual being, indulges in the intuition of the Deity. Thus the Therapeutae, like Philo and the Alexandrians, held the view that, the body being the seat of sin the flight from a corporeal into a purely spiritual existence ought to be the true and highest aim of life. And Philo himself expressly states that the Therapeutae went into the desert, because they had entirely broken with their earthly life, and intended to lead another, as it were immortal and blessed existence. The Therapeutae thus represent a sect which earnestly strove after carrying out and practicing those principles and views to which the Jewish Alexandrian religious philosophy did homage.

 At what time, however, this sect, with its ceremonies, originated it is hard to tell, since Philo does not say anything more definite about it. The only indication in the Περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ from which we may conclude that the sect existed a long time before Philo, is the notice that the Therapeutae possessed writings of the ancients which the founders had left behind them as memorials of the allegorical system, and which the Therapeutae took as a kind of model. The founding of the sect probably took place at the time when the Jewish Alexandrian theosophy originated and developed itself. We may trace it back to the beginning of the 2nd century before Christ, to Aristobulus, who introduced Jewish doctrines into the Orphic hymns because he believed that Greek philosophers had derived their wisdom from an ancient version of the Pentateuch. Whether we have any traces of a connection of Greek philosophy with Jewish theology in the Septuagint, which, according to Josephus, was commenced in B.C. 285, is at least very doubtful; but certain it is that with the beginning of the 2nd pre-Christian century the conditions were already given for the origin of the sect. That the sect of the Therapeutae was propagated beyond Egypt is not probable, and its number was, perhaps, not very large.

After all, it is very interesting to know that about the time when Christ came into the world, among the Jews in Egypt the desire was felt to come into a nearer relation to the Deity, and to be freed from those relations which were not satisfactory. The Therapeutae endeavored to reach this object by leaving all earthly possessions, and in this respect they resemble the Christian monks, who borrowed from them many traits, as, in fact, Egypt was the real country of monasticism. But, when Christians regarded them for a long time as flesh of their own flesh, they misunderstood the character and tendency of the Therapeutae entirely, because their whole  history shows how far they were still from that goal which alone could satisfy the cravings of the heart, but which human reason and power alone cannot reach.

V. Literature. — Gfrorer, Philo und die jüdisch-alexandrinische Theosophie (Stuttg. 1835); D ahne, Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch alexandrinischen Religions-Philosophie (Halle, 1834); Kuenen, De Godsdienst van Israel (Haarlem, 1870), 2, 382 sq. (Engl. transl. by May, The Religion of Israel [Lond. 1874 sq.]); Ritschl, Die Entstehung der altkatholischem Kinche (Bonn, 1857), p. 216;. Herzfeld, Geschichte des Volkes Israel (Leips. 1863), 3, 496; Delaunay, Ecrits Historiques de Philon (Par. 1870), p. 55; id. Moines et Sibylles (ibid. 1874), p. 385; Baur, Drei Abhandlungen zür Geschichte der alten Philosophie (Leips. 1876), p. 216; Schwegler, Das nachapostolische Zeitalter (Tub. 1846), 1, 190; Lutterbeck, Die neutestanzenitlichen Lehrbegrimfe (Mentz, 1852), 1, 131, 271; Wegnern, Ueber das Verhaltniss des Chrisfenthums zum Essenisnus, in Illgen's Zeitsch. F. d. hist. Theol. 1841, 11:2, 1 sq.; Leroux, Encyclopedie Nouvelle (Par. 1843), 4:656 sq.; Bauer, Christus und die C'saren (Berl. 1879), p. 307 sq.; Gratz, Geschichte der Juden, 2nd ed. 3, 464 sq.; Jost, Gesch. des Judenthums, 1, 224; Nicolas, Revue de Theologie (Strasb. 1868), p. 36 sq.; Derenbourg, Journal Asiatique (Par. 1868), p. 282 sqt.; Renan, Journal des Savants (ibid. 1874), p. 798 sq.; Clemens, Die Therapeuten (Konigsb. 1869); Lucius, Die Therapeuten und ihre Stellung in der Geschichte der Askese. Eine kritische Untersuchung der Schrift de Vita Contemplativa (Strasb. 1880). ‘The last writer comes to the conclusion that the Therapeutse were not Jews, and that the treatise bearing the name of Philo was written towards the end of the 3rd century as an apology for Christian asceticism. (B.P.)

## Theras[[@Headword:Theras]]

             (θέρα), a corrupt Greek form (1Es 8:41; 1Es 8:61) of the name Hebraized (Ezr 8:21; Ezr 8:31) AHANA SEE AHANA (q.v.).

## Theremin, Ludwig Friederich Franz[[@Headword:Theremin, Ludwig Friederich Franz]]

             a celebrated German preacher and professor, was born at Gramzow, March 19, 1780. He was of Huguenot extraction, his family having emigrated from France after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and his father was the pastor of the French congregation in the town where Franz was born. After suitable preparation, the latter was ordained at Geneva in 1805, and  in 1810 was chosen by the French congregation at Berlin to be its pastor. This post he exchanged, Dec. 29,1814, for that of preacher to the court. In 1824 he was made a member of the high consistory and lecturer in the department of instruction of the ministry of worship; and in the same year the degree of Doctor of Divinity was conferred on him by the University of Greifswalde. In 1839 he added to his former dignities that of extraordinary, and in 1840 that of ordinary, honorary, professor in the University of Berlin. He lectured on homiletics, and established a homiletical seminary in his house, devoting himself to the guidance of the latter with an enthusiasm which increased steadily, in proportion as physical infirmities restricted the range of his activity as a preacher. A cataract formed over one of his eyes, and gave rise to the apprehension that he would become totally blind; but he was relieved from such fear by death, which came to him quietly and gently Sept. 26, 1846. His wife had preceded him into the eternal world by more than twenty years. A son and an unmarried daughter survived him.

Theremit was the representative of a specific homiletical tendency which held that classical antiquity is the true school of eloquence and claimed Demosthenes as its master. Its characteristic was that it devoted exclusive attention to finished perfection of form, and consequently had nothing in common with that rugged German school of eloquence of which Luther is the representative, and whose peculiarity it is that “out of the fullness of the heart the mouth speaketh” and shapes its own forms of expression. Not Luther or Harms, but Massillon, was Theremin's ideal; for Theremin's mind was in its structure not German, but French. This peculiarity may partially explain the fact that Theremin did not found a school of pulpit orators in any actual sense; while Reinhard, to whom he was unquestionably superior, had numerous imitators. Theremin's fundamental principle in homiletics was that eloquence is not an art, but a virtue (see his work Beredsamkeit eine Tugend). The idea is evidently faulty, since eloquence is not, like other virtues, a duty; nor is the use of eloquence confined altogether to the promotion of ethical results. As a preacher he was accustomed to use brief texts, and consequently to employ considerable latitude in the handling of his themes, often dragging in extraneous matter, instead of educing it from the text. His bearing in the pulpit was that of quiet dignity; his gestures were few and simple, his voice good, his modulation perfect. The finish of his productions, however, produced the impression of an aristocratic refinement, which, though evidently altogether natural in his case, prevented the achieving of such  popular results as were secured by Luther, Heinrich Miller, Conrad Rieger, L. Hofacker, and others. Ten volumes of his Sermons have been published, most of them in repeated editions (Duncker and Humblot, Berlin). Other works of theological and ascetical character emanated from his pen, and have received deserved recognition, e.g. Lehre orm gott Reiche (Berlin, 1823): —Adalhert's Bekenntnisse (2nd ed. 1835): —Abendstunden (5th ed. 1858). See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Theresa, or Teresa, St[[@Headword:Theresa, or Teresa, St]]

             was born at Avila, in Castile, Spain, March 28, 1515. Her full name was Theresa Sanchez de Cepeda. From early childhood she was accustomed, with a favorite brother, to read the lives of the saints and martyrs until they both became possessed of a passionate desire to obtain the crown of martyrdom. When they were children eight or nine years old, they set off on a begging expedition into the country of the Moors, in hopes of being taken by the infidels and sacrificed for their faith. Disappointed in this, they resolved to turn hermits; but in this they were also prevented. Theresa lost her mother at the age of twelve, and in a few years became so worldly that her father placed her, at the age of sixteen, in a convent. Here her mind again took a religious turn, and when twenty years of age she obtained her father's consent to take the vow, and entered the convent of the Carmelites at Avila. For nearly twenty years, however, she says, she lived without feeling that repose for which she had hoped when she sacrificed the world. But at length while reading the Confessions of St. Augustine, she was led to pray with greater confidence, and her enthusiastic and restless spirit found peace. She remained in the convent in her native town till 1561, when she conceived the idea of reforming the Order of the Carmelites, into which several disorders had crept.

In 1562 she laid the foundation of the new monastery at Avila, which she dedicated to St. Joseph, whom she had chosen as her patron saint. The branch of her order which she founded were the “Barefooted Carmelites,” and also, after her, the THERESIANS SEE THERESIANS (q.v.). It was the principle of Theresa that the convents of the Carmelites, under her new rule, should either have no worldly possessions whatever, and literally exist upon the charity of others, or that they should be so endowed as not to require any external aid. This was a principle from which her spiritual directors obliged her to depart; and yet such was her success that at the time of her death she had founded  seventeen convents for women and fifteen for men. During the latter part of her life Theresa found ample occupation ill traveling from one convent to another to promulgate her new regulations for the government of her order. In 1582 she was seized with her last illness in the palace of the duchess of Alva, but was, by her urgent request, carried back to her convent of San Jose, where she died a few days afterwards. She was beatified by pope Paul V, April 24,1614, and canonized by Gregory XV, March 22, 1622, her feast being fixed on October 15. Philip III declared her the second patron saint of the Spanish monarchy after Santiago, a decree solemnly confirmed by the Spanish Cortes in 1812. Her shrine is at Avila, in the -church of her convent. The ascetic treatises and letters of Theresa, in which she describes the internal struggles and aspirations of her heart, are among the most remarkable documents of the mystic literature of the Roman Catholic Church. Five of them are extant: Discurso ó Relacion de su Vida (1562): —El Camino de la Perfeccion, prepared in 1563 as a guide for the nulls of the reformed order El Libro de las Fundaciones, an account of convents founded by her: —El Castillo Interior, ó las Moradas (1577): —Santos Conceptos del Amor de Dios. The original MSS. of the first four works are preserved in the library of the Escurial, that of the last was burned by order of her confessor; but a copy had previously been taken by one of her nuns. The first complete edition of St. Theresa's Works appeared at Salamanca (1587), and a recent one by Ochoa at Paris (1847): —Letters (Saragossa, 1658). The abbé Migne edited a complete collection of her works in French (Paris, 1840-46, 4 vols.); and pere Marcel Bouix published a French translation from the original MSS. (Le Mans, 1852- 56,3 vols. 8vo). For Lives of Theresa consult those of Ribera (Salamanca, 1590), pere Bouix (Paris,'1865), Bollandist Vandermoere (Brussels, 1845), and Maria French (Lond. 1875). See Mrs. Jameson, Legends of the Monastic Orders, p. 415 sq.

## Thermeleth[[@Headword:Thermeleth]]

             (θερμελέθ), a Greek form (1 Esdr. 5, 36) of the name Hebraized (Ezra 2, 59) TEL-MELATH SEE TEL-MELATH (q.v.).

## Thesaurarius[[@Headword:Thesaurarius]]

             the treasurer of a cathedral or collegiate church; the bursar (treasurer) of a college or monastery; the keeper of a shrine house or treasury.

## Thessalonian[[@Headword:Thessalonian]]

             (θεσσαλονικεύς), the designation (Act 26:4; 1Th 1:1; 2Th 2:1; “of Thessalonica,” Act 27:2) of an inhabitant of Thessalonica (q.v.).

## Thessalonians, First Epistle To The[[@Headword:Thessalonians, First Epistle To The]]

             is the eighth in order of the Pauline epistles as found in the New Test., but the first in point of chronological date, and immediately followed by the second bearing a corresponding title.

I. Authorship and Canonicity. —The external evidence in favor of the genuineness of the First Epistle to the Thessalonians is chiefly negative, but this is important enough. There is no trace that it was ever disputed at any age or in any section of the Church, or even by any individual, till the present century. On the other hand, the allusions to it in writers before the close of the 2nd century are confessedly faint and uncertain — a circumstance easily explained when we remember the character of the epistle itself, its comparatively simple diction, its silence on the most important doctrinal questions, and, generally speaking, the absence of any salient points to arrest the attention and provoke reference. In Clement of Rome there are some slight coincidences of language, perhaps not purely accidental (c. 38, κατὰ πάντα εὐχαριστεῖν αὐτῷ, comp. 1Th 5:18; ibid. σωζέσθω ουν ἡμῖν ὅλον τὸ σῶμα ἐν X. I., comp.  1Th 5:23). Ignatius in two passages (Polyc. 1, and Ephes. 10) seems to be reminded of Paul's expression ἀδιαλείπτως προσεύχεσθε (1Th 5:17), but in both passages of Ignatius the word ἀδιαλείπτως, in which the similarity mainly consists, is absent in the Syriac, and is therefore probably spurious. The supposed references in Polycarp (ch. 1Th 4:1 to 1Th 5:17, and 1Th 2:1-20) are also unsatisfactory. It is more important to observe that the epistle was included in the Old Latin and Syriac versions, that it is found in the canon of the Muratorian fragment, and that it was also contained in that of Marcion and of the Council of Laodicea in 364. With Irenseus commence direct citations (Adv. Haeres. 5, 6, I): “On account of this the apostle hath set forth the perfect spiritual man, saying in 1 Thessalonians, ‘But the God of peace sanctify you wholly, and may your whole body, soul, and spirit be preserved blameless to the coining of our Lord Jesus. Christ'” (comp. 1 Thessalonians 5, 23). Clemens Alex. (Pcedag.,1, 88): “But this the blessed  Paul hath most clearly signified, saying, ‘When we might be burdensome as the apostles of Christ, we were gentle among you, as a nurse cherisheth her children” ‘(comp. 1 Thessalonians 2, 7). Tertullian (De Resurrect. Carnis, c. 24): “What these times were, learn along with the Thessalonians; for we read, ‘How ye were turned from idols to serve the living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, Jesus, whom he hath raised from the dead'” (comp. 1 Thessalonians 1, 9, 10). This father quotes the epistle more than twenty times. To these citations we may add those by Caius (ap. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. 6:20), by Origen (Cont. Cels. lib. 3), and by others of the ecclesiastical writers (Lardner, 2, pl. locc.).

On the other hand, the internal evidence derived from the character of the epistle itself is so strong that it may fairly be called irresistible. It would be impossible to enter into the question of style here, but the reader may be referred to the Introduction of Jowett, who has handled this subject very fully and satisfactorily. An equally strong argument may be drawn also from the matter contained in the epistle. Two instances of this must suffice. In the first place, the fineness and delicacy of touch with which the apostle's relations towards his Thessalonian converts are drawn-his yearning to see them, his anxiety in the absence of Timothy, and his heart- felt rejoicing at the good news are quite beyond the reach of the clumsy forgeries of the early Church. In the second place, the writer uses language which, however it may be explained, is certainly colored by the anticipation of the speedy advent of the Lord language natural enough on the apostle's own lips, but quite inconceivable in a forgery written after his death; when time had disappointed these anticipations, and when the revival or mention of them would serve no purpose and might seem to discredit the apostle. Such a position would be an anachronism in a writer of the 2nd century.

The genuineness of this epistle was first questioned by Schrader (Apostel Paulus), who was followed by Baur (Paulus, p. 480). The latter writer has elaborated and systematized the attack. The arguments which he alleges in favor of his view are briefly controverted by Linemann, and more at length, and with great fairness, by Jowett. The following is a summary of Baur's arguments.

(a.) He attributes great weight to the general character of the epistle, the difference of style, and especially the absence of distinctive Pauline doctrines-a peculiarity which will be remarked upon and explained below (§ 3).

(b.) In the mention of the “wrath” overtaking the Jewish people (2, 16), Baur sees an allusion to the destruction of Jerusalem, and therefore a proof of the later date of the epistle. The real significance of these words will be considered below in discussing the Apocalyptic passage in the second epistle.

(c.) He urges the contradictions to the account in the Acts-a strange argument, surely, to be brought forward by Baur, who postdates and discredits the authority of that narrative. The real extent and bearing of these divergences will be considered below (§ 4),

(d.) He discovers references to the Acts, which show that the epistle was written later. It will be seen, however, that the coincidences are subtle and incidental, and the points of divergence and. prima-facie contradictions, which Baur himself allows, and indeed insists upon, are so numerous as to preclude the supposition of copying. Schleiermacher (Einleit. ins N.T. p. 150) rightly infers the independence of the epistle on these grounds.

(e.) He supposes passages in this epistle to have been borrowed from the acknowledged letters of Paul. The resemblances, however, which he points out are not greater than, or, indeed, so great as, those in other epistles, and bear no traces of imitation.

II. Date. —This has been approximately determined in the following way: During the course of his second missionary journey, which began in the year 47, Paul founded the Church of Thessalonica. Leaving Thessalonica, he passed on to Beroea. From Beroea he went to Athens, and from Athens to Corinth (Act 17:1; Act 18:18). With this visit to Corinth, which extends over a period of two years or thereabouts, his second missionary journey closed, for from Corinth he returned to Jerusalem, paying only a brief visit to Ephesus on the way (Act 18:20-21). There is some uncertainty about the movements of Paul's companions at this time (see below); but, whatever view we adopt on this point, it seems indisputable that, when this epistle was written, Silvanus and Timothy were in the apostle's company (1Th 1:1; comp. 2Th 2:1)-a circumstance which confines the date to the second missionary journey, for, though Timothy was with him on several occasions afterwards, the name of Silvanus appears for the last time in connection with Paul during this visit to Corinth (Act 18:5; 2Co 1:19). The epistle, then, must have been written in the interval between Paul's leaving Thessalonica and the close of  his residence at Corinth, i.e. within the years 48-51. The following considerations, however, narrow the limits of the possible date still more closely.

(1.) When Paul wrote, he had already visited, and probably left, Athens (1Th 3:1).

(2.) Having made two unsuccessful attempts to revisit Thessalonica, he had dispatched Timothy to obtain tidings of his converts there. Timothy had returned before the apostle wrote (1Th 3:1 to 1Th 2:6).

(3.) Paul speaks of the Thessalonians as “ensamples to all that believe in Macedonia and Achaia,” adding ‘that “in every place their faith to God- ward was spread abroad” (1Th 1:7-8)-language prompted, indeed, by the overflowing of a grateful heart, and therefore not to be rigorously pressed, but still implying some lapse of time at least.

(4.) There are several traces of a growth and progress in the condition and circumstances of the Thessalonian Church. Perhaps the mention of “rulers” in the Church (1Th 5:12) ought not to be adduced as proving this, since some organization would be necessary from the very beginning. But there is other evidence besides. Questions had arisen relating to the state of those who had fallen asleep in Christ, so that one or more of the Thessalonian converts must have died in the interval (1Th 4:13-18). The storm of persecution which the apostle had discerned gathering on the horizon had already burst upon the Christians of Thessalonica (1Th 3:4; 1Th 3:7). Irregularities had crept in and sullied the infant purity of the Church (1Th 4:4; 1Th 5:14). The lapse of a few months, however, would account for these changes, and a much longer time cannot well be allowed. For

(5) the letter was evidently written by Paul immediately on the return of Timothy, in the fullness of his gratitude for the joyful tidings (1Th 3:6). Moreover

(6), the second epistle also was written before he left Corinth, and there must have been a sufficient interval between the two to allow of the growth of fresh difficulties, and of such communication between the apostle and his converts as the case supposes. We shall not be far wrong, therefore, in placing the writing of this epistle early in Paul's residence at Corinth, a few  months after he had founded the Church at Thessalonica, i.e. during the year 49.

The statement in the subscription appearing in several MSS. and versions that it was written “from Athens” is a superficial inference from 1Th 3:1, to which no weight should be attached, as is clear from the epistle itself.

(1.) In 1Th 1:7-8 Paul says that the Thessalonians had become “ensamples to all that believe in Macedonia and Achaia for from you [says he] sounded out the word of the Lord not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but also in every place your faith to God-ward is spread abroad.” Now, for such an extensive diffusion of the fame of the Thessalonian Christians and of the Gospel by them, a much longer period of time must have elapsed than is allowed by the supposition that Paul; wrote this epistle while at Athens; and, besides, his reference particularly to Achaia seems prompted by the circumstance of his being, at the time he wrote, in Achaia, of which Corinth was the chief city.

(2.) His language in 1Th 3:1-2 favors the opinion that it was not from Athens, but after he had left Athens, that he wrote this epistle; it is hardly the turn which one living at Athens at the time would have given his words.

(3.) Is it likely that during the short time Paul was in Athens before writing this epistle (supposing him to have written it there) he should have “over and again” purposed to revisit the Thessalonians, but have been hindered? And yet such purposes he had entertained before writing this epistle, as we learn from 1Th 2:18; and this greatly favors the later date.

(4.) Before Paul wrote this epistle, Timothy had come to him from Thessalonica with good tidings concerning the faith and. charity of the Christians there (1Th 3:6). But had Timothy followed Paul to Athens from Beroea, what tidings could he have brought the apostle from Thessalonica except such hearsay reports as would inform the apostle of nothing he did not already know? From these considerations it follows that this epistle was not written from Athens. It must, however, have been written very soon after his arrival at Corinth; for at the time of his writing Timothy had just arrived from Thessalonica (ἄρτι ἐλθόντος Τιμοθέου, 1Th 3:6), and Paul had not been long in Corinth before Timothy and Silas joined him there (Act 17:1-5).  Michaelis contends for a later date; but his arguments are destitute of weight. Before Paul could learn that the fame of the Thessalonian Church had spread through Achaia and far beyond, it was not necessary, as Michaelis supposes, that he should have made several extensive journeys from Corinth; for as that city, from its mercantile importance, was the resort of persons from all parts of the commercial world, the apostle had abundant means of gathering this information even during a brief residence there. As little is it necessary to resort to the supposition that when Paul says that over and again Satan had hindered him from fulfilling his intention of visiting Thessalonica he must refer to shipwrecks or some such misfortunes (as Michaelis suggests); for Satan has many ways of hindering men from such purposes besides accidents in traveling. The views of critics Who have assigned to this epistle a later date than the second nissionary journey are stated and refuted in the Introduction of Koch (p. 23, etc.) and of Linemann (§ 3).

III. Relation to Other Epistles. —The epistles to the Thessalonians then (for the second followed the first after no long interval) are the earliest of Paul's writings-perhaps the earliest written records of Christianity. They belong to that period which Paul elsewhere styles “the beginning of the Gospel” (Php 4:15). They present the disciples in the first flush of love and devotion, yearning for the day of deliverance, and straining their eyes to catch the first glimpse of their Lord descending amidst the clouds of heaven, till in their feverish anxiety they forget the sober business of life absorbed in this one engrossing thought. It will be, remembered that a period of about five years intervenes before the second group of epistles- those to the Corinthians, Galatians, and Romans — were written, and about twice that period to the date of the epistles of the Roman captivity. It is interesting, therefore, to compare the Thessalonian epistles with the later letters and to note the points of difference. These differences are mainly fourfold.

1. In the general style of these earlier letters there is greater simplicity and less exuberance of language. The brevity of the opening salutation is an instance of this. “Paul… to the Church of the Thessalonians in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ, grace and peace to you?” (1Th 1:1; comp, 2Th 1:1). The closing benediction is correspondingly brief: “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you” (1Th 5:28; comp. 2Th 3:18). And throughout the epistles there is much more evenness of style; words are not accumulated  in the same way, the syntax is less involved, parentheses are not so frequent, the turns of thought and feeling are less sudden and abrupt, and, altogether, there is less intensity and variety than we find in Paul's later epistles.

2. The antagonism to Paul is not the same. The direction of the attack has changed in the interval between the writing of these epistles and those of the next group. Here the opposition comes from Jews. The admission of the Gentiles to the hopes and privileges of Messiah's kingdom on any condition is repulsive to them. They “forbade the apostle to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved” (1Th 2:16). A period of five years changes the aspect of the controversy. The opponents of Paul are now no longer Jews so much as Judaizing Christians (Ewald, Jahrb. 3, 249; Sendschr. p. 14). The question of the admission of the Gentiles has been solved by time, for they have “taken the kingdom of heaven by storm.” But the antagonism to the apostle of the Gentiles having been driven from its first position, entrenched itself behind a second barrier. It was now urged that though the Gentiles may be admitted to the Church of Christ, the only door of admission is the Mosaic covenant-rite of circumcision. The language of Paul speaking of the Jewish Christians in this epistle shows that the opposition to his teaching had not at this time assumed this second phase. He does not yet regard them as the disturbers of the peace of the Church, the false teachers who, by imposing a bondage of ceremonial observances, frustrate the free grace of God. He can still point to them as examples to his converts at Thessalonica (1 Thessalonians 2, 14). The change, indeed, was imminent; the signs of the gathering storm had already appeared (Gal 2:11), but hitherto they were faint and indistinct, and had scarcely darkened the horizon of the Gentile churches.

3. It will be no surprise that the doctrinal teaching of the apostle does not bear quite the same aspect in these as in the later epistles. Many of the distinctive doctrines of Christianity, which are inseparably connected with Paul's name, though implicitly contained in the teaching of these earlier letters-as indeed they follow directly from the true conception of the person of Christ-were yet not evolved and distinctly enunciated till the needs of the Church drew them out into prominence at a later date. It has often been observed, for instance, that there is in the epistles to the Thessalonians no mention of the characteristic contrast of “faith and works;” that the word “justification” does not once occur; that the idea of dying with Christ and living with Christ, so frequent in Paul's later  writings, is absent in these. It was, in fact, the opposition of Judaizing Christians insisting on a strict ritualism, which led the apostle, somewhat later, to dwell at greater length on the true doctrine of a saving faith and the true conception of a godly life; but the time had not yet come.

4. This difference appears especially in the eschatology of the apostle. In the epistles to the Thessalonians, as has been truly observed, the Gospel preached is that of the coming of Christ, rather than of the cross of Christ. There are many reasons why the subject of the second advent should occupy a larger space in the earliest stage of the apostolical teaching than afterwards. It was closely bound up with the fundamental fact of the Gospel, the resurrection of Christ, and thus it formed a natural starting- point of Christian doctrine. It afforded the true satisfaction to those Messianic hopes which had drawn the Jewish converts to the fold of Christ. It was the best consolation and support of the infant Church under persecution, which must have been most keenly felt in the first abandonment of worldly pleasures and interests. More especially, as telling of a righteous Judge who would not overlook iniquity, it was essential to that call to repentance which must everywhere precede the direct and positive teaching of the Gospel. “Now he commandeth all men everywhere to repent, for he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that Man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance unto all men in that he raised him from the dead” (Act 17:30-31).

There is no just ground, however, for the supposition that the apostle entertained precipitate expectations as to the Lord's second coming. His language is suited to every age of the Church. Where an event is certain of accomplishment, but uncertain as regards the precise time, it may be said to be always “at hand” to devout expectation; and this is the aspect which the topic in question, after all that has been written on the subject, wears in Paul's writings taken as a whole., The task of proving that he was mistaken, and therefore that the gift of inspiration was only partial, is as arduous as one would suppose it must be ungrateful.

IV. Relation to the Associated History. —A comparison of the narrative in the Acts with the allusions in this and the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians is equally instructive with the foregoing comparison. With some striking coincidences, there is just that degree of divergence which might be expected between a writer who had borne the principal part in the  scenes referred to and a narrator who derives his information from others, between the casual half-expressed allusions of a familiar letter and the direct account of the professed historian.

1. Passing over patent coincidences, we may single out one of a more subtle and delicate kind. It arises out of the form which the accusation brought against Paul and his companions at Thessalonica takes in the Acts: “All these do contrary to the decrees of Caesar, saying that there is another king, one Jesus” (Act 17:7). The allusions in the epistles to the Thessalonians enable us to understand the ground of this accusation. It appears that the kingdom of Christ had entered largely into his oral teaching in this city, as it does into that of the epistles themselves. He had charged his new converts to await the coming of the Son of God from heaven as their deliverer (1Th 1:10). He had dwelt long and earnestly (προείπαμεν καὶ διεμαρτυράμεθα) on the terrors of the judgment, which would overtake the wicked (1Th 4:6). He had even explained at length the signs, which would usher in the last day (2Th 2:5). Either from malice or in ignorance such language had been misrepresented, and he was accused of setting up a rival sovereign to the Roman emperor.

2. On the other hand, the language of these epistles diverges from the narrative of Luke on two or three points in such a way as to establish the independence of the two accounts, and even to require some explanation.

(1.) The first of these relates to the composition of the Church of Thessalonica. In the first epistle Paul addresses his readers distinctly as Gentiles, who had been converted from idolatry to the Gospel (1Th 1:9-10). In the Acts we are told that “some (of the Jews) believed… and of the devout Greeks (i.e. proselytes) a great multitude, and of the chief women not a few” (Act 17:4). If for σεβομένων ῾Ελλήνων we read σεβομένων καὶ ῾Ελλήνων, “proselytes and Greeks,” the difficulty vanishes; but though internal probabilities are somewhat in favor of this reading, the array of direct evidence (now reinforced by the Codex Sinaiticus) is against it. But even if we retain the common reading, the account of Luke does not exclude a number of believers converted directly from heathendom; indeed, if we may argue from the parallel case at Beroea (Act 17:12), the “women” were chiefly of this class; and if any divergence remains, it is not greater than might be expected in two independent writers, one of whom, not being an eye-witness, possessed  only a partial and indirect knowledge. Both accounts alike convey the impression that the Gospel made but little progress with the Jews themselves.

(2.) In the epistle the persecutors of the Thessalonian Christians are represented as their fellow-countrymen, i.e. as heathens (ὑπὸ τῶν ἰδίων συμφυλετῶν, 1Th 2:14), whereas in the Acts the Jews are regarded as the bitterest opponents of. the faith (Act 17:5). This is fairly met by Paley (Horae Paul. 9:No. 5), who points out that the Jews were the instigators of the persecution, which, however, they were powerless of themselves to carry out without aid from the heathen, as may be gathered even from the narrative of Luke. We may add, also, that the expression ἴδιοι συμφυλέται Trat need not be restricted to the heathen population, but might include many Hellenist Jews who must have been citizens of the free town of Thessalonica.

(3.) The narrative of Luke appears to state that Paul remained only three weeks at Thessalonica (Act 17:2); whereas in the epistle, though there is no direct mention of the length of his residence among them, the whole language (1Th 1:4; 1Th 2:4-11) points to a much longer period. The latter part of the assertion seems quite correct, the former needs to be modified. In the Acts it is stated simply that for three Sabbath days (three weeks) Paul taught in the synagogue. The silence of the writer does not exclude subsequent labor among the Gentile population; and, indeed, as much seems to be implied in the success of his preaching, which exasperated the Jews against him.

(4.) The notices of the movements of Silas and Timothy in the two documents do not accord at first sight. In the Acts Paul is conveyed away secretly from Beroea to escape the Jews. Arrived at Athens, he sends to Silas and Timothy, whom he had left behind at Beroea, urging them to join him as soon as possible (Act 17:14-16). It is evident from the language of Luke that the apostle expects them to join him at Athens; yet we hear nothing more of them for some time, when at length, after Paul had passed on to Corinth, and several incidents had occurred since his arrival there, we are told that Silas and Timothy came from Macedonia (Act 18:5). From the first epistle, on the other hand, we gather the following facts: Paul there tells us that they (ριεσιλχ, i.e. himself, and probably Silas), no longer able to endure the suspense, “consented to be left alone at Athens, and sent Timotheus their brother” to Thessalonica (1Th 3:1-2). Timothy returned with good news (1Th 3:6) (whether to Athens or Corinth does not appear), and when the two epistles to the Thessalonians were written, both Timothy and Silas were with Paul (1Th 1:1; 2Th 1:1; comp. 2Co 1:19). Now, though we may not be prepared, with Paley, to construct an undesigned coincidence out of these materials, yet, on the other hand, there is no insoluble difficulty; for the events may be arranged in two different ways, either of which will bring the narrative of the Acts into accordance with the allusions of the epistle.

(a.) Timothy was dispatched to Thessalonica, not from Athens, but from Beroea, a supposition quite consistent with the apostle's expression of “consenting to be left alone at Athens.” In this case Timothy would take up Silas somewhere in Macedonia on his return, and the two would join Paul in company; not, however, at Athens, where he was expecting them, but later on at Corinth, some delay having arisen. This explanation, however, supposes that the plurals “we consented, we sent” (εὐδοκήσαμεν, ἐπέμψαμεν), can refer to Paul alone.

(b.) The alternative mode of reconciling the accounts is as follows: Timothy and Silas did join the apostle at Athens, where we learn from the Acts that he was expecting them. From Athens he dispatched Timothy to Thessalonica, so that he and Silas (ἡμεῖς) had to forego the services of their fellow-laborer for a time. This mission is mentioned in the epistle, but not in the Acts. Subsequently he sends Silas on some other mission, not recorded either in the history or the epistle; probably to another Macedonian Church-Philippi, for instance, from which he is known to have received contributions about this time, and with which, therefore, he was in communication (2Co 11:9; comp. Php 4:14-16; see Koch, p. 15). Silas and Timothy returned together from Macedonia and joined the apostle at. Corinth. This latter solution, if it assumes more than the former, has the advantage that it preserves the proper sense of the plural “we consented, we sent,” for it is at least doubtful whether Paul ever uses the plural of himself alone. The silence of Luke may in this case be explained either by his possessing only a partial knowledge of the circumstances, or by his passing over incidents of which he was aware as unimportant.

Whether the expected meeting ever took place at Athens is therefore a matter involved in much uncertainty. Michaelis, Eichhorn, De Wette, Koppe. Pelt, and others are of opinion that, at least as respects Timothy, it  did take place; and they infer that Paul again remanded him to Thessalonica, and that he made a second journey along with Silas to join the apostle at Corinth. Hug, on the other hand, supposes only one journey, viz. from Thessalonica to Corinth; and understands the apostle, in 1Th 3:1-2, as intimating, not that he had sent Timothy from Athens to Thessalonica, but that he had prevented his coming to Athens by sending him from Beroea to Thessalonica. Between these two opinions there is nothing to enable us to judge with certainty, unless we attach weight to the expression of Luke, that Paul had desired the presence of Timothy and Silas in Athens ὡς τάχιστα , “as speedily as possible.” His desiring them to follow him thus, without loss of time, favors the: conclusion that they did rejoin him in Athens, and were thence sent to Thessalonica. SEE SILAS; SEE TIMOTHY.

V. Occasion of the Epistle. —We are now prepared to consider the circumstances of the Church at Thessalonica which drew forth this letter. These were as follows: Paul had twice attempted to revisit Thessalonica, and both times had been disappointed. Thus prevented from seeing them in person, he had sent Timothy to inquire and report to him as to their condition (1Th 3:1-5). Timothy returned with most favorable tidings, reporting not only their progress in Christian faith and practice, but also their strong attachment to their old teacher (1Th 3:6-10). The First Epistle to the Thessalonians is the outpouring of the apostle's gratitude on receiving this welcome news.

At the same time, the report of Timothy was not unmixed with alloy. There were certain features in the condition of the Thessalonian Church which called for Paul's interference, and to which he addresses himself in his letter.

(1.) The very intensity of their Christian faith, dwelling too exclusively on the day of the Lord's. coming, had been attended with evil consequences. On the one hand, a practical inconvenience had arisen. In their feverish expectation of this great crisis, some had been led to neglect their ordinary business, as if the daily concerns of life were. of no account in the immediate presence of so vast a change (1Th 4:11; comp. 2Th 2:1; 2Th 3:6; 2Th 3:11-12). On the other hand, a theoretical difficulty had been felt. Certain members of the Church had died, and there was great anxiety lest they should be excluded from any share in the glories  of the Lord's advent (1Th 4:13-18). Paul rebukes the irregularities of the former, and dissipates the fears of the latter.

(2.) The flame of persecution had broken out, and the Thessalonians needed consolation and encouragement under their sore trial (1Th 2:14; 1Th 3:2-4).

(3.) An unhealthy state of feeling with regard to spiritual gifts was manifesting itself. Like the Corinthians at a later day, they needed to be reminded of the superior value of “prophesying,” compared with other gifts of the Spirit, which they exalted at its expense (1Th 5:19-20).

(4.) There was the danger, which they shared in common with most Gentile churches, of relapsing into their old heathen profligacy. Against this the apostle offers a word in season (1Th 4:4-8). We need not suppose, however, that Thessalonica was worse in this respect than other Greek cities. SEE THESSALONICA.

Yet, notwithstanding all these drawbacks, the condition of the Thessalonian Church was highly satisfactory, and the most cordial relations existed between Paul and his converts there. This honorable distinction it shares with the other great Church of Macedonia, that of Philippi. At all times, and amid every change of circumstance, it is to his Macedonian churches that the apostle turns for sympathy and support. A period of nearly ten years is interposed between the First Epistle to the Thessalonians and the Epistle to the Philippians, and yet no two of his letters more closely resemble each other in this respect. In both he drop's his official title of apostle in the opening salutation, thus appealing rather to their affection than to his own authority; in both he commences the body of his letter with hearty and unqualified commendation of his converts; and in both the game spirit of confidence and warm affection breathes throughout.

VI. Contents. —The design of this epistle thus being to comfort the- Thessalonians under trial, and to encourage them to the patient and consistent profession of Christianity, the letter itself is rather practical than doctrinal. It was suggested more by personal feeling than by any urgent need, which might have formed a center of thought, and impressed a distinct character on the whole. Under these circumstances, we need not expect to trace unity of purpose, or a continuous argument, and any analysis must be more or less artificial. The body of the epistle, however,  may conveniently be divided into two parts, the former of which, extending over the first three chapters, is chiefly taken up with a retrospect of the apostle's relation to his Thessalonian converts, and an explanation of his present circumstances and feelings; while the latter, comprising the 4th and 5th chapters, contains some seasonable exhortations. At the close of each of these divisions is a prayer commencing with the same words, “May God himself,” etc., and expressed in somewhat similar language. The epistle may therefore be tabulated as follows: Salutation (1Th 1:1).

I. Narrative portion (1Th 1:2 to 1Th 3:13).

1. The apostle gratefully records their conversion to the Gospel and their progress in the faith (1Th 1:2-10).

2. He reminds them how pure and blameless his life and ministry among them had been (1Th 2:1-12).

3. He repeats his thanksgiving for their conversion, dwelling especially on the persecutions which they had endured (1Th 2:13-16).

4. He describes his own suspense and anxiety, the consequent mission of Timothy to Thessalonica, and the encouraging report which he brought back (1Th 2:17 to 1Th 3:10).

5. The apostle's prayer for the Thessalonians (1Th 3:11-13).

II. Hortatory portion (1Th 4:1 to 1Th 5:24).

1. Warning against impurity (1Th 4:1-8).

2. Exhortation to brotherly love and sobriety of conduct (1Th 4:9-12). —

3. Touching the advent of the Lord (1Th 4:13 to 1Th 5:11).

a. The dead shall have their place in the resurrection (1Th 4:13-18).

b. The time, however, is uncertain (1Th 5:1-3).

c. Therefore all must be watchful (1Th 5:4-11).

4. Exhortation to orderly living and the due performance of social duties (1Th 5:12-15).

5. Injunctions relating to prayer and spiritual matters generally (1Th 5:16-22).

6. The apostle's prayer for the Thessalonians (1Th 5:23-24).

The epistle closes with personal injunctions and a benediction (1Th 5:25-28).

VII. Commentaries. —The following are the special exegetical helps on both the epistles to the Thessalonians exclusively; to the most important of them we prefix an asterisk: Willich, Commentarius (Argent. 1545; Basil. 1546, 8vo); Weller, Commentarius [includ. Philippians] (Norib. 1561, 8vo); Major, Enarratio (Vitemb. 1563, 8vo-); Musculus, Commentarius [includ. other ep.] (Basil. 1564, 1578, 1595, fol.); Aretius, Commentarius [includ. Philippians and Colossians] (Morg. 1580, 8vo); \*Jewell, Exposition (Lond. 1583, 12mo; 1811, 8vo; also in Latin, and in Works); Zanchius, Comnmentarius [includ. Philippians and Colossians] (Neost. 1595, fol.; also in Opp.); \*Rollock, Commentarius (Edinb. 1598; Herb. 1601, 8vo); also Lectures (Edinb. 1606, 4to); Hunnius, Expositio (Francof. 1603, 8vo); Steuart [Romans Cath.], Commentarius (Ingolst. 1609, 4to); Crell [Socin.], Commentarius [from Peter Mocov's notes] (Racov. 1636, 8vo; also in Opp.); Ferguson, Exposition (Lond. 1674, 8vo); Schmid, Paraphrasis [includ. other ep.] (Hamb. 1691,1696,1704,4to); Landresen,: Erklarung (Frankf. 1707, 4t.); Streso, Meditatien (Amst. 1710, 8vo); Turretin, Commentarius (Basil. 1739, 8vo; also in Opp.); Chandler, Notes [includ. Galatians] (Lond. 1777, 4to); Krause, Erklurung [includ. Philippians] (Frankf. 1790); Schleiermacher, Notae (Berol. 1823,8vo); \*Pelt, Commentarius (Gryph. 1830, 8vo); Schott, Commentarius (Lips. 1834, 8vo); Tafel, Historia Thessalonicensium (Tub. 1835, 8vo); Sumner, Lectures (Lond. 1850, 2 vols. 12mo); Lillie, Version (N. Y. 1856, 4to); also Lectures (ibid. 1870, 8vo); \*Ellicott, Commentary (Lond. 1858, 1862, 1866, 8vo); Edmunds, Commentary (ibid. 1858,-8vo); Headland, Notes (ibid. 1866, 8vo); \*Eadie, Commentary (ibid. 1877, 8vo). SEE EPISTLE.

On the first epistle alone there are the following: Sclater, Exposition (Lond. 1629, 4to); Martin, Analysis (Greening. 1669, 12mo); Van Alphen, Verklaering (Utrecht, 1741, 4to); Phillips, Explanation (Lond. 1751, 4to);  Burgerhoudt, De Argumento, etc. (L. B. 1825, Svo); Koch, Commentar (Berl. 1848,1855, 8vo); Paterson, Commentary [includ. James and 1 John] (Edinb. 1857, 8vo). SEE COMMENTARY.

## Thessalonians, Second Epistle To The[[@Headword:Thessalonians, Second Epistle To The]]

             follows immediately after the first in all the texts and versions of the New Test.

I. Author. —

1. The external evidence in favor of the second epistle is somewhat more definite than that which can be brought in favor of the first. It seems to be referred to in one or two passages of Polycarp (3, 15, in Polyc. c. 11, and possibly 1, 4 in the same chapter; comp. Polyc. c. 3, and see Lardner, 2, 6); and the language in which Justin Martyr (Dial. p. 336 D) speaks of the Man of Sin is so similar that it can scarcely be independent of this epistle. With Irenseus the direct testimony commences (Adv. Hcer. 3, 7, 2): “And again in the second epistle to the Thessalonians, speaking concerning Antichrist, ‘And then shall the ungodly one be revealed, whom the Lord Jesus Christ shall slay with the breath of his mouth,'” etc. (comp. 2Th 2:8). Clemens Alexandrinus (Strom. 5, 554): “The apostle says, ‘Pray that we may be delivered from perverse and wicked men, for all have not faith” (comp. 2Th 3:2). Tertullian (De Res. Carnis, 24:339): “And in the second epistle to the same,” viz. the Thessalonians, “with greater earnestness he says, ‘I beseech you, brethren, by the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, etc., that ye be not soon moved in your mind, nor shaken, neither by spirit nor by word,'” etc. (comp. 2Th 2:2-3).

The second epistle, like the first, is found in the canons of the Syriac and Old Latin versions, and in those of the-Muratorian fragment and of the heretic Marcion, and was universally received by the Church.

2. The internal character of the epistle, as in the former case, bears the strongest testimony to its Pauline origin (see Jowett, 1, 143). “The genuineness of this epistle, remarks Eichhorn, “follows from its contents. Its design is to correct the erroneous use which had been made of some things in the first epistle; and who but the writer of that first epistle would have set himself thus to such a task? It, however, appears that the author of the first must also be the author of the second; and, as the former is the  production of Paul, we must ascribe the latter also to him. It was essential to the apostle's reputation that the erroneous consequences which had been deduced from his words should be refuted. Had he refrained from noticing the expectation built upon his words of the speedy return of Christ, his silence would have confirmed the conclusion that this was one of his peculiar doctrines; as such it would have passed to the succeeding generation; and when they perceived that in this Paul had been mistaken, what confidence could they have had in other parts of his teaching? The weight of this as an evidence of the genuineness of this Second Epistle to the Thessalonians acquires new strength from the fact that of all the other expressions in the epistle not one is opposed to any point either in the history or the doctrine of the apostle” (Einleit. ins N.T. 3, 69).

3. Notwithstanding these evidences in its favor, the genuineness of this epistle has been called into doubt by the restless scepticism of some of the German critics. The way here was led by John Ernest Chr. Schmidt, who, in 1801, published in his Bibliothek für Kritik und Exegese a tract entitled Vermuthungen über die beiden Briefe an die Thessalonier, in which he impugned the genuineness of the first twelve verses of the second chapter. He afterwards, in his Einleitung, p. 256, enlarged his objections and applied them to the whole epistle. He has been followed by Schrader (Apostel Paulus), Kern (Tiibing. Zeitschrif. Theol. 1839, 2, 145), and Baur (Paulus der Apostel). De Wette at first condemned this epistle, but afterwards withdrew his condemnation and frankly accepted it as genuine. His cavils are more than usually frivolous,-and have been most fully replied to by Guericke (Beitrdge zur hist. —krit. Einleit. ins N.T. [Halle, 1828], p. 92-99), by Reiche (Authentiae Post. ad Thessalon. Epist. Vindiciae [Gött. 1829], and by Pelt, in the Prolegomena to his Commentary on the Epistles to the Thessalonians (p. 27). See also Grimm, in the Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1850, p. 753 sq.; Lipsius, ibid. 1854, p. 905 sq.; Hilgenfeld, in his Zeitschr.f. wiss. Theol. 1862, p. 225 sq. It will thus be seen that this epistle has been rejected by some modern critics who acknowledge the first to be genuine. Such critics, of course, attribute no weight to arguments brought against the first, such as we have considered already. The Apocalyptic passage (2Th 2:1-12) is the great stumbling-block to them. It has been objected to either as alluding to events subsequent to Paul's death — the Neronian persecution, for instance-or ‘as betraying religious views derived from the Montanism of the 2nd century, or, lastly, as contradicting Paul's anticipations expressed elsewhere, especially in the  first epistle, of the near approach of the Lord's advent. That there is no reference to Nero we shall endeavor to show presently. That the doctrine of an Antichrist did not start into being with Montanism is shown from the allusions of Jewish writers even before the Christian era (see Bertholdt, Christ. p. 69; Gfrorer, Jahrh. des Heils, 2, 257); and appears still more clearly from the passage of Justin Martyr referred to in the paragraph above. That the language used of the Lord's coming in the second epistle does not contradict, but rather supplement, the teaching of the first- postponing the day, indeed, but still anticipating its approach as possibly within the apostle's lifetime-may be gathered both from expressions in the passage itself (e.g. 2Th 2:7,” is already working”) and from other parts of the epistle (1Th 1:7-8), especially those which speak of the “signs” of the coming. Other special objections to the epistle will scarcely command a hearing, and must necessarily be passed over here.

II. Date. —There is the strongest reason for believing that this second epistle was written very soon after the first, and at the same place, viz. Corinth, A.D. cir. 50. The circumstances of the apostle while writing the one seem very much the same as they were while writing the other; nor do those of the Thessalonians present any greater difference than such as the influences referred to in the second epistle may be supposed in a very short time to have produced. What seems almost to decide the question is that, while writing the second epistle, the apostle had Timothy and Silas still with him. Now, after he left Corinth, it was not for a long time that either of these individuals was found again in his company (Act 18:18; comp. 19:22); and with regard to one of them, Silas, there is no evidence that he and Paul were ever together at any subsequent period.

It will be seen presently that the teaching of the second epistle is corrective of, or rather supplemental to, that of the first, and therefore presupposes it. Moreover, the first epistle bears on its face evidence that it is the first gush of his affectionate yearnings towards his converts after his departure from Thessalonica; while, on the other hand, the second epistle contains a direct allusion to a previous letter, which may suitably be referred to the first-” Hold fast the tradition which ye were taught either by word or by letter from us” (2Th 2:15). We can scarcely be wrong, therefore, in maintaining the received order of the two epistles. It is due, however, to the great names of Grotius and of Ewald (Jahrb. 3, 250; Sendschr. p. 16), who are followed in this by Baur, Hilgenfeld. Laurent, and Davidson, to  mention that they reverse the order, placing the second epistle before the first in point of time--on different grounds, indeed, but both equally insufficient to disturb the traditional order, supported as it is by the considerations already alleged.

III. Occasion and Design. —In the former letter we saw chiefly the outpouring of strong personal affection occasioned by the renewal of the apostle's intercourse with the Thessalonians, and the doctrinal and hortatory portions are there subordinate. In the second epistle, on the other hand, his leading motive seems to have been the desire of correcting errors in the Church of Thessalonica. We notice two points especially which call forth his rebuke.

1. It seems that the anxious expectation of the Lord's advent, instead of subsiding, had gained ground since the writing of the first epistle. They now looked upon this great crisis as imminent, and their daily vocations were neglected in consequence. There were expressions in the first epistle which, taken by themselves, might seem to favor this view; and, at all events, such was falsely represented to be the apostle's doctrine. This notion some inculcated as a truth specially confirmed to them by the Spirit; others advocated it as part of the apostolic doctrine; and some claimed for it the specific support of Paul in a letter (2Th 2:2). Whether the letter here referred to is the apostle's former epistle to the Thessalonians or one forged in his name by some keen and unscrupulous advocates of the notion above referred to is uncertain. The latter opinion has been very generally adopted from the time of Chrysostom downwards, and is certainly somewhat countenanced by the apostle's statement in the close of the epistle as to his autograph salutation being the mark of a genuine letter from him (2Th 3:17). At the same time, it must be admitted that the probability of such a thing being done by any one at Thessalonica is, under all the circumstances of the case, not very strong. He now writes to soothe this restless spirit and quell their apprehensions by showing that many things must happen first, and that the end was not yet, referring to his oral teaching at Thessalonica in confirmation of this statement (2Th 2:1-12; 2Th 3:6-12).

2. The apostle had also a personal ground of complaint. His authority was not denied by any, but it was tampered with, and an unauthorized use was made of his name. It is difficult to ascertain the exact circumstances of the case from casual and indirect allusions, and indeed we may perhaps infer  from the vagueness of the apostle's own language that he himself was not in possession of definite information; but, at all events, his suspicions were aroused. Designing men might misrepresent his teaching in two ways, either by suppressing what he actually had written or said, or by forging letters and in other ways representing him as teaching what he had not taught. Paul's language hints in different places at both these modes of false dealing. He seems to have entertained suspicions of this dishonesty even when he wrote the first epistle. At the close of that epistle he binds the Thessalonians by a solemn oath, “in the name of the Lord,” to see that the epistle is read “to all the holy brethren” (1Th 5:27) a charge unintelligible in itself, and only to be explained by supposing some misgivings in the apostle's mind. Before the second epistle was written his suspicions seem to have been confirmed, for there are two passages which allude to these misrepresentations of his teaching... In the first of these he tells them in vague language, which may refer equally well to a false interpretation put upon his own words in the first epistle, or to a supplemental letter forged in his name, “not to be troubled either by spirit or by word or by letter, as coming from us as if the day of the Lord were at hand. They are not to be deceived,” he adds, “by any one, whatever means he employs” (κατὰ μηδένα τρόπον, 1Th 2:2-3). In the second passage, at the close of the epistle, he says, “The salutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is a token in every epistle: so I write” (2Th 3:17) evidently a precaution against forgery. With these two passages should be combined the expression in 2Th 3:14, from which we infer that he now entertained a fear of direct opposition “If any man obey not our word conveyed by our epistle, note that man.”

IV. Eschatology. —The most striking feature in the epistle is the apocalyptic passage, announcing the revelation of the Man of Sin (2Th 2:1-12); and it will not be irrelevant to investigate its meaning, bearing, as it does, on the circumstances under which the epistle was written, and illustrating this aspect of the apostle's teaching. He had dwelt much on the subject; for he appeals to the Thessalonians as knowing this truth, and reminds them that he told them these things when he was yet with them. The following considerations may help to clear up this obscure subject.

1. The passage speaks of a great apostasy which is to usher in the advent of Christ, the great judgment. There are three prominent figures in the picture — Christ, Antichrist, and the Restrainer. Antichrist is described as  the Man of Sin, the Son of Perdition, as the Adversary who exalteth himself above all that is called God, as making himself out to be God. Later on (for apparently the reference is the same) he is styled the “mystery of lawlessness,” “the lawless one.” The Restrainer is in one place spoken of in the masculine as a person (ὁ κατέχων), in another in the neuter as a power, an influence (τὸ κατέχον). The “mystery of lawlessness” is already at work. At present it is checked by the Restrainer; but the check will be removed, and then it will break out in all its violence. Then Christ will appear, and the enemy shall be consumed by the breath of his mouth, shall be brought to naught by the splendor of his presence.

2. Many different explanations have been offered of this passage. Each generation and each section in the Church has regarded it as a prophecy of that particular power which seemed to them and in their own time to be most fraught with evil to the true faith. A good account of these manifold interpretations will be found in Linemann's commentary on the epistle, p. 204, Schlussbem. zu 2, 1-12 (see also Alford, Proleg.). By one class of interpreters it has been referred to circumstances which passed within the circle of the apostle's own experience, the events of his own lifetime, or the period immediately following. Others, again, have seen in it the prediction of a crisis yet to be realized, the end of all things. The former of these, the Praeterists, have identified the Man of Sin with divers historical characters, and have sought for a historical counterpart to the Restrainer in like manner. Among them may be mentioned Grotius, Wettstein, Whitby, Schöttgen, Nosselt, Krause, and Kern. Agreeing, however, in the main point of a past accomplishment, these writers differ widely from each other in the details of interpretation. The Man of Sin was, according to Grotius, Caligula; according to Wettstein, Titus; according to Hammond, Simon Magus; by many (Whitby, Le Clerc, etc.) the Jewish people are thought to have been thus indicated in their opposition to Christianity and to the Roman power (τὸ κατέχον). Commentators of this class are, of course, compelled to consider the coming of Christ as already past, i.e. to interpret it of the destruction of Jerusalem; and this alone seems to render the view untenable. For Paul's description of the parousia, or appearance, of Christ (1Th 2:19) is far too exalted to correspond to any temporal event. The latter class of interpreters, the Futurists, have also given various accounts of the Antichrist, the mysterious power of evil which is already working. We hold, in general terms, that this view is substantially right, i.e. that the prophecy, however it may have been partially fulfilled in the past,  yet awaits its complete fulfillment. But among the advocates of the Futurist opinion also differences of opinion prevail. To the Greek Church the Man of Sin was Mohammed, and the “mystery of iniquity” is Mohammedanism, which, it is held, will yet culminate in some fearfully Antichristian form. From the middle of the 11th century the pope began to be considered the predicted Antichrist, and this view, as might have been expected, became the prevalent one in all the Protestant churches.

By way of retaliation, Romanists maintained that Luther and Protestantism are pointed at in the passage. This seems to show the danger of limiting the prophecy to any one form of Antichristian error. John writes that even in his time there were many antichrists” (1Jn 2:18); the one he specifies as denying that “Jesus Christ had come in the flesh” is descriptive neither of Mohammed nor of the pope nor of Luther, but of the Gnostics. Many of the features of Antichrist as portrayed by Paul no doubt present themselves in the papacy, but others hardly so. At any rate, the papacy, so far as it contains elements of impiety, seems to have reached its culminating point; perhaps did so three hundred years ago, and yet Christ has not come. We are disposed, therefore, to adopt the view that there have been, since the prophecy was written, many partial manifestations of Antichristian error the Gnostics, the Judaizing tendencies of the 1st century, Mohammed, the papacy, the French Revolution, etc.; but that there still is in prospect some mystery of iniquity which will combine in itself the several evil tendencies which the Church has already witnessed, but in a greatly intensified form; and probably that this final outburst of impiety will be embodied in a personal head or representative, the Man of Sin of our epistle. His appearance will be the signal for the second advent of Christ. As regards the Restrainer (ὁ κα τέχων, τὸ κατέχον), the view of the fathers does not seem far wrong— viz. that Paul obscurely alludes to the temporal power (in his and their day the Roman empire), by which the excesses of lawless licentiousness are, to some extent, held in check. Hence, in Paul's view, the mission of the State as such was a divine one (Romans 13). SEE ANTICHRIST.

3. More particularly, therefore, in arbitrating between the Praeterists and the Futurists, we are led by the analogy of other prophetic announcements, as well as by the language of the passage itself, to take a middle course. Neither is wholly right, and yet both are, to a certain extent, right. It is the special characteristic of prophecy to speak of the distant future through the present and immediate. The persons and events falling within the horizon  of the prophet's own view are the types and ‘representatives of greater figures and crises far off, and as yet but dimly discerned. Thus the older prophets, while speaking of a delivery from the temporary oppression of Egypt or Babylon, spoke also of Messiah's kingdom. Thus our Lord himself, foretelling the doom, which was even then hanging over the holy city, glances at the future judgment of the world as typified and portrayed in this; and the two are so interwoven that it is impossible to disentangle them. SEE DOUBLE SENSE.

Following this analogy, we may agree with the Praeterists that Paul is referring to events which fell under his own cognizance; for indeed the Restrainer is said to be restraining now, and the mystery of iniquity to be already working; while, at the same time, we may accept the Futurist view, that the apostle is describing the end of all things, and that therefore the prophecy has not yet received its most striking and complete fulfillment. This commingling of the immediate and partial with the final and universal manifestation of God's judgments, characteristic of all prophecy, is rendered more easy in Paul's case, because he seems to have contemplated the end of all things as possibly, or even probably, near at hand; and therefore the: particular manifestation of Antichrist, which he witnessed with his own eyes, would naturally be merged in and identified with the final Antichrist, in which the opposition to the Gospel will culminate. SEE ESCHATOLOGY.

4. If this view be correct, it remains to inquire what particular adversary of the Gospel, and what particular restraining influence, Paul may have had primarily in view. But, before attempting to approximate to an explanation; we may clear the way by laying down two rules.

(1.) The imagery of the passage must be interpreted mainly by itself, and by the circumstances of the time. The symbols may be borrowed in some cases from the Old Test.; they may reappear in other parts of the New. But we cannot be sure that the same image denotes exactly the same thing in both cases. The language describing the Man of Sin is borrowed, to some extent, from the representation of Antiochus Epiphanes in the Book of Daniel, but Antiochlus cannot be meant here. The great adversary in the Revelation seems to be the Roman power, but it may be widely different here. There were even in the apostolic age “many antichrists;” and we cannot be sure that the Antichrist present to the mind of Paul was the same with the Antichrist contemplated by John.

(2.) In all figurative passages it is arbitrary to assume that a person is denoted where we find a personification. Thus the Man of Sin here need not be an individual man; it may be a body of men, or a power, a spiritual influence. In the case of the Restrainer we seem to have positive ground for: so interpreting it, since in one passage the neuter gender is used, “the thing which restraineth” (τὸ κατέχον), as if synonymous. (See Jowett, Essay on the Man of Sin, 1, 178, rather for suggestions as to the mode of interpretation than for the conclusion he arrives at; also Cowles, in the Biblioth. Sacra, 29:623.) SEE MAN OF SIN.

5. When we inquire definitely, then, what Paul had immediately in view when he spoke of the Man of Sin and the Restrainer, we can only hope to get even an approximate answer by investigating the circumstances of the apostle's life at this epoch. Now we find that the chief opposition to the Gospel, and especially to Paul's preaching at this time, arose from the Jews. The Jews had conspired against the apostle and his companions at Thessalonica, and he only saved himself by secret flight. Thence they followed him to Beroea, which he hurriedly left in the same way. At Corinth, whence the letters to the Thessalonians were written, they persecuted him still further, raising a cry of treason against him, and bringing him before the Roman proconsul. These incidents explain the strong expressions he uses of them in these epistles: “They slew the Lord Jesus and the prophets, and persecuted the apostles; they are hateful to God; they are the common enemies of mankind, whom the Divine wrath (ἡ ὀργή) at length overtakes” (1Th 2:15-16). With these facts in view, it seems, on the whole, probable that the Antichrist, in its primary aspect, is represented especially by Judaism. With a prophetic insight the apostle foresaw, as he contemplated the moral and political condition of the race, the approach of a great and overwhelming catastrophe. And it is not improbable that our Lord's predictions of the vengeance which threatened Jerusalem blended with the apostle's vision, and gave as color to this passage. If it seem strange that “lawlessness” should be mentioned as the distinguishing feature of those whose very zeal for “the law” stimulated their opposition to the Gospel, we may appeal to our Lord's own words (Mat 23:28) describing the Jewish teachers, “within they are full of hypocrisy and lawlessness (ἀνομίας).”

Corresponding to this view of the Antichrist, we shall probably be correct, as already suggested, in regarding the Roman empire as the restraining power, for so it was taken by many of the fathers, though without altogether  understanding its bearing. It was to Roman justice and Roman magistrates that the apostle had recourse at this time to shield him from the enmity of the Jews, and to check their violence. At Philippi, his Roman citizenship extorted an ample apology for ill-treatment. At Thessalonica, Roman law secured him fair play. At Corinth, a Roman proconsul acquitted him of frivolous charges brought by the Jews. It was only at a later date under Nero that Rome became the antagonist of Christendom, and then she also, in turn, was fitly portrayed by John as the type of Antichrist. Whether the Jewish opposition to the Gospel entirely exhausted Paul's own conception of the “mystery of lawlessness” as he saw it “already working” in his own day, or whether other elements did not also combine with this to complete the idea, it is impossible to say; but we may presume that he had at least a dim and general anticipation of the more distant future, and at least of the final earthly catastrophe which the Divine Spirit intimates in this striking prediction. Moreover, at this distance of time and with our imperfect information, we cannot hope to explain the exact bearing of all the details in the picture. But, following the guidance of history, we seem justified in adopting this as a probable, though only a partial, explanation of a very difficult passage. SEE REVELATION, BOOK OF.

V. Contents. —This epistle, in the range of subject as well as in style and general character, closely resembles the first; and the remarks made on that epistle apply, for the most part, equally well to this. The structure, also, is somewhat similar, the main body of the epistle being divided into two parts in the same way, and each part closing with a prayer (2Th 2:16-17; 2Th 3:16; both commencing with αὐτὸς δὲ κύριος). The following is a tabular summary:

The opening salutation (2Th 1:1-2).

I. A general expression of thankfulness and interest, leading up to the difficulty about the Lord's advent (2Th 1:3 to 2Th 2:17).

1. The apostle pours forth his thanksgiving for their progress in the faith; he encourages them to be patient under persecution, reminding them of the judgment to come, and prays that they may be prepared to meet it (2Th 1:3-12).

2. He is thus led to correct the erroneous idea that the judgment is imminent, pointing out that much must happen first (2Th 2:1-12).

3. He repeats his thanksgiving and exhortation, and concludes this portion with a prayer (2Th 2:13-17).

II. Direct exhortation (2Th 3:1-16).

1. He urges them to pray for him, and confidently anticipates their progress in the faith (2Th 3:1-5).

2. He reproves the idle, disorderly, and disobedient, and charges the faithful to withdraw from such (2Th 3:6-15).

This portion again closes with a prayer (2Th 3:16). The epistle ends with a special direction and benediction (2Th 3:17-18).

VI. Commentaries. —The following exegetical helps are on the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians exclusively: Hoffmann, Commentarius [includ. Titus] (Francof. 1545, 8vo); Bradshaw,: Exposition (Lond. 1620, 4to); Jackson, Exposition (ibid. 1621, 4to); Reiche, Authentiae, etc. (Gött. 1829, 4to); Sclater, Exposition (Lond. 1629, 4to). SEE EPISTLE.

## Thessalonica[[@Headword:Thessalonica]]

             (θεσσαλονίκη, in classical writers also θεσσαλονικεία and θετταλονίκη), a large and important town of Macedonia, visited by Paul on several occasions, and the seat of a Church to which two of his letters were addressed. (For fuller details we refer to Smith's Dict. of Greek and Roman Geography, s.v.)

I. Name. —Two legendary names which Thessalonica is said to have borne in early times are Emathia (Zonar. -Hist. 12:26) and Halia (Steph. B. s.v.), the latter probably having reference to the maritime position of the town. During the first period of its authentic history, it was known under the name of Therma (θέρ μα, Esch.; θέρμη, Herod.,Thucyd.; θέρ μαι, Malelas, Chronog. p. 190, ed. Bonn), 1 derived, in common with the designation of the gulf (Thermaicus Sinus), from the hot salt-springs which are found on various parts of this coast, and one of which especially is described by Pococke as being at a distance of four English miles from the modern city (see Scylax, p. 278, ed. Gail). Three stories are told of the origin of the name Thessalonica. The first (and by far the most probable) is  given by Strabo (7, Epit. 10), who says that Therma was rebuilt by Cassander, and called after his wife Thessalonica, the daughter of Philip; the second is found in Steph. B. (s.v.), who says that its new name was a memorial of a victory obtained by Philip over the Thessalians (see Const. Porphyrog. De Them. 2, 51. ed. Bonn); the third is in the Etym. Magn. (s.v.), where it is stated that Philip himself gave the name in honor of his daughter. Whichever of these stories is true, the new name of Thessalonica, and the new eminence connected with the name, are distinctly associated with the Macedonian period, and not at all with the earlier passages of true Greek history. The name thus given became permanent. Through the Roman and Byzantine periods it remained unaltered. In the Middle Ages the Italians gave it the form of Salonichi or Saloniki, which is still frequent. In Latin chronicles we find Salonicia. In German poems of the 13th century the name appears, With a Teutonic termination, as Salnek. The uneducated Greeks of the present day call the place, Σαλο νίκη, the Turks Selanik.

II. Situation. —This is well described by Pliny (4, 10) as “medio flexu litoris [sinus Thermaici].” The gulf extends about thirty leagues in a north- westerly direction from the group of the Thessalian islands, and then turns to the north-east, forming a noble basin between Capes Vardar and Karaburnu. On the edge of this basin is the city, partly on the level shore and partly on the slope of a hill, in 40° 38'47” N. lat., and 22° 57'22” E. long. The present appearance of the city, as seen from the sea, is described by Leake, Holland, and other travelers as very imposing. It rises in the form of a crescent up the declivity, and is surrounded by lofty whitened walls with towers at intervals. On the east and west sides of the city ravines ascend from the shore and converge towards the highest point, on which is the citadel called ῾Επταπύργιον, like that of Constantinople. The port is still convenient for large ships, and the anchorage in front of the town is good. These circumstances in the situation of Thessalonica were evidently favorable for commanding the trade of the Macedonian sea. Its relations to the inland districts were equally advantageous, With one of the two great levels of Macedonia, viz. the plain of the “wide-flowing Axius” (Homer, II. 2, 849), to the north of the range of Olympus, it was immediately connected. With the other, the plain of the Strymon and Lake Cercinitis, it communicated by a pass across the neck of the Chalcidic peninsula. Its distance from Pella, as given by the Itineraries, is twenty-seven miles,: and from Amphipolis (with intermediate stations; see Act 17:1) sixty-seven  miles. It is still the chief center of the trade of the district. It contains a population of 60,000 or 70,000, and (though Adrianople may possibly be larger) it is the most important town of European Turkey next after Constantinople.

III. Political and Military History. —Thessalonica was a place of some importance even while it bore its earlier name of Therma. Three passages of chief interest may be mentioned in this period of its history. Xerxes rested here on his march, his land-forces being encamped on the plain between Therma and the Axius, and his ships cruising about the Thermaic gulf; and it was the view from hence of Olympus and Ossa which tempted him to explore the course of the Peneus (Herod. 7:128 sq.). A short time (B.C. 421) before the breaking out of the Peloponnesian war, Therma was occupied by the Athenians (Thucyd. 1, 61); but two years later it was given up to Perdiccas (ibid. 2, 29). The third mention of Therma is in Eschines (De Fals. Leg. p. 31, ed. Bekk.), where it is spoken of as one of the places taken by Pausanias.

The true history of Thessalonica begins, as we have implied above, with the decay of Greek nationality. The earliest author who mentions it under its new name is Polybius. It seems probable that it was rebuilt in the same year (B.C. 315) with Cassandrea, immediately after the fall of Pydna and the death of Olympias. We are told by Strabo. (loc.cit.) that Cassander incorporated in his new city the population not only of Therma, but likewise of three smaller towns, viz. Anea and Cissus (which are supposed to have been on the eastern side of the gulf) and Chalastra (which is said by Strabo [7, Epit. 9] to have been on the farther side of the Axius, whence Tafel [p. 22], by some mistake, infers that it lay between the Axius and Therma). It does not appear that these earlier cities were absolutely destroyed; nor, indeed, is it certain that Therma lost its separate existence. Pliny (loc. cit.) seems to imply that a place bearing this name was near Thessalonica; but the text is probably corrupt.

As we approach the Roman period, Thessalonica begins to be more and more mentioned. From Livy (44, 10) this city would appear to have been the great Macedonian naval station. It surrendered to the Romans after the battle of Pydna (ibid. 44, 45), and was made the capital of the second of the four divisions of Macedonia (ibid. 45, 29). Afterwards, when the whole of Macedonia was reduced to one province (Flor. 2, 14), Thessalonica was its most important city, and virtually its metropolis, though not so called till  a later period. SEE MACEDONIA. Cicero, during his exile, found a refuge here in the quaestor's house (Pro Planc. 41); and on his journeys to and from his province of Cilicia he passed this way, and wrote here several of his extant letters. During the first civil war Thessalonica was the headquarters of the Pompeian party and the Senate (Dion Cass. 41, 20). During the second it took the side of Octavius and Antonius (Plutarch, Brut. 46; Appian, B. C. 4:118), and reaped the advantage of this course by being made a free city (see Pliny, loc. cit.). It is possible that the word ἐλευθερίας, with the head of Octavia, on some of the coins of Thessalonica, has reference to this circumstance (see Eckhel, 2, 79); and some writers see in the Vardar gate, mentioned below, a monument of the victory over Brutus and Cassius.

Even before the close of the Republic, Thessalonica was a city of great importance, in consequence of its position on the line of communication between Rome and the Earst. Cicero speaks of it as “posita in gremio imperil nostri.” It increased in size and rose in importance with the consolidation of the Empire. Strabo, in the 1st century, and Lucian.'in the 2nd, speak in strong language of the amount of its population. The supreme magistrates (apparently six in number) who ruled in Thessalonica as a free city of the Empire were entitled πολιτάρχαι, as we learn from the remarkable coincidence of Luke's language (Act 17:6) with an inscription on the Vardar gate (Bockh, 1967.'Belley mentions another inscription containing the same term). In Act 17:5 the δῆμος is mentioned, which formed part of the constitution of the city. Tafel thinks that it had a βουλή also.

During the first three centuries of the Christian sera Thessalonica was the capital of the whole country between the Adriatic and the Black Sea; and even after the founding of Constantinople it remained practically the metropolis of Greece, Macedonia, and Illyricum. In the middle of the 3rd century, as we learn from coins, it was made a Roman colonia; perhaps with the view of strengthening this position against the barbarian invasions, which now became threatening. Thessalonica was-the great safeguard of the Empire during the first shock of the Gothic inroads. Constantine passed some time here after his victory over the Samarians; and perhaps the second arch, which is mentioned below, was a commemoration of this victory. He is said also, by Zosimus (2, 86, ed. Bonn), to have constructed  the port, by which we are, no doubt, to understand that he repaired and improved it after a time of comparative neglect. Passing by the dreadful massacre by Theodosius (Gibbon, Rome, ch. 27), we come to the Slavonic wars, of which the Gothic wars were only the prelude, and the brunt of which was successfully borne by Thessalonica from the middle of the 6th century to the latter part of the 8th. The history of these six Slavonic wars, and their relation to Thessalonica, has been elaborated with great care by Tafel.

In the course of the Middle Ages, Thessalonica was three times taken; and its history during this period is thus conveniently divided into three stages. On Sunday, July 29, 904, the Saracen fleet appeared before the city, which was stormed after a few days fighting. The slaughter of the citizens was dreadful, and vast numbers were sold in the various slave-markets of the Levant. The story of these events is told by Jo. Cameniata, who was crosier-bearer to the archbishop of Thessalonica. From his narrative it has been inferred that the population of the city at that time must have been 220,000 (De Excidio Thessalonicensi, in the volume entitled Theophanes Continuatus of the Bonn ed. of the Byzantine writers [1838]). The next great catastrophe of Thessalonica was caused by a different enemy-the Normans of Sicily, The fleet of Tancred sailed round the Morea to the Thermaic gulf, while an army marched by the Via Egnatia from Dyrrhachium. Thessalonica was taken on Aug. 15, 1185, and the Greeks were barbarously treated by the Latins, whose cruelties are de scribed by Nicetas Choniates (De Andron. Commeno, p. 4388, ed. Bonn, 1835). The celebrated Eustathius was archbishop of Thessalonica at this time; and he wrote an account of this capture of the city, which was first published by Tafel (Tub. 1832), and is now printed in the Bonn ed. of the Byzantine writers (De Thessalonica a Latinis Capta, in the same vol. with Leo Grammaticus [1842]). Soon after this period follows the curious history of Western feudalism in Thessalonica under Boniface, marquis of Montferrat, and his successors, during the first half of the 13th century. The city was again under Latin dominion (having been sold by the Greek emperor to the Venetians), when it was finally Ataken by the Turks under Amurath II, in 1430. This event also is described by a writer in the Bonn Byzantine series (Joannes Anagnostes, De Thessalonicensi Exidio NVarratio, in the same vol. with Phranzes and Cananus [1838]).

For the mediaeval history of Thessalonica see Mr. Finlay's works, Mediaeval Greece (1851), p. 70, 71,135147; Byzantine and Greek  Empires (1853), 1, 315-332; (1854), 2, 182, 264-266, 607. For its modern condition we must refer to the travelers, especially Beaujour, Cousindry, Holland, and Leake.

IV. Ecclesiastical History. —The annals of Thessalonica are so closely connected with religion that it is desirable to review them in this aspect. After Alexander's death the Jews spread rapidly in all the large cities of the provinces which had formed his empire. Hence there is no doubt that, in the 1st century of the Christian era, they were settled in considerable numbers at Thessalonica; indeed, this circumstance contributed to the first establishment of Christianity there by Paul (Act 17:1). It seems probable that a large community of Jews has been found in this city ever since. They are mentioned in the 7th century, during the Slavonic wars; and again in the 12th, by Eustathis and Benjamin of Tudela. The events of the 15th century had the effect of bringing a large number of Spanish Jews to Thessalonica. Paul Lucas says that in his day there were 30,000 of this nation here, with 22 synagogues. More recent authorities vary between 10,000 and 20,000. The present Jewish quarter is in the south-east part of the town.

Christianity, once established in Thessalonica, spread from it in various directions, in consequence of the mercantile relations of the city (1 Thessalonians 1, 8). During the succeeding centuries this city was the bulwark, not simply of the Byzantine empire, but of Oriental Christendom; and was largely instrumental in the conversion of the Slavonians and Bulgarians. Thus it received the designation of “The Orthodox City.” It is true that the legends of Demetrius, its patron saint (a martyr of the early part of the 4th century), disfigure the Christian history of Thessalonica; in every siege success or failure seems to have been attributed to the granting or withholding of his favor: but still this see has a distinguished place in the annals of the Church. Theodosius was baptized by its bishop; even his massacre, in consequence of the stern severity of Ambrose, is chiefly connected in our minds with ecclesiastical associations. The see of Thessalonica became almost a patriarchate after this time; and the withdrawal of the provinces subject to its jurisdiction from connection with the see of Rome, in the reign of Leo Isauricus, became one of the principal causes of the separation of East and West. Cameniata, the native historian of the calamity of 904, was, as we have seen, an ecclesiastic. Eustathius, who was archbishop in 1185, was, beyond dispute, the most learned man of his age, and the author of an invaluable commentary on the Iliad and  Odyssey, and of theological works, which have been recently published by Tafel. A list of the Latin archbishops of Thessalonica from 1205 to 1418, when a Roman hierarchy was established along with Western feudalism, is given by Le Quien (Oriens Christianus, 3, 1089). Even to the last we find this city connected with questions of religious interest. Simeon of Thessalonica, who is a chief authority in the modern Greek Church on ritual subjects, died a few months before the fatal siege of 1430; and Theodore Gaza, who went to Italy soon after this siege, and, as a Latin ecclesiastic, became the translator of Aristotle, Theophrastus, and Hippocrates, was a native of the city of Demetrius and Eustathius.

V. Connection with the Apostle Paul. —Paul's visit to Thessalonica (with Silas and Timothy) occurred during his second missionary journey, and to this is due the introduction of Christianity into Thessalonica. Timothy is not mentioned in any part of the direct narrative of what happened at Thessalonica, though he appears as Paul's companion before at Philippi (Act 16:1-13), and afterwards at Beroea (Act 17:14-15); but from his subsequent mission to Thessalonica (1Th 3:1-7; see Act 18:5), and the mention of his name in the opening salutation of both epistles to the Thessalonians, we can hardly doubt that he had been with the apostle throughout.

Three circumstances must here be mentioned, which illustrate in an important manner this visit and this journey, as well as the two epistles to the Thessalonians, which the apostle wrote from Corinth very soon after his departure from his new Macedonian converts.

(1.) This was the chief station on the great Roman road called the Via Egnatia, which connected Rome with the whole region to the north of the Eggean Sea. Paul was on this road at Neapolis (Act 16:11) and Philippi (Act 16:12-40), and his route from the latter place (Act 17:1) had brought him through two of the well-known minor stations mentioned in the Itineraries. SEE AMPHIPOLIS; SEE APOLLONIA

(2.) Placed as it was on this great road, and in connection with other important Roman ways, Thessalonica was an invaluable centre for the spread of the Gospel. It must be remembered that, be sides its inland communication with the rich plains of Macedonia and with far more remote regions, its maritime position made it a great emporium of trade by sea. In  fact, it was nearly, if not quite, on a level with Corinth and Ephesus in its share of the commerce of the Levant. Thus we see the force of what Paul says in his first epistle, shortly-after leaving Thessalonica— ἄφ᾿ ὑμῶν ἐξήχηται ὁ λόγος τοῦ Κυρίου οὐ μόνον ἐν τῇ Μακεδονιᾷ καὶ ἐν τῇ Α᾿χαϊvᾷ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ (1, 8).

(3.) The circumstance noted in Act 17:1, that here was the synagogue of the Jews in this part of Macedonia, had-evidently much to do with the apostle's plans, and also doubtless with his success. Trade would inevitably bring Jews to Thessalonica; and it is remarkable that, ever since, they have had a prominent place in the annals of the city.

The first scene of the apostle's work at Thessalonica was the synagogue. According to his custom, he began there, arguing from the ancient Scriptures (Act 17:2-3); and the same general results followed as in other places. Some believed, both Jews and proselytes, and it is particularly added that among these were many influential women (Act 17:4); on which the general body of the Jews, stirred up with jealousy, excited the Gentile population to persecute Paul and Silas (Act 17:5-10). It is stated that the ministrations among the Jews continued for three weeks (Act 17:2); but we are not obliged to limit to this time the whole stay of the apostles at Thessalonica. A flourishing church was certainly formed there; and the epistles show that its elements were much more Gentile than Jewish. Paul speaks of the Thessalonians as having turned “from idols;” and he does not here, as in other epistles, quote the Jewish Scriptures. In all respects it is important to compare these two letters with the narrative in the Acts; and such references have the greater freshness from the short interval which elapsed between visiting the Thessalonians and writing to them. Such expressions as ἐν θλίψει πολλῇ (1Th 1:6), and ἐν πολλῷ ἀγῶνι (1Th 2:2), sum up the suffering and conflict which Paul and Silas and their converts went through at Thessalonica (see also 1Th 2:14-15; 1Th 3:3-4; 2Th 1:4-7). The persecution took place through the instrumentality of worthless idlers (τῶν ἀγοραίων ἄνδρας τινὰς πονη ρούς, Act 17:5), who, instigated by the Jews, raised a tumult. The house of Jason, with whom the apostles seem to have been residing, was attacked; they themselves were not found, but Jason was brought before the authorities on the accusation that the Christians were trying to set up a new king in opposition to the emperor; a guarantee (τὸ ἱκανόν) was taken from Jason and others for the maintenance of the peace, and Paul and Silas were sent away by night southward to Beroea (Act 17:5-10). The  particular charge brought against the apostles receives an illustration from the epistles, where the kingdom of Christ is prominently mentioned (1Th 2:12; 2Th 1:5). So, again, the doctrine of the resurrection is conspicuous both in Luke's narrative (Act 17:3) and in the first letter (1Th 1:10; 1Th 4:14; 1Th 4:16). If we pass from these points to such as are personal, we are enabled from the epistles to complete the picture of Paul's conduct and attitude at Thessalonica, as regards his love, tenderness, and zeal, his care of individual souls, and his disinterestedness (see 1Th 1:5; 1Th 2:1-10). As to this last point, Paul was partly supported here by contributions from Philippi (Php 4:15-16), partly by the labor of his own hands, which he diligently practiced for the sake of the better success of the Gospel, and that he might set an example to the idle and selfish. (He refers very expressly to what he had said and done at Thessalonica in regard to this point; see 1Th 2:9; 1Th 4:11; comp. 2Th 3:8-12.) SEE THESSALONIANS.

To complete the account of Paul's connection with Thessalonica, it must be noticed that he was certainly there again, though the name of the city is not specified, on his third missionary journey, both in going and returning (Act 20:1-3). Possibly he was also there again after his liberation from his first imprisonment. See Php 1:25-26; Php 2:24, for the hope of revisiting Macedonia, entertained by the apostle at Rome, and 1Ti 1:3; 2Ti 4:13; Tit 3:12, for subsequent journeys in the neighborhood of Thessalonica.

Of the first Christians of Thessalonica, we are able to specify by name the above-mentioned Jason (who maybe the same as the apostle's own kinsman mentioned in Rom 16:21), Demas (at least conjecturally; see 2Ti 4:10), Gaius, who shared some of Paul's perils at Ephesus (Act 19:29), Secundus (who accompanied him, from Macedonia to Asia on the eastward route of his third missionary journey, and was probably concerned in the business of the collection; see Act 20:4), and especially Aristarchus (who, besides being mentioned here with Secundus, accompanied Paul on his voyage to Rome, and had therefore probably been with him during the whole interval, and is also specially referred to in two of the epistles written during the first Roman im-prisonment; see Act 27:2; Col 4:10; Phm 1:24; also, Act 19:29, for his association with the apostle at Ephesus in the earlier part of the third journey).

VI. Ancient Remains. —The two monuments of greatest interest at Thessalonica are two arches connected with the line of the Via Egnatia. The course of this. Roman road is undoubtedly preserved in the long street which intersects the city from east to west. At its western extremity is the Vardar gate, which is nearly in the line of the modern wall, and which has received its present name from the circumstance of its leading to the river Vardar, or Axius. This is the Roman arch believed by Beaujour, Holland, and others to have been erected by the people of Thessalonica in honor of Octavius and Antonius, and in memory of the battle of Philippi. The arch is constructed of large blocks of marble, and is about twelve feet wide and eighteen feet high; but a considerable portion of it is buried deep be-low the surface of the ground. On the outside face are two bas-reliefs of a Roman wearing the toga and standing before a horse. On this arch is the above-mentioned inscription containing the names of the politarchsof the city. Leake thinks from the style of the sculpture, and Tafel from the occurrence of the name Flaviusin the inscription, that a later date ought to be assigned to the arch (a drawing of it is given by Cousinerry). The other arch is near the eastern (said in Clarke's Travels, 4:359, by mistake, to be near the western) extremity of the main street. It is built of brick and. faced with marble, and formerly consisted of three archways. The sculptured camels give an Oriental aspect to the monument; and it is generally supposed to commemorate the victory of Constantine over Licinius or over the Sarmatians.

Near the line of the main street, between the two above-mentioned arches, are four Corinthian columns supporting an architrave, above which are caryatides; his monument is now part of the house of a Jew; and, from a inoion that the figures were petrified by magic, it is called by the Spanish Jews Las Incantadas. The Turks call it Sureth-Maleh. (A view will be found, with architectural details, in Stuart and Revett, Athen. Antiq. 3, 53). This colonnade is supposed by some to have been part of the Propylea of the Hippodrome, the position of which is believed by Beaujour and Clarke to have been in the south-eastern part of the town, between the sea and a building called the Rotunda, now a mosque, previously the church Eski- Metropoli, but formerly a temple, and in construction similar to the Pantheon at Rome. Another mosque in Thessalonica, called Eski-Juma, is said by Beaujour to have been a temple consecrated to Venus Thermeea.  The city walls are of brick, and of Greek construction, resting on a much older foundation, which consists of hewn stones of immense thickness. Everywhere are broken columns and fragments of sculpture. Many remains were taken in 1430 to Constantinople. One of the towers in the city wall is called the Tower of the Statue, because it contains a colossal figure of Thessalonica, with the representation of a ship at its feet. The castle is partly Greek and partly Venetian. Some columns of verd antique, supposed to be relics of a temple of Hercules, are to be noticed there, and also a shattered triumphal arch, erected (as an inscription proves) in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, in honor of Antoninus Pius and his daughter Faustina.

In harmony with what has been noticed of its history, Thessalonica has many remains ‘of ecclesiastical antiquity. Leake says that in this respect it surpasses any other city in Greece. The church of greatest interest (now a mosque) is that of St. Sophia, built, according to tradition, like the church of the same name at Constantinople, in the reign of Justinian, and after the designs of the architect Anthemius. This church is often mentioned in the records of the Middle Ages, as in the letters of pope Innocent III, and in the account of the Norman siege. It remains very entire, and is fully described by Beaujour and Leake. The Church of St. Demetrius (apparently the third on the same site, and now also a mosque) is a structure of still greater size and beauty. Tafel believes that it was erected about the end of the 7th century; but Leake conjectures, from its architectural features; that it was built by the, Latins in the 13th. Tafel has collected with much diligence the notices of a great number of churches which have existed in Thessalonica. Dapper says that in his day the Greeks had the use of thirty churches. Walpole (in Clarke's Travels, 4:349) gives the number as sixteen. All travelers have noticed two ancient pulpits, consisting of “single blocks of variegated marble, with small steps cut in them,” which are among the most interesting ecclesiastical remains of Thessalonica.

VII. Authorities. —The travelers who have described Thessalonica are numerous. The most important are Lucas, Second Voyage (1705); Pococke, Description of the East (1743-45); Beaujour, Tableau du Commerce de la Graec, translated into English (1800); Clarke, Travels in Europe, etc. (1810-23); Holland, Travels in the Ionian Isles, etc. (1815); Cousindry, Voyage dans la Macedoine (1831); Leake, Northern Greece (1835); Zacharia, Reise in dem Orient (1840); Griesbach, Reise durch  Rumelien (1841); Bowen, Mount Athos, Thessaly, and Epirus (1852); Dodd, in the Biblioth. —Sacra, 11:830; 18:845.

In the Memoires de Academie des Inscriptions, tom. 38 Sect. Hist. p. 121- 146, is an essay on the subject of Thessalonica by the abbé Belley. But the most elaborate work on the subject is that by Tafel, Hist. Thessalonicae usque ad A.D. 904, the first part of which was published at Tübingen in 1835; this was afterwards reprinted as Prolegomena to the Dissertatio de Thessalonica ejusque Agro Geographica (Berl. 1839). With this should be compared his work on the Via Egnatia. To these authorities we ought to add the introduction to some of the commentaries on Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians-especially those of Koch (ibid. 1849) and Linemann (Gött. 1850). The early history of the Thessalonian Church is discussed by Burgerhoudt, De Coetu Chr. Thessal., Ort, Fatisque :(Leid. 1825). A good description of the modern place is given in Murray's Handbook for Greece, p. 455.

## Theudas[[@Headword:Theudas]]

             a person incidentally mentioned but once in the New Test. (Act 5:36), and concerning whom much controversy has arisen.

I. The Name. —This, in the original, is θευδᾶς (a form which likewise occurs in Josephus, Ant. 20:5, 1), and, if Greek, may be for θεοδᾶς, as a contraction of θεόδο τος or θεόδωρος, i.e. God-given=Johanan (comp. Vulg. Theodas). A similar form, θειώδας', occurs in Diogenes Laert. 9:116. If Hebrew (Simonis, Onomast. N.T. p. 72), it may = תּוֹדָה, praise. The Mishna has a similar form, תודים (Bechor. 4:4).

II. Scriptural Statement. —According to Luke's report of Gamaliel's speech before the Jewish Sanhedrim, on the occasion of the first arraignment of the apostles (A.D. 29), Theudas was the leader of a popular tumult some time previously (πρὸ τούτων τῶν ἡμερῶν) (Act 5:34-36). He is spoken of as a religious impostor of high pretensions (λέγων ειναί τινα ἑαυτόν), to whom a considerable body of adherents (ἀνδρῶν ἀριθμὸς ὡς τετρακοσίων) closely attached themselves (προσεκολ λήθη, προσεκλίθη, A. B.), but who was ultimately slain (ἀνῃρέθη), and his party annihilated (ἐγένοντο εἰς οὐ δέν). Gamaliel, it appears, was counseling prudent and temperate measures towards the apostles. Previous well-known examples, he said, had made it plain that the leaders of a bad  cause would soon bring all to ruin, while those of a different kind would be sure to succeed. The first case he appeals to is that of Theudas, as above recited. He then goes on to notice the case of Judas of Galilee, who rose after Theudas in the days of the taxing, and after collecting a considerable band was defeated and slain. Now there can be no doubt that the Judas here spoken of was the Judas Gaulonites of Josephus, or Judas the Galilean, who, in the time of Cyrenius, raised a disturbance by opposing the census then ordered to be taken by the ‘Roman government, and was cut off (Josephus, Ant. 18:1, 2; War, 2, 12). Thus far there is no difficulty; it is only by a comparison of contemporaneous history that a discrepancy is alleged as arising.

III. Adjustment of the Account with Josephus. —No insurgent of this name is mentioned by the Jewish historian at the period to which Gamaliel must refer, but he gives statements of several somewhat similar occurrences about that time.

1. A religious impostor (γόης τις ἀνήρ) named Theudas is described by him as having raised a strikingly analogous commotion in the reign of Claudius, when Cuspius Fadus was procurator of Judaea. Josephus's account of the matter (Ant. 20:5, 1) is that this fanatic, laying claim to prophetical powers, persuaded a very large body (τὸν πλεῖστον ὄχλον) to follow him to the Jordan, taking their effects along with them, with the assurance that the waters would divide before him as they had done before Elijah and Elisha in the days of old; but being unexpectedly attacked by a squadron of cavalry sent out after him by Fadus, his followers werb killed: or taken prisoners, and the leader himself, being taken, was beheaded. The reign of Claudius and the procuratorship of Fadus fix this incident at about A.D. 44, i.e. some fifteen years later than the delivery of Gamaliel's speech; and some forty after the scriptural event, since Luke places his Theudas, in the order of time, before Judas the Galilaean, who made his appearance soon after the dethronement of Arcbelaus, i.e. A.D. 6 or 7 (Josephus, War, 2, 8, 1; Ant. 18:1,6; 20:5, 2).

Now, if we are to regard it as certain that there was only one Jewish insurgent named Theudas, it follows that either Luke or Josephus must be guilty of a chronological blunder. The hypothesis that Josephus has misplaced Theudas, though not impossible, and maintained by Michaelis (Einleit. in N.T. 1, 63) and Jahn (Archceöl. 2, 2), is a way of cutting the knot which no unbiased critic would desire to resort to. That the error is  Luke's, though taken for granted by most modern German critics (Eichhorn, De Wette, Credner, Meyer, Baur, etc.), is even more improbable when we take into account the great historical accuracy of his narrative, which closer researches are continually placing in a stronger light, and the date of the publication of the Acts. (It may not be amiss to remind the reader of some fine remarks, in illustration of Luke's historical accuracy, in Tholuck's Glaubwürdigkeit der evang. Geschichte, p. 161- 177, 375-389. See also Ebrard, Evangelische Kritik, p. 678 sq.; and Lechler, Das Apostolische Zeitalter, p. 6 sq.) Few things are, therefore, less credible than that a careful author like Luke, writing within a few years of the event, should have been betrayed into such a glaring historical mistake as antedating the insurrection of Theudas by nearly half a century. That he should have done this by an intentional prolepsis, as is supposed by some (Vales. Ad Euseb. H. E. 2, 11), is as completely at variance with the simplicity and unartistic character of his narrative. It is the height of injustice to charge that the writer of the Acts either fabricated the speech put into the mouth of Gamaliel, or that he carelessly or surreptitiously wrought into it a transaction which took place forty years or more after the time when it is said to have occurred (see Zeller, Die Apostelgeschichte, p. 132 sq.).

But without resorting to either of these violent methods, the difficulty may be solved with perfect satisfaction by the simple hypothesis that there were two insurgents of the same name. Since Luke represents Theudas as having preceded Judas the Galilean (q.v.), it is certain that he could not have appeared later, at all events, than the latter part of the reign of Herod the Great. The very year, now, of that monarch's death was remarkably turbulent; the land was overrun with belligerent parties, under the direction of insurrectionary chiefs or fanatics (ἕτερα μυρία θορύβων ἐχόμενα τὴν Ι᾿ουδαίαν κατελάμβανε, Josephus, Ant. 17:12,4). The whole of these, with three exceptions, are passed over by Josephus without particularizing their leaders, so that it need create little surprise that one in which comparatively so small a number were concerned (Gamaliel's 400 can hardly be made to tally with Josephus's πλεῖστος ὄχλος) should have been omitted by him, or spoken of in equally general terms. The name Theudas was one of no infrequent occurrence (see above), while the fact that there were as many as three impostors of the name of Simon (Josephus, Ant. 17:12, 6; 20:4, 2), besides Simon Magus, and as many Judases (ibid. 17:12, 5; War, 1, 33, 2-4), mentioned by Josephus in the  space of about ten years increases the probability that there may have been two named Theudas in the space of forty years. This mode of reconciling Luke with Josephus, which has commended itself to such critics as Beza, Scaliger, Casaubon, and Bengel, in earlier times, and Kuinol, Olshausen, Winer, and Ebrard, in later days, is ably supported by Anger (De Temp. in Act. Apost. Ratione, p. 185), and also by Lardner (Credibility, 1, 404-414), who remarks that “it is not at all strange that-there should be two impostors in Judaea of the same name in the compass of forty years, and that they should come to the same end; on the contrary, it is strange that any learned man should find this hard to believe.” So impartial a witness as Jost, the historian of the Jews (Geschichte der Israeliten, 2, Anh. p.76), admits the reasonableness of such combinations, and holds in this case to the credibility of Luke, as well as that of Josephus. Moreover Jsephus was by no means infallible, as Strauss and critics of his school may almost be said to take for granted; and it is possible certainly (this is the position of some) that Josephus himself may have misplaced the time of Theudas, instead of Luke: who is charged with that oversight. Calvin's view that Judas the Galilean appeared not after, but before, Theudas (μετὰ τοῦτον =insuper vel praeterea), and that the examination of the apostles before the Sanhedrim occurred in the time of Claudius (contrary to the manifest chronological order of the Acts), deserves mention only as a way mark of the progress which has been made in Biblical exegesis since his time.

2. Another explanation (essentially different only as proposing to identify the person) is that Luke's Theudas may have been one of the three insurgents whose names are mentioned by Josephus in connection with the disturbances that took place about the time of Herod's death. Sonntak (Theol. Stud. u. Kritik. 1837, p. 622, etc.; translated in the Biblioth. Sacra, 1848, p. 409 sq.) has advanced this view, and supported it with much learning and ability. He argues that the Theudas referred to by Gamaliel, is the individual who occurs in Josephus under the name of Simon (War, 2, 4, 2; Ant. 17:10, 6), a slave of Herod, who attempted to make himself king amid the confusion which attended the vacancy pf the throne when that monarch died. He urges the following reasons for that opinion: first, this Simon, as he was the most noted among those who disturbed the public peace at that time, would be apt to occur to Gamaliel as an illustration of his point; secondly, he is described as a man of the same lofty pretensions (ειναι ἄξιος ἐλπίσας παῤ ὁντιονῦν = λέγων ειναί τινα ἑαυτόν); thirdly, he died a violent death, which Josephus does not mention as true of  the other two insurgents; fourthly, he appears to have had comparatively few adherents, in conformity with Luke's ὡσεὶ τετρακοσίων; and, lastly, his having been originally a slave accounts for the twofold appellation, since it was very common among the Jews to assume a different name on changing their occupation or mode of life. It is very possible, therefore, that Gamaliel speaks of him as Theudas because, having borne that name so long at Jerusalem, he was best known by it to the members of the Sanhedrim; and that Josephus, on the contrary, who wrote for Romans and Greeks, speaks of him as Simon because it was under that name that he set himself up as king, and thus acquired his foreign notoriety (see Tacit. -Hist. 5, 9).

3. Wieseler (Chronicles Synops. of Gospels, transl. p. 9092) considers Luke's Theudas to have been the same with Matthias or Matthew, the son of Margaloth (Matthias = מִתַּיָּהbeing the Hebrew form of θεόδοτος = θευδᾶς), of whom Josephus (Ant. 17:6, 2-4) gives a detailed account as a distinguished teacher among the Jews, who, in the latter days of Herod the Great, raised a band of his scholars to effect a social reform in the spirit of the old Hebrew constitution, by “destroying the heathen works which the king had erected contrary to the law of their fathers.” A large golden eagle, which the king had caused to be erected over the great gate of the Temple, in defiance of the law that forbids images or representations of any living creatures, was an object of their special dislike, which, on hearing a false report that Herod was dead, Matthias and his companions proceeded to demolish; when the king's captain, supposing the undertaking to have a higher aim than was the fact, came upon the riotous reformers with a band of soldiers, and arrested the proceedings of the multitude. Dispersing the mob, he apprehended forty of the bolder spirits, together with Matthias and his fellow-leader Judas. Matthias was burned. Now, had we used the term Theudas for the term Matthias, the reader would at once have seen that what we have just given from the more minute narrative of Josephus is only a somewhat detailed statement of the facts of which Gamaliel gave a brief summary before the Sanhedrim. The chronological difficulty then disappears. Matthias, or Theudas, appeared “before these days,” before Judas of Galilee, and before the census; he appeared, that is, some four years anterior to the birth of our Lord.

4. Other identifications are those of Usher (Ann. p. 797) and Zuschlag, who regard Theudas as the same person with Judas the robber (Josephus, Ant. 17:10, 5), or with Theudion (ibid. 4, 2). Such attempts arise from an  unwillingness to acquiesce in the fragmentary character of the annals of the period, and are simply curious as efforts of ingenuity. —

IV. Literature. Among the works, in addition to those already mentioned, which discuss this question or touch upon it are the following: Casaubon, Exercit. Antibaron. 2, 18; Neander, Geschichte der Pacmung, 1, 75, 76; Heinrichs, Exerc. ad Act. 2, 375; Guericke, Beitrdge zür Einleit. ins N. Test. p. 90; Baumgarten, Apostelgeschichte, 1, 114; Lightfoot, Hot. Heb. 2, 704; Biscoe, History of the Acts, p. 428; Wordsworth, Commentary, 2, 26; and the monographs De Theuda by Gros (Viteb. 1697), Kling (Hafn. 1714), and Scheuffelhut (Lips. 1774).

Theurgists, those mystics who claim to hold converse with the world of spirits, and to have the high power and prerogative of working miracles, not by magic, but by supernatural endowment. Among these may be mentioned Apollonius of Tyana, Peter of Alcantara, and the large company of Romish saints.

## Theurer, CARL Johann Wilhelm[[@Headword:Theurer, CARL Johann Wilhelm]]

             a Protestant minister, was born April 26, 1826, at Waldenbuch, in Wurtemberg. In 1858 he was pastor at Muhlhausen-on-the-Neckar, in 1870 assistant at the hospital church in Stutgard, in 1875 second preacher at the Stiftskirche there, and died July 16, 1882, at Zavelstein. He published, Das Reich Gottes, etc. (Ludwigsburg, 1862): — Predigten (ibid. 1874, 2d ed. 1879): — Blicke in die Herrlichkeit des Vater- Unsers (1881, 2d ed. 1882). (B.P.)

## Theurgy[[@Headword:Theurgy]]

             (θεουργία, divine work) is the science concerning the gods and the various classes of superior spirits, their appearing to men and their operations; and the art, by means of certain acts, habits, words, and symbols, of moving the gods to impart to men secrets which surpass the powers of reason, to lay open to them the future, and to become visible to them. These communications were claimed as being held with the inferior orders of supernatural beings, with whom men rose to converse by the power of purificatory rites and by the possession of science. Magic of this kind was considered to be a divine work, as its name clearly shows, and its action entirely beneficent. The theurgical system attained perfection among the Neo-Platonists of the Alexandrian school, particularly those of the last epoch, and the propensity to daemonological rites which was already marked in the time of Porphyry triumphed completely under Proclus. The magic of ancient Egypt was quite theurgic in origin and doctrine, and we cannot deny that the reveries of the later Neo-Platonists are in a great measure due to its influence; although it did not take the place of all other worship, being considered inferior to the official religion, and not formally recognised as a rite. See Lenormant, Chaldean Magic, p. 74 sq.

## Thevet, Andre[[@Headword:Thevet, Andre]]

             a writer of some note in the 16th century, was born at Angouleme, France, and entered the Franciscan Order, and afterwards visited Italy, the Holy Land, Egypt, Greece, and Brazil. On his return to France, in 1556, he quitted the Cordelier's habit, took that of an ecclesiastic, and was appointed almoner to queen Catherine de Medicis. He had the titles of historiographer of France and cosmographer to the king, and received the profits of these offices. He died Nov. 23, 1590, leaving Cosmographie du Levant (Lyons, 1554, 4to). —A History of Illustrious Men (1671,8 vols. 12mo; or 1684, 2 vols. fol.): —Singularites de la France Antarctique (Paris, 1558, 4to); and other works.

## Thiard, Cyrus de[[@Headword:Thiard, Cyrus de]]

             a French prelate, became bishop of Chalon-sur-Sabne, Feb. 20, 1594, and assisted at the States-General held in Paris in 1614, having received by letters-patent, Aug. 13, 1602, the right to represent Dijon. He died Jan. 3, 1624, leaving only a Pastoral addressed to his clergy (Chalon, 1605).

## Thiard, Henri de[[@Headword:Thiard, Henri de]]

             cardinal of Bissy, was born May 25, 1657, and at the age of twelve received the abbey of Noaille, in reward for his father's services to Louis XIV. He was educated at the Jesuit College of Dijon and at the Sorbonne, and was made doctor of theology in the latter. In 1687 he was named as bishop of Toul, but was not consecrated until 1692. In 1697 he was offered the archbishopric of Bordeaux, but declined; and soon afterwards was given the abbeys of Trois-Fontaines and Saint-Germain, and the bishopric of Meaux. He was raised to the cardinalate May 29, 1715. Other papal honors were subsequently conferred upon him. He died in Paris, July 26, 1737, having published numerous ecclesiastical works, for which see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Thibaud[[@Headword:Thibaud]]

             archbishop of Canterbury, of whose family nothing is known, was first made abbot of Bec after the year 1136, and soon after was called to England, where we find him raised to the see of Canterbury in 1139. Under the influence of Thomas a Becket, Thibaud espoused the cause of the pope in the quarrels with the king of England, and was therefore treated by the  latter as a public enemy. He escaped to St. Omer, but was afterwards imprisoned by Eustachius for refusing to crown the son of the latter. Some time after 1153 he was restored to his diocese by the duke of Normandy, and died April 18, 1161, leaving a number of Letters. See Hook, Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, s.v.

## Thibet, Religion of[[@Headword:Thibet, Religion of]]

             The religion of Buddha was introduced into Thibet under king Srongstan Gampo, in A.D. 617-698, by priests from Sinde. These priests brought with them the art of writing, and translated the sacred books of the Indian Buddhists into Thibetan, and their monasteries became the centers of learned education and professional skill. In the 11th century, the Bompa religion (the old worship of evil daemons) was once more established, but after eighty years the Buddhist priests again came into power. These priests, in the 14th century, had become mere jugglers; and then arose a reformer, the monk Tsonkhapa, born in 1355, in the district of Amdo, where is now the famous monastery of Kunbum. He opposed the tricks and pretended miracles of charlatanism, and undertook the task of uniting and reconciling the dialectical and mystical schools of Thibetan Buddhism. His innovations were never universally acknowledged.

In the 15th century, GednuDub, provost of a large monastery, claimed to be an incarnation of Buddha, and assumed the title of the “very costliest teacher ocean.” The Mongols called him Gyasto, or Dalai Lama, the “priest ocean,” and thus was inaugurated Lamaism (q.v.), which became the established religion of the country. The election of the grand lama, although by lot, has been so managed as to prevent any child from being elected which might be disagreeable to the Chinese government. The last election took place in 1875, and a child from the western boundary, towards Ladak, was elected, which seems to indicate a decrease of the Chinese influence. Thibet is greatly oppressed by its ecclesiastical system. The number of monasteries and monks is almost incredible. Eighteen thousand live in and around Lassa; on an average every thirteenth, and in some places every seventh, man is a monk, and must be provided for by others. The poverty of the people is very great, their moral depravity still greater. Between 1854 and 1864 some French missionaries attempted to establish a Roman Catholic station at Bonga, in South-eastern Thibet, but were violently assailed by the lamas, and, unprotected by the Chinese authorities, they were obliged to leave. All other efforts to introduce Christianity have also failed; indeed,  so jealous of Europeans are the authorities that they are rarely even admitted into the country. SEE LAMAISM.

## Thibetan Version[[@Headword:Thibetan Version]]

             The vast and mountainous tract of country in which the Thibetan language is spoken lies directly north of Hindustan, from which it is separated by the Himalaya Mountains. Its eastern frontiers border on China; to the west it extends as tar as Cashmere, Afghanistan, and Turkestan; while on the north it is bounded by the countries of the Turks and the Mongols. It is, for the most part, comprised within the Chinese empire; the western parts, however, appear to be independent of China. On account of the extreme jealousy of the Chinese government, Thibet has hitherto been almost inaccessible to foreigners, and our knowledge of the country is in consequence extremely limited.

In 1816 an attempt was made by the Church Missionary Society to furnish the Thibetans with a version of the Scriptures in their own language, but, unhappily, this important undertaking ultimately proved abortive. The matter rested until the year 1843, when Dr. Haberlin, an agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society, after journeying through Thibet, again forced the necessity of a Thibetan version upon the attention of Christian societies. Dr. Haberlin states, as the result of his observations and inquiries in Thibet, that as far as the Thibetan language is spoken and the Lamas have any sway, so far literature exercises an important influence on the people. If there were a version of the Scriptures in the Thibetan language, thousands of volumes might annually be sent into the interior of Asia from five different points along the immense frontier of British India; and the millions of people speaking that language, and inquisitive as the Chinese are, might thus have a profitable opportunity of being made acquainted with the things that belong to their salvation.” In spite of this encouraging fact, the object advocated by Dr. Haberlin moved very slowly, for not until 1856 do we read of an effort made towards translating the Gospel of St. Matthew, which in 1863 was published by the Moravian Mission at Kyelang. About the same time, a Bible society for the Punjab, with its headquarters at Lahore, was formed, and one of the projects entertained by that society was the translation of the Scriptures into the Thibetan, which had already been commenced by Moravian missionaries. The difficulties, however, were very great, and the work of translation was naturally very slow. Hence we need not be surprised that about five years after the  publication of the Gospel of St. Matthew those of John and Mark were published, while up to date the New Test. has not yet been completed. See Bible of Every Land, p. 20 sq. (B. P.)

## Thief[[@Headword:Thief]]

             (גִּנָּב, κλέτης). Among the Hebrews, the restitution that was required in case of theft was double the amount taken (Exo 20:3-8). If a sheep, however, was stolen, and had been slain or sold, fourfold was required; or if an ox, a fivefold restitution was to be made. The reason of this distinction was that sheep, being kept in the desert, were more exposed than other animals to be stolen; and oxen, being so indispensably necessary in an agricultural community, could not be taken from their owners without great injury and peculiar aggravation (Exo 22:1). In case the thief was unable to make the restitution demanded by the law, he was sold, with his wife and children, into servitude (Exo 22:3; 2Sa 12:6; 2Ki 4:1; comp. Gen 44:17). In later times, the fine is thought by some to have been increased (Pro 6:30-31). ‘Whoever slew a thief who was attempting to break a house at night, i.e. any hour before sunrise, was left unpunished, since he did not know but that the thief might have a design upon his life, and he was unable also, owing to the darkness, to identify and thereby bring him to justice (Exo 22:2). — SEE THEFT.

“Men do not despise a thief,” says Solomon, “if he steal to satisfy his soul when he is hungry. But if he be found, he shall-restore sevenfold; he shall give all the substance of his house” (Pro 6:30-31). Bishop Hall is of opinion that Solomon, in this passage, does not so much extenuate the crime of theft as point out the greater criminality of adultery; but we have abundant evidence that theft, unaccompanied by violence, was viewed more leniently by ancient than by modern legislators. Wilkinson says, “The Egyptians held a singular custom respecting theft and burglary. Those who followed the profession of thief gave in their name to the chief of the robbers and agreed that he should be informed of everything they might thenceforward steal the moment it was in their possession. In consequence of this, the owner of the lost goods always applied by letter to the chief for their recovery; and having stated their quality and quantity, the day and hour when they were stolen, and other requisite particulars, the goods were identified, and on payment of one quarter of their value they were restored to the applicant in the same state as when taken from his house; for, being  fully persuaded of the impracticability of putting an entire check to robbery, either by the dread of punishment or by any other method that could be adopted by the most vigilant police, they considered it more for the advantage of the community that a certain sacrifice should be made, in order to secure the restitution of the remainder, than that the law, by taking on itself to protect the citizen and discover the offender, should be the indirect cause of greater loss; and that the Egyptians, like the Indians, and, I may say, the modern inhabitants of the Nile, were very expert in the art of thieving we have abundant testimony from ancient authors” (Anc. Egyptians, 2, 216). SEE STEAL.

The criminals who were crucified with our Lord appear to have been, not “thieves” in the ordinary sense of the word, but rather public robbers or highwaymen (λῃστής is carefully distinguished from κλέπτης, Joh 10:8), 1. . fellow-insurgents with Barabbas; for it is said that he “lay bound with them that had made insurrection with him in the city, who had committed murder in the insurrection” (Mar 15:7). These malefactors, as bishop Maltby has well observed, “were not thieves who robbed all for profit, but men who had taken up arms on a principle of resistance to the Roman oppression, and to what they thought an unlawful burden, the tribute-money; who made no scruple to rob all the Romans, and when engaged in these unlawful causes made less difference between Jews and Romans than they at first meant to do” (Sermons [1819-22], vol. 1). SEE ROBBER.

## Thiemon, otherwise Diethmar[[@Headword:Thiemon, otherwise Diethmar]]

             a Bavarian prelate and artist, was born of noble parentage about 1045. Agreeably to the custom of his time, he was as well versed in mechanics as in the fine arts. He executed many works in painting and sculpture for the churches, particularly for the Church of St. Blaise, near Ems. In 1079 he was appointed abbé of the diocese of Salzburg, and in 1090 was chosen archbishop of that city. He started for the Holy Land about 1099, and is said to have been taken prisoner by the infidels, who, learning of his skill in sculpture, commanded him to restore the arms of a brazen idol. Refusing to do so on account of religious scruples, he was put to death, in 1101. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Thiermes (or Tiermes)[[@Headword:Thiermes (or Tiermes)]]

             in the mythology of the Laplanders, was the son of the devil by a Lapland girl. The latter was sitting upon the ground under a tree, when Perkel (the devil), disguised as a stranger, came to her, and asked her to hang her fur coat upon a bundle of wood. This she complied with, but suddenly the bundle of wood began to burn, and she, vainly endeavoring to escape his embraces, became his victim. The child was removed to the highest heaven, and was there questioned as to whose child it desired to be, the father's or the mother's. It decided in favor of the mother, after which the high ruler made of it a god of thunder. As such, pursued by its father, it flies about in the heavens, thundering and lightening, now uprooting trees, again splitting rocks, doing good and evil. The Laplanders have a poorly developed worship of the deities. Thus, it seems, there can be accredited to Thiermes only a general worship.

## Thiers, Jean Baptiste[[@Headword:Thiers, Jean Baptiste]]

             a French divine, was born at Chartres, Nov. 11, 1636. He was professor at the College du Plessis in Paris, and was, in 1666, appointed to the incumbency of Champrond in Gastine (Chartres). Here he came in conflict with the archdeacon of Chartres, and went to Ribraye (Meuse), where he died, Feb. 28, 1703. He wrote, De Festorum Diesrum Imminutione (Lyons, 1668), which was placed on the Index “donec corrigatur” Traite de l'Exposition du S. Sacrament de I'Autel (Paris, 1673): —Traite des Superstitions selon Ecriture Sainte (ibid. 1679): —Dissert. sur la Sainte Larme de Vend6me (ibid. 1696), against which Mabillon wrote a rejoinder, Lettre d'un Benedictin a Mgr. de Jelois (ibid. 1700). Against the priesthood he wrote, Avocat des Pauvres (ibid. 1676): —Histoire des Perruques (ibid. 1690). He also wrote some historical work's, for which see Niceron, Memoires pour Servir, etc., vol. 11; Dupin, Nouvelle Biblioth. vol. 19; Theolog. Universal-Lex. s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v. (B. P.)

## Thiersch, Heinrich Wilhelm Josias[[@Headword:Thiersch, Heinrich Wilhelm Josias]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born at Munich, November 5, 1817. In 1840 he commenced his academical career at Erlangen, and in 1843 was professor at Marburg, but resigned his professorship in 1850 on account of his conversion to the "Catholic Apostolic Church." He spent many years as a private tutor in South Germany, continuing all the time active and fertile in the production of theological works. In 1875 Thiersch retired to Basle, and died December 3, 1885. He published, Ad Pentateuchi Versionem Alexandrinam Criticae Pertractandam Prolegomena (Erlangen, 1840): — De Pentateuchi Versione Alexandrina Libri Tres (1841): — Hebraische Grammatik (1842; 2d ed. 1858): — Versuch zur Erstellung des historischem Stauldpunkts fur die Kritik der neutestamentlichen Schrifteen (1845): — Einige Worte uber die Aechtheit der neutest. Schriften, etc. (1846): — Vorlesunge uber Katholicismus und Protestantismus (eod.; 2d ed. 1848): — De Epistola ad Hebraeos Commentatio Historica (Marburg, 1849): — De Stephani Protomartyris Oratione Commentatio Exegetica (eod. ): — Die Geschichte der christl. Kirche im Alterthumn (2d ed. 1858; 3d ed. 1879): — Politik und Philosophie im ihrem Verhaltniss zur Religion unter Trajanus, Hadrianus und den beiden Antoninen (1853): — Ueber christliches Familien leben (1854; often reprinted): — Die Bergpredigt Christi und ihre Bedeutung fur die Gegenwart (1867; 2d ed. 1878): — Die Gleichnisse Christi nach ihrer moralischen und prophetischen Bedeutung betrachtet (1867; 2d ed. 1875): — Die Genesis nach ihrer moralischen und prophetischen Bedeutung betrachtet (1870; new ed. 1875): — Inbegriff der christlichen Lehre (published shortly after the author's death, Basle, 1886). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v.; Allyemeine evangel. luth. Kirchenzeitung. (Leipsic, 1886), No. 1, 2, 3. (B.P.)

## Thiersch, Heinrich Wilhelm Josias, D.D[[@Headword:Thiersch, Heinrich Wilhelm Josias, D.D]]

             an Irvingite minister, was born in Munich, Bavaria, November 5, 1817; studied philology at Munich, and theology at Erlaingen and Tubingen; became privat-docent at Erlangen in 1839; professor of theology at Marburg in 1843, resigned in 1850 in order to labor in the interest of the Catholic Apostolic Church; had charge of a small congregation at Aigsburg, and subsequently at Basel, and died at the latter place, December  3, 1885. He is the author of many works, among which are Commentaries on Genesis (translated), and on Daniel.

## Thiess, Johann O[[@Headword:Thiess, Johann O]]

             a German doctor of theology, was born Aug. 15, 1762, at Hamburg. For a number o)f years he lectured at the University of Kiel, retiring in 1805. He died Jan. 7,1810. He wrote, Handbuch d. neueren bes. deutschen u. protest. Literat. d. Theol. (Leips. 1795-97, 2 vols.): —Neuer krit. Commentar fiber das N.T. (pt. 1, 2, Die Evangel. der Apostel und Jesus  Halle, 1804-6]): —Vorlesungen über die Moral (Gera, 1810): — Fundamenta Theol. Christ. Critico-dogmaticae (Lips. 1792): —A Commentary on 2 Thessalonians 2, 1-12 and Joh 10:12-16 (Kiel, 1809): —Ueber die bibl. und kirchl. Meinung von der Ewigkeit der Hillenstrafen (Hamb. 1791): — Ueber die Magier und ihren Stern (ibid. 1794): Einleitung in die neuere Gesch. der Religion, der Kirche u. der theol. Wissenschaften (ibid. 1740, 1796; Sleswick, 1797), etc. See Winer, Handb. der theol. Literatur, 1, 6, 172, 237, 290, 294, 358, 478, 555, 580, 857, 868; 2, 31, 59, 92, 125, 126, 331, 360, 366; Fürst, Bibl. Judaica, 3, 422. (B. P.)

## Thietmar[[@Headword:Thietmar]]

             a noble Saxon belonging to the family of Waldeck, and related to the imperial house, was born July 25, 976. In 989 he became canon of St. Maurice, and in 1002 provost of Waldeck, which his grandfather had founded. In 1009 he was made bishop of Merseburg, and in 1018 he died. He wrote a chronicle, with the purpose of transmitting to his successors in the bishopric a history of Merseburg; but the work grew into a history of the German State and of the neighboring Germanic and Slavonic countries. It is the most important of accessible sources for the time of the later emperors, since its statements cover almost the whole of the 10th century, and are largely the reports of what the author himself saw and knew. The book is deficient in point of literary excellences, but is characterized by abundance of matter and truthfulness of spirit. It is as important for the illustration of manners and customs in the days of the Saxon emperors as for the statement of historical events.

Literature. —Lappenberg's preface to Mon. Germ. Hist. vol. 3 of Script.; Giesebrecht, in Ranke's Jahrbb. II, 1, 156-163, and Gesch. der Kais. 1, 746, 780; 2, 517, 547 sq.; Wattenbach, Geschichtsquellen Deutschlands inm ittelalter, p. 181 sq.; Maurenbrecher, De Hist. Decimi SCeculi Scriptt. (Bonn, 1861); Lappenberg, ed. of Thietmar's Chronik in Mon. Germ. Hist. 3, 733-871. See also Hall, Allqenz. Lit. —Zeitung, 1849, Nos. 204-206. — Herzog, Real Encyclop. s.v.

## Thieves, the Two on the Cross[[@Headword:Thieves, the Two on the Cross]]

             (Mat 27:38-44; Mar 15:27; Luk 23:39-43; comp. Joh 18:40). The men who under this name appear in the history of the crucifixion were robbers (λῃσταί) rather than thieves (κλεπταί)  belonging to the lawless bands by which Palestine was at that time and afterwards infested (Josephus, Ant. 17:10, 8; 20:8, 10). Against these brigands every Roman procurator had to wage continual war (Josephus, War, 2, 13, 2). The parable of the Good Samaritan shows how common it was for them to attack and plunder travelers even on the high-road from Jerusalem to Jericho (Luk 10:30). It was necessary to use an armed police to encounter them (Luk 22:52). Often, as in the case of Barabbas, the wild robber life was connected with a fanatic zeal for freedom which turned the marauding attack into a popular insurrection (Mar 15:7). For crimes such as these the Romans had but one sentence. Crucifixion was the penalty at once of the robber and the rebel (Josephus, War, 2, 13, 2).

Of the previous history of the two who suffered on Golgotha we know nothing. They had been tried and condemned, and were waiting their execution before our Lord was accused. It is probable enough, as the death of Barabbas was clearly expected at the same time, that they were among the συστασιασταί who had been imprisoned with him, and had taken part in the insurrection in which zeal, and hate, and patriotism, and lust of plunder were mingled in wild confusion.

They had expected to die with Jesus Barabbas (q.v.). They find themselves with one who bore the same name, but who was described in the superscription on his cross as Jesus of Nazareth. They could hardly fail to have heard something of his fame as a prophet, of his triumphal entry as a king. They now find him sharing the same fate as themselves, condemned on much the same charge (Luk 23:5). They too would bear their crosses to the appointed place, while He fainted by the way. Their garments would be parted among the soldiers. For them also there would be the drugged wine, which He refused, to dull the sharp pain of the first hours on the cross. They catch at first the prevailing tone of scorn. A king of the Jews who could neither save himself nor help them, whose followers had not even fought for him (Joh 18:36), was strangely unlike the many chieftains whom they had probably known claiming the same title (Josephus, Ant. 17:10, 8), strangely unlike the “notable prisoner” for whom they had not hesitated, it would seem, to incur the risk of bloodshed. But over one of them there came a change. The darkness which, at noon, was beginning to steal over the sky awed him, and the divine patience and silence and meekness of the sufferer touched him. He looked back upon his past life, and saw an infinite evil. He looked to the man dying on the cross  beside him, and saw an infinite compassion. There, indeed, was one unlike all other “kings of the Jews” whom the robber had ever known. Such a one must be all that he had claimed to be. To be forgotten by that King seems to him now the most terrible of all punishments to take part in the triumph of his return, the most blessed of all hopes. The yearning prayer was answered, not in the letter, but in the spirit. To him alone, of all the myriads who had listened to him, did the Lord speak of Paradise (q.v.), waking with that word the thoughts of a purer past and the hopes of an immediate rest. But its joy was to be more than that of fair groves and pleasant streams. “Thou shalt be with me!” He should be remembered there.

We cannot marvel that a history of such wonderful interest should at all times have fixed itself on men's minds, and led them to speculate and ask questions which we have no data to answer. The simplest and truest way of looking at it has been that of those who, from the great Alexandrian thinker (Origen, in Romans 3) to the writer of the most popular hymn of our own times, have seen in the “dying thief” the first great typical instance that “a mail is justified by faith without the deeds of the law.” Even those whose thoughts were less deep and wide acknowledged that in this and other like cases the baptism of blood supplied the place of the outward sign of regeneration (Hilar. De Trinit. c. 10; Jerome, Ep. 13). The logical speculations of the Pelagian controversy overclouded, in this as in other instances, the clear judgment of Augustine. Maintaining the absolute necessity of baptism to salvation, he had to discuss the question whether the penitent thief had been baptized or not, and he oscillates, with melancholy indecision, between the two answers. At times he is disposed to rest content with the solution which had satisfied others. Then again he ventures on the conjecture that the water which sprang forth from the pierced side had sprinkled him, and so had been a sufficient baptism. Finally, yielding to the inexorable logic of a sacramental theory, he rests in the assumption that he probably had been baptized before, either in his prison or before he entered on his robber-life (August. De Anima, 1, 11; 3, 12; Serm. de Temp. 130; Retract. 1, 26; 3, 18, 55).

Other conjectures turn more on the circumstances of the history. Bengel, usually acute, here overshoots the mark, and finds in the Lord's words to him, dropping all mention of the Messianic kingdom, an indication that the penitent thief was a Gentile, the impenitent a Jew, and that this the scene on Calvary was typical of the position of the two churches (Gnomon N.T.  in Luke 23). Stier (Words of the Lord Jesus, ad loc.) reads in the words of reproof (οὐδὲ φοβῇ σὺ τὸν θεόν) the language of one who had all along listened with grief and horror to the revilings of the multitude, the burst of an indignation previously suppressed. The Apocryphal gospels, as usual, do their best to lower the divine history to the level of a legend. They follow the repentant robber into the unseen world. He is the first to enter Paradise of all mankind. Adam and Seth and the patriarchs find him already there bearing his cross. Michael the archangel had led him to the gate, and the fiery sword had turned aside to let him pass (Evang. Nicod. 2, 10). Names were given to the two robbers. Demas or Dismas was the penitent thief, hanging on the right, Gestas the impenitent on the left (ibid. 1, 10; Narrat. Joseph. c. 3).

The cry of entreaty is expanded into a long, wordy prayer (Narrat. Joseph. loc. cit.), and the promise suffers the same treatment. The history of the Infancy is made prophetic of that of the crucifixion. The holy family, on their flight to Egypt, come upon a band of robbers. One of them, Titus (the names are different here), has compassion, purchases the silence of his companion Dumachus, and the infant Christ prophesies that after thirty years Titus shall be crucified with him, and shall go before him into Paradise (Evang. Infant. c. 23). As in other instances [see MAGI], so in this, the fancy of inventors seems to have been fertile in names. Bede (Collectan.) gives Matha and Joca as those which prevailed in his time. The name given in the Gospel of Nicodemus has, however, kept its ground, and St. Dismas takes his place in the hagiology of the Syrian, the Greek, and the Latin Church. —Smith. It has been assumed that the penitent thief had been very wicked; that he continued so till he was nailed to the cross; that he joined the other malefactor in insulting the Savior; and that then, by a miracle of grace, he was transformed into a penitent Christian; so Origen (Hom. 35 in Matthew), Chrysostom (Hom. 88 in Matthew), and others (comp. Suicer, s.v. Λῃστής). But this view of the case seems to involve some misconception of the facts, which it may not be inexpedient to indicate. Whitby says, “Almost all interpreters that I have read here say that this thief began his repentance on the cross.” With regard to his moral character, he is indeed styled by the evangelist one of the “malefactors (κακοῦργοι) who were led with Jesus to be put to death” (Luk 23:32); but the word is evidently used δοξαστικῶς, i.e. malefactors as they were considered. Matthew (Mat 27:44) and Mark (Mar 15:27) call them λῃσταί; but this word denotes not only robbers, etc., but also brigands, rebels, or any who carry on unauthorized hostilities, insurgents (Thucyd. 4:53).

Insurrection was a crime, but it was a crime a  person might have committed who had good qualities, and had maintained a respectable character. Again, this man's punishment was crucifixion, which was not in use among the Jews, but was inflicted by the Romans, as we have seen, not on mere thieves, but rebels. Barabbas had been one of these, and though he'” lay bound with them that had made insurrection with him, who had committed murder in the insurrection,” Mark (Mar 15:27) has the same word, λῃστής, “robber,” which is applied to him by John (Joh 18:40). It is most probable that these “malefactors” were two of his companions. Our Lord-was condemned under the same charge of insurrection (Luk 23:2), and the man whose case we are considering says to his fellow-sufferer, “Thou art under the same sentence, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κρίματι, and admits that they both were guilty of the charge, while our Lord was innocent of it (Luk 23:40-41). It is impossible, then, to determine the degree of his criminality without knowing what provocations he had received under the despotic and arbitrary rule of a Roman governor such as Pilate, how far he had been active, or only mixed up with the sedition, etc. The notion that he was suddenly and instantaneously converted on the cross is grounded entirely upon the general statement of Matthew, “the thieves also which were crucified with him cast the same in his teeth” (Mat 27:44); whereas Luke, in his relation of the incident, is more exact. Instances of Matthew's style of speaking, which is called amplification, abound in the gospels, and in all writers. Thus, “the soldiers brought him vinegar” (Luk 23:36; Joh 19:29), “one of them did so” (Mat 27:48; Mar 15:36). “The disciples had indignation” (Mat 26:8), “some of them” (Mar 14:4),” one of them” (Joh 12:4). So on Mar 16:5; Mat 28:2, there is mention of one angel only: but in Luk 24:4; Joh 20:12, there is mention of two. This is substantially the explanation given by Cyprian (De Passione Domini), Augustine (DeCons. Evang. 3, 16), and others, which assumes a synecdoche or syllepsis or enallage. The captious objections to the narrative of Luke as inconsistent with that. of Matthew and Mark, and the inference drawn from; them that both are more or less legendary, are therefore puerile (Strauss, Leben Jesu, 2, 519; Ewald, Christus, in Gesch. 5, 438). It is far from certain that either faith or repentance of this “thief” was the fruit of this particular season. He must have known something o the Savior, otherwise he could not have said οὐδὲν ἄτοπον ἔπραξε, “he hath done nothing amiss.” He may have been acquainted with the miracles and preaching of Jesus before he was cast into prison; he may have even conversed with him there. He was convinced of our Lord's Messiahship,  “Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.” His crime possibly consisted of only one act of insubordination, and he might have been both a sincere believer, and, with this one exception, a practical follower of Christ. Kocher (ap. Bloomfield, Recen. Synop.) tells; us that it is a very ancient tradition that the thief was not converted at the cross, but was previously imbued; with a knowledge of the Gospel. See Kuinol, Macknight, etc.; and the monographs cited by Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 63; Hase, Leben Jesu., p. 212.

## Thigh[[@Headword:Thigh]]

             ( יָרֵךְyarek; Sept. μηρός ; Vulg. femur), properly the part of the body from the legs to the trunk, of men, quadrupeds, etc. (Gen 32:25; Gen 32:31-32; Jdg 3:16; Jdg 3:21; Psa 45:3; Son 3:8), occurs in several phrases of special significance in the Bible.

1. Putting the hand under the ‘thigh appears to have been a very ancient custom, upon occasion of taking an oath to any one. Abraham required this of the oldest servant of his house, when he made him swear that he would not take a wife for Isaac of the daughters of the Canaanites (Gen 24:2-9). Jacob required it of his son Joseph, when he bound him by oath not to bury him in Egypt, but with his fathers in the land of Canaan (Gen 47:29-31). The origin, form, and import of this ceremony in taking an oath are very doubtful Aben-Ezra says, “It appears to me that it was the custom in that age for a servant to place his hand on his master's thigh, at the command of the latter, to show that he considered himself subject to, and undertook, his master's bidding; and such is at present the custom in India.” Grotius thinks that, as the sword was worn upon the thigh (comp. Jdg 3:16; Jdg 3:21; Psa 45:3; Son 3:8), this custom was as much as to say, If I falsify, kill me. Not a few commentators, ancient and modern, explain it of laying the hand on or near the sectio circumcisionis, to protest by that solemn covenant of God, whereof circumcision was the badge and type, in the Abrahamic family. So R. Eleazar says, “Before the giving of the law, the ancient fathers swore by the covenant of circumcision” (Pirke, c. 49). The Targum of Jonathan ben- Uzziel explains it כגזירת מהולתי, “in sectione circumcisionis meae;” the Jerusalem Targum, תחות יר ִקימי, “sub femore foederis mei.” Dr. Adam Clarke adopts the former of these two explanations (Commentary on Gen 24:9). This interpretation supposes meiosis, or metonymy such as is supposed by some to attend the use of the word with regard to the  effect of the water of Jealousy (Num 5:21-22; Num 5:27). Bochart adduces many similar instances (Hieroz. II, 5, 15). We may also refer to the margin or Heb. of Gen 46:26; Exo 1:5; Jdg 8:30. No further allusion to this ceremony in taking an oath occurs in Scripture, unless the phrase “giving the hand under” ? refer to it. (See Heb. or margin of 1Ch 29:24, and “giving the hand,” 2Ch 30:8; Jer 1:15; Eze 17:18.) SEE OATH.

2. Our translation states that “the hollow of Jacob's thigh was out of joint by the touch of the angel who wrestled with him” (Gen 32:25). Some, however, (prefer to render וְתָקִע, was sprained or wrenched, and adduce Jer 6:8; Eze 23:17-18. The Sept. renders it καὶ ἐνάρκησε τὸ πλάτος τοῦ μηροῦ; the Vulg. tetigit nervum femoris ejus, et statim emarcuit. Some such sense better suits Eze 23:31, where we find Jacob limping on his thigh; see Gesenius on צלע. The custom of Jacob's descendants, founded upon this incident, is recorded in Eze 23:32, which has been thus translated: “Therefore the children of Israel eat not of the nerve Nashe, which is upon the hollow of the thigh, unto this day; because he struck the hollow of Jacob's thigh, on the nerve Nashe (Sept. τὸ νεῦρον,Vulg. nervus). The true derivation of the word נשהis considered by Dr. Fürst, in his Concordance, to be still a secret; but, along with Gesenius, he understands the nerve itself to be the sciatic nerve, which proceeds from the hip to the ankle. This nerve is still extracted from the hinder limbs by the Jews in England, and in other countries where properly qualified persons are appointed to remove it (New Translation, etc., by the Rev. D. A. De Sola, p. 333).

3. (שׁוֹק, shok.) The phrase “hip and thigh” occurs in Jdg 15:8, in the account of Samson's slaughter of the Philistines. Gesenius translates עִל in this passage with, and understands it as a proverbial expression for “he smote them all.” The Chaldee paraphrase interprets it, “He smote both footmen and horsemen, the one resting on their legs (as the word שׁוֹק should be rendered), the other on their thighs, as they sat on their horses.” Others understand that he smote them both on the legs and thighs. Some give another interpretation: smiting on the thigh denotes penitence (Jer 31:19), grief, and mourning (Eze 21:12).

A few mistranslations occur. The word “thigh” should have been translated “leg” in Isa 47:2, שׁוֹק, κνήμας, crura. In Son 7:1,  “The joints of thy thighs,” etc., the true meaning is “the cincture of thy loins (i.e. the drawers, trousers) is like jewelry.” Lady Wortley Montagu describes this article of female attire as: composed of thin rose-colored damask, brocaded with silver flowers” (Letters, 2, 12; see Harmer, On Solomon's Song, p. 110). Cocceius, Buxtorf, Mercerus and Junius all adopt this explanation. In Rev 19:16 it is said “the Word of God (Rev 19:13) hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of kings and Lord of lords.” Schleusner thinks the name was not written upon the thigh, but upon the sword. Montfaucon gives an account of several images of warriors having inscriptions on the thighs (Antiquite Expliquae, III, 2, 268, 269; Grupter, 3, 1489; and Zornii Opuscula S. S. 2, 759).

## Thilo, Johann Karl[[@Headword:Thilo, Johann Karl]]

             a theologian of Halle, was born at Langensalza, in Thuringia, Nov. 28,1794. While a student he began to distinguish himself by superior philological attainments. He completed his studies at Leipsic and Halle, and in 1817 obtained the post of collaborator in the Latin school of the Orphanage at Halle, and subsequently that of teacher in the Royal Pe4agogium. He remained in the latter station five years, but joined to its duties those of theological tutor in the university, where he began to deliver lectures on exegetical and patristical subjects in 1819. In 1820 he visited Paris and Oxford in the company of Gesenius, and on his return assisted Knapp, who afterwards became his father-in-law, in the conduct of the Theological Seminary. In 1822 he was made extraordinary, and in 1825 ordinary, professor of theology. In 1833 he received the title of consistorial councilor, and in 1840 the badge of the Order of the Red Eagle. He was a member of the Order of Freemasons, and temporarily of the direction of Francke's institutes. The lectures of Thilo extended into the fields of the history of doctrines and of the Church, and into symbolics and patristics. They were characterized by thoroughness of treatment and fullness of detail as well as simplicity of style; and they came in time to be recognized and valued by the entire university. The progress of his researches led him from the study of classical antiquity and the Greek philosophers to the antiquity of the Church, the Neo-Platonists, and the Greek fathers.

He was also led to give attention to the almost uncultivated field of the New Test. Apocrypha. In 1823 he published Acta St. Thomae Apostoli, etc. The fruit of subsequent labors was accidentally lost in 1828, so that the appearance of the first volume of his Codex Apocryphus N.T., etc., was delayed until 1832. This volume, containing the Apocryphal gospels, proved the greatest  literary production of his life. His plans for the completion of the series were only partially executed. In 1838 appeared Acta Apostol. Petri et Pauli, etc.: —in 1846, Acta Apostol. Andrece et Matthice, etc. and in 1847, Fragm. Actuum S. Joannis, etc. Thilo also furnished a contribution to the literature of the Old-Test. Apocrypha in the memorial written for Knapp's jubilee in 1825, Specimen Exercit. Criticarum in Sap. Salomonis (Hallse, 1825). Various dissertations display his acquaintance with the Neo-Platonists and the Church writers who followed in their steps; e.g. De Celo Empyreo Commentationes III (1839 sq.) Euseb. Alexandr. Oratio περὶ ἀστρονόμων prcemissa de Magis et Stella Quaestione (1834): — Comment. in Synesii Hymnum II (1842 sq.). He was long employed on a complete edition of the hymns of Synesius but did not finish the undertaking. This was also the case with his last important work, the Bibliotheca Patrum Graec. Dogmatica, a single volume, containing S. A thanasii Opera Dogmatica Selecta, after the text of Montfaucon, being the extent to which it was published. Thilo was simply a student and an inquirer. He connected himself with none of the theological parties in the Church, because he saw much to approve and something to condemn in them all. Nor did he found any school, because he was unable to regard his own mind as fully formed. He gave himself simply to the work of inquiry, and became, in consequence, one of the most widely and accurately. learned men of the modern Church within the field of his own chosen labors. He was, withal, a devout lover of the Bible, a most genial associate in the friendly circle, and a profoundly interested observer of all important events. He died May 17, 1853. Dryander's discourse delivered at the funeral of Thilo was published at Halle in 1853; and a brief characterization of Thilo was given by Meier in the Hallischer Sektionskatatog (185354); and another in Convers. —Lexikon d. Gegenwart (1841),4, 2, by Henke. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Thilo, Wilhelm[[@Headword:Thilo, Wilhelm]]

             a German teacher, was born in the year 1802, and died Feb. 17,1870, at Berlin. For a; number of years he stood at the head of the Berlin seminary for the education of teachers, and published, Spener als Katechet (Berlin, 1840): —Das geistliche Lied in der evangel. Volksschule Deutschlands (ibid. 1842; 2nd ed. 1855): —Ludwig Helmbold nach Leben und Dichten (2nd ed. 1856): —Ludamilia Elisabeth Grafin von Schwarzburg- Rudolstadt. Ein Beitrag zür Geschichte der geistl. Dichtung im 17. Jahrhundert (ibid. 1855): —Melanchthon im Dienste an heiliger Schrift  (ibid. 1860): —Preussisches Volksschulwesen nach Geschichte und Statistik (ibid. 1867). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2, 1332; Literarischer Handweiser fur das kathol. Deutschland, 1868, p. 66; 1870, p. 486. (B.P.)

## Thimnatha[[@Headword:Thimnatha]]

             (Jos 19:43). SEE TIMNAH.

## Thionville, Councils of[[@Headword:Thionville, Councils of]]

             (Concilia apud Theodonis-villam). Thionville, now known as Diedenhofen, is a town of Germany; in Lorraine, situated on the Moselle; and has belonged in succession to the counts of Luxemburg, to Burgundy, Austria, Spain, and France. It was ceded by the peace of May 10, 1871, to Germany. This town has been the seat of three councils.

I. Held in 822; thirty-two bishops being present, among whom were Aistuphus of Mayence and Ebbo of Rheims. Four or five articles were drawn up in defense of ecclesiastical persons and property. See Mansi, Concil. 7:1519.

II. Held in February, 835; more than forty bishops being present. All the proceedings against Louis le Debonnaire were declared to be null and void, and he was conducted to the cathedral church of Metz, and solemnly restored to his rights and privileges. This done, the prelates returned to Thionville, where Agobard of Lyons and Bernard of Vienne, who were absent, were solemnly deposed, together with Ebbo of Rheims, who, being present, himself consented to the sentence, and renounced the episcopate. See Mansi, 7:1695.

III. Held in October, 844, in a place called at present “Just” (Judicium); Drogon, bishop of Metz, presided. In this council Lothaire, Louis, and Charles promised to observe brotherly concord among themselves. Six articles were drawn up, which the princes promised to observe. They are exhorted, among other things, to live in unity and brotherly love; to fill without delay the sees which, owing to their quarrels, had remained vacant; to hinder the laity from appropriating to themselves the property of the Church, etc.

Third Orders is the name given by Roman Catholics to persons who desire to lead a religious life in their homes, and yet have connection with some regular order. The first mention of such persons is in 1199, in connection  with the Augustines, though this order claims that it was established much earlier. There are third orders of nearly all the principal orders, as of Dominicans, Minims, Carmelites, Trinitarians, etc. Their members take the vow of allegiance to the rules of the order, with the exception of that of perpetual chastity; have directors and superiors, yet live in the world, marry, and carry on business. Their only distinguishing mark is a scapulary and leather girdle, but these are often worn under their ordinary dress.

Thirds, a peculiar arrangement, under Mary queen of Scots, for the support of the Protestant clergy. “The barons,” says Knox, “perceiving that the Book of Discipline was refused, presented to the nobility certain articles, requiring idolatry to be suppressed, the Kirk to be planted with true ministers, and some certain provision to be made for them, according to equity and conscience… And so devised they that the kirkmen” (the former clergy) “should have no intromission with the two parts of their benefices” (that is, with two thirds), “and that the third part should be lifted up by such men as thereto should be appointed, for such apsesas in the acts are more fully expressed.” The result was that two thirds of the benefices were retained by the popish clergy, and the remaining third handed to a collector for the queen. The ministers and superintendents were to have a sum modified for their support, anti the surplus was to become a part of the revenue of the crown. Thus very little was left for the ministers of the Kirk.

## Thirlwall, Connop, D.D[[@Headword:Thirlwall, Connop, D.D]]

             an English clergyman and historian, was born at Stepney, Middlesex. Feb. 11, 179. His precocity was so great that his father published for him, at the age of eleven, a volume of his compositions, Primitiae, or Essays and Poems on Various Subjects (1809). He took the Craven and Bell scholarships at Trinity College, Cambridge, 1815; graduated as senior chancellor's medallist, 1818; became tutor and fellow; and was called to the bar in 1825. In 1828 he entered, the Church, and became rector of Kirby-under-Dale, Yorkshire. For several years he was examiner for the classical tripos at Cambridge, classical examiner in the University of London, and visitor of St. David's College, Lampeter. He was created bishop of St. David's in 1840, which office he resigned in June, 1874. He died July 27, 1875. He published a number of sermons, charges, letters, addresses, and essays, which, with other writings, were issued under the title of Literary and Theological Remains, edited by canon Perowne (Lond. 1875-6,3 vols.).

## Thirst[[@Headword:Thirst]]

             ( עםאι.οχ) is a painful natural sensation occasioned by the absence of moistening liquors from the stomach. As this sensation is accompanied by vehement desire, the term is sometimes used in Scripture, in. a moral sense, for a mental desire, as in Jeremiah 2, 25,” With-hold thy throat from thirst; but thou saidst, I loved strangers, and after them will I go;” in other words, “I desire the commission of sin — I thirst for criminal indulgence,.” Matthew 5, 6, “Blessed are they who hunger and thirst after righteousness.” Psa 43:2, “My soul thirsteth for God.” The same figure is employed in the discourse of our Lord with the woman of Samaria,. “Whosoever drinketh of the water which I shall give him shall never thirst,” an allusion which the woman mistook as if intended of natural water, drawn from some spring possessing peculiar properties (Joh 3:14) SEE HUNGER.

## Thirty Years War, the[[@Headword:Thirty Years War, the]]

             a German political and, religious conflict, was not properly one war, but rather an uninterrupted succession of wars (1618-48), in Germany. Austria, most of the Catholic princes of Germany, and Spain were engaged on one side throughout, but against different antagonists.

1. Causes of the War. —For the influences which led to this struggle we must look back to the 16th century, when Germany was divided into two parties by the Reformation. Under Maurice of Saxony, Protestantisms became triumphant, and by the Peace of Augsburg(1555) each State was allowed to prescribe the form of worship within its bounds, and subjects were allowed to move from those states where their worship was prohibited to those in which it was not. There still remained many unsettled questions which provoked strife.. To guard against the future appropriation of prelacies. by Protestants, the Catholic party, against the protest of the Lutheran members of the diet, inserted an article by which all prelates who should thereafter abjure Catholicism were to forfeit their benefices. Another matter of dispute was the desire to secure for Protestants the right of worship in Catholic states. The Catholics refused to admit such an article, and all that could be gained was a personal declaration to ‘this  effect from the emperor's brother, Ferdinand, who presided over the diet at Augsburg. Under the reign of Maximilian (1564-76) Protestantism spread in Bohemia, Hungary, and Austria proper; but under his successor, Rudolf II (1576-1612), there was a reaction. Swayed by the Jesuits and the court of Spain, he proceeded to restrict, and even to abolish, Protestant worship.

2. First Stage of the War. —Thoroughly aroused, the Protestant princes formed the Evangelical Union at Anhausen, in Franconia, May 4, 1608, under the lead of the elector-palatine, Frederick-IV. The rival union of the Catholic powers, under the leadership of the duke of Bavaria, followed, July 11, 1609. The Bohemians had forced from Rudolf an edict of toleration (Majesttsbrief), July 11, 1609, which guaranteed them religious liberty; but his successor, Matthias, having signed it upon his accession, appointed his cousin Ferdinand of Styria his heir. Ferdinand, educated by the Jesuits, had taken an oath to exterminate Protestantism from his kingdom; and immediately upon: his accession, in 1617, persecutions began. Two Protestant churches, in Klostergraben and Braunau, having been pulled down, a lawsuit was instituted, and decided in favor of the Roman Catholic authorities. An appeal to the emperor only elicited a harsh reply, which aroused the Protestants, who, under the leadership of count Thurn, penetrated into the Castle of Prague (May 23,1618), threw the imperial councilors out of the window, and organized a general rising. They routed the imperial troops, and actually besieged the emperor in Vienna. Frederick, whose sole allies were Bohemians, Moravians, Hungarians, and a Piedmontese contingent of 3000, was opposed by a well-appointed army of 30,000 under duke Maximilian, and totally routed at Weissenberg, Nov. 8, 1620. The military operations of count Mansfeld and Christian of Brunswick, and the forced cession of large portions of Hungary and Transylvania to Bethlem Gabor, did much to equalize the success of the antagonistic parties.

3. Second Stage of the War. —The fearful tyranny of Ferdinand over all the Protestants in his dominions, Hungary excepted, drove them to despair, and prolonged the war. Christian IV of Denmark, smarting under some. injuries inflicted upon him by the emperor, and aided by a British subsidy, came to the relief of his German coreligionists in 1624. Holland aided with troops, and Christian of Brunswick and Mansfeld reappeared in the field. In April, 1626, Mansfeld's army was nearly annihilated by Wallenstein at Dessau, while in August Tilly overwhelmed the king of Denmark at Lutter. This victory was followed up by Wallenstein, who drove the Danes into  Jutland and extended his operations to the Baltic. Christian IV was compelled by the Peace of Lubeck, May 22, 1629, to withdraw altogether from the contest. Here, again, the war might have ended; but Ferdinand, on March 6, 1629, issued the Edict of Restitution, ordering that all ecclesiastical estates secularized since 1552 should be returned to the Church, and all immediate sees held by Protestants transferred to Roman Catholic prelates. Brandenburg, Saxony, Hesse, Magdeburg, and other states protested, but the edict was carried out by force in all the imperial cities; and Tilly was ordered to move northward and crush every attempt at resistance. At this juncture Gustavus Adolphus came to the rescue of German Protestantism, and thus began the

4. Third Stage of the War. —Gustavus landed on the island of Usedom, in June, 1630, and drove away the imperial garrisons from Pomerania and Mecklenburg, where he reinstated the expelled princes. He then formed alliances with Hesse, Saxe -Weimar, Magdeburg, and France; and was afterwards joined by the electors of Brandenburg and Saxony. With these last allies he joined battle with Tilly at Breitenfeld, Sept. 17, 1631, and nearly annihilated his army. Defeating Tilly the second time, April 15, 1632, on the Lech, Gustavus and Frederick V entered Munich. Wallenstein was recalled; and, after a few months waiting, the battle of Ltitzen was fought, Nov. 16, 1632, in which Gustavus fell, but Wallenstein was defeated. The death of Gustavus Adolphus was a severe blow to the Protestants, though the genius and indefatigable zeal of his chancellor, Oxenstierna, and the superior ability of the Swedish generals, preserved the advantages they had gained, till the crushing defeat of Bernard of Weimar at Nordlingen, Sept. 6,1634, restored to the emperor a preponderating influence in Germany. Saxony now made peace at Prague, May 30, 1635, obtaining such satisfactory terms for the Lutherans that the treaty was, within three months, adhered to by all the princes of that sect. The Calvinists were left to their fate. Sweden, however, resolved to continue the struggle, and Oxenstierna propitiated Richelieu by giving him the direction of the war. Baner led the Swedes into Germany, and won the great battle of Wittstock. Sept. 24,1636. Upon his death, in 1641, he was succeeded by Torstensson, who made the Swedish arms a terror throughout Germany. Cond and Turenne led the French to victory over the leaguers on the Rhine, until at last the emperor was deserted by all his allies except the duke of Bavaria, whose territories were already mostly in the hands of Turenne and Wrarigel. Preliminaries had been arranged for  negotiations as early as 1641, but it was not until Oct. 24, 1648, that the Peace of Westphalia was concluded at Minster.

5. Results of the War. — These, ecclesiastically considered, were that the possession of the ecclesiastical benefices was placed on the basis of Jan. 1, 1624; and in the case of the Palatinate, Baden, Durlach, and Würtemberg, the Catholics were obliged to accept 1618 as the normal year. An age of greater toleration was introduced into Germany. In all religious questions the Protestants secured an equality with the Catholics, and gained equal weight in the diet and high courts of the empire. The Peace of Westphalia terminated the religious wars of Europe, and thus became an important landmark in its history. SEE WESTPHALIA, PEACE OF.

For literature of the Thirty Years War, see Cust. Lives of the Warriors of the Thirty Years War (Lond. 1865); Ranke, Geschichte Wallezsteins (Leips. 1869) ; Stieve, Ursprung des dreissigjaihrigen Kieges (Munich, 1875),: vol. 1; and similar sketches by Menzel (Breslau, 183539, 3 vols.), Flathe (1840), Mebold (1840), Barthold (1842), Heilman (1851), Klopp (1861), Hausser (1862), Gindely (Prague, 1869), Gardner (Lond. 1874).

## Thirty nine Articles[[@Headword:Thirty nine Articles]]

             SEE ARTICIES, THE THIRTY-NINE.

## Thisbe[[@Headword:Thisbe]]

             (θίσβη v.r. θίβη), a name found only in Tobit 1, 2, as that of a city of Naphtali from which Tobit's ancestor had been carried captive by the Assyrians. The real interest of the name resides in the fact that it is maintained by some interpreters (Hiller, Ononu. p. 236, 947; Reland, Palaest. p. 1035) to be the place which had the glory of giving birth to Elijah (q.v.) the Tishbite. This, however, is, at the best, very questionable, and derives its main support from the fact that the word employed in 1Ki 17:1 to denote the relation of Elijah to Gilead, if pointed as it now stands in the received Hebrew text, signifies that he was not a native of Gilead, but merely a resident there, and came originally from a different and foreign district. But it is also possible to point the word so that the sentence shall mean “from Tishbi of Gilead,” in which case all relation between the great prophet and Thisbe of Naphtali at once falls to the ground. There is, however, a truly singular variation in the texts of the passage in Tobit, a glance at which (on the following page) will show how hazardous it is to base any definite topographical conclusions upon it.

Assuming that Thisbe, and not Thibe, is the correct reading of the name, it has been conjectured (apparently for the first time by Keil, Comm. über die  Konige, p. 247) that it originated in an erroneous rendering of the Hebrew word מַתַּשְׁבּי, which word, in fact, occurs in the Hebrew version of the passage, and may be pointed in two ways, so as to mean either “from the inhabitants of” or “from Tishbi,” i.e. Thisbe. The reverse suggestion, in respect of the same word in 1Ki 17:1, has also been made. SEE TISHBITE. But this, though very ingenious, and quite within the bounds of possibility, is at present a mere conjecture, since none of the texts support it, and there is no other evidence in its favor.

No name resembling Thisbe or Thibe has been yet encountered in the neighborhood of Kedes or Safed, but it seems impossible to suppose that the minute definition of the Latin and Revised Greek texts-equaled in the sacred books only by the well-known description of the position of Shiloh in Jdg 21:19 -can be mere invention.